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Abstract—Children’s literature is a young literary genre which is guided by a complex set of motivational, cognitive and metacognitive considerations. In the Arab world, children’s literature emerged in tandem with the modern translation movement but has started to prosper as an independent literary form only recently. Translating for children is an arduous task with myriad challenges on the linguistic, sociocultural and educational levels. This paper aims to research Kamil Kilani’s Arabic adaptation of King Lear as a model to translate for children. Kilani’s translations are significant because they are adapted in a way which responds to the needs of children without simplifying the lexical and stylistic components of the source texts or compromising their cultural content. The paper adopts a descriptive methodology supporting the main argument with comparative examples from the source text and the target text. The analysis shows that Kilani’s adaptation revolutionized the source text’s form and structure, while preserving its conceptual content, language level and style exquisitely. The results suggest that translating for children does not have to embrace cultural adaptation strategies and can instead embrace a model of acculturation between the source text cultural content and the target text readers.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Children’s literature is not an independent literary genre with distinctive features shared by all the books that belong to this literary form. Rather, it is an overarching term which refers to a variety of literary forms like “nursery rhymes, songs, storybooks, poems, riddles, fairy tales, folk tales and picture books” (Leonardi, 2020, p. 2). There is an integrated relationship between children’s literature and translation movements all over the world. Children’s literature emerged as a result of adapting or translating influential texts like holy books, classical works, adults’ literature, etc. to target the age group of children. Since translation contributed to giving children’s literature its shape and distinctive features and introduced it as a new literary form combining features from different genres, it is no exaggeration to say that translation movements have played a pivotal role in “the canonization” of children’s literature (Ghesquiere, 2016, p.25).

The following excerpt provides a general definition of children’s literature:

Children’s literature is not a homogenous body of texts characterized by features of content, style or form shared by every book in the corpus. Its sole common denominator lies in its audience and in those who engage with it: children’s books are texts that are produced or deemed appropriate for children by adults. (O’Sullivan, 2019, p. 16)

Although children’s literature is not a distinctive literary genre in its own right, works which belong to this literary form have common features that are shared cross-culturally and linguistically. For instance, children’s literature has a marginal status compared to other types of literature, and this provided authors, translators as well as editors with ample flexibility in adapting works of art as children’s literature to respond to the educational needs of the little readers who are considered “unable to understand specific cultural and linguistic elements” (Leonardi, 2020, p. 4). According to Leonardi (2020), children’s literature invests in adaptation for ideological reasons relating to politics, feminism or cultural considerations, and these adaptations have contributed to the “acceptability and survival [of children’s literature] throughout the years.” (p. 2). The author continues to remark that such adaptations lead to loss and/or shifts in the content of the original text, which implies that “its original ideology, values and norms will be inevitably shifted, diminished or lost and new ideas and concepts may be added to suit the target culture” (p. 6).

The adaptations of literary works as children’s literature address three components of the translated text: language use, topics discussed, style and presentation. As for language use, the authors of children’s literature tend to observe the appropriateness of the text’s lexical content culturally and cognitively by showing sensitivity to the target group’s cultural norms and enriching the children’s vocabulary and lexical patterns. Regarding the topics discussed in works of children’s literature, the authors of this literary form feel the need to distance their works from “violent or strong content features” (Leonardi, 2020, p. 3). Also, writers of children’s literature are keen on developing stylistic features which appeal to the target group’s aesthetic taste such as the use of lyrics, imagery and others. Other features of
children’s books are the directness and simplicity of their presentation, and the limitation in the topics discussed as the main goal behind writing for children lies in the educational component with an unswerving interest in appealing to the ethos of the audience more than anything else. The following passage provides a description of the features ascribed to translating children’s literature:

the message in children’s books was presented in a straightforward manner. Every question came with an answer, and children’s stories remained silent about topics that were not fit for discussion. Sex, violence and injustice became taboo subjects, considered unfit for young children, unless sublimated in fantasy takes set in a hardly recognizable world. (Ghesquiere, 2006, p.23)

In the Arab world, the emergence of children’s literature coincided with the dawn of the modern translation movement that marked the onset of almawada, the cultural revival movement, at the end of the nineteenth century in countries like Egypt, Syria and Lebanon (Dunes, 2011; Mdallel, 2003). This literary genre was the fruit of translating from European languages into Arabic to target the age group of children. Although translating for children into Arabic started more than a century ago, it is believed that the Arab world children’s literature is “still too young and little explored” (Bizri, 2015, p. 78) and that “there is a scarcity of research related to children’s translated literature in the Arab World” (Habtoor & Al-Qahtani, 2018, p. 1017). By and large, translating for children into Arabic adopted the translation strategy of domestication for ideological or socio-cultural reasons, taking into consideration the Arab culture as an integrated whole with unifying features like language and religion. The following excerpt summarizes the features of children’s literature translated into Arabic:

Arabic children’s literature is still impregnated with morality, didactics, and a heavy ideological bias, despite some attempts for change. Translating for children is, in its turn, governed by the same rules that govern writing for them. Translation is a cross-cultural communication in a world made up of heterogeneous cultural entities some of which see in translation a potential threat to their cultural specificity: hence the recourse to ideological manipulation. (Mdallel, 2003, p. 305)

This study is conducted to bridge a gap in current research endeavours on translating for children in the Arab world by discussing the adaptation of children’s literature for non-ideological reasons. The study is significant as it examines the complexities of translating for children from English into Arabic from a new perspective which is not classical discussed vis-à-vis the translation of children’s literature. The article proposes an unconventional reading of translating for children, in general, and Kilani’s translations of Shakespeare as children’s literature, in particular. The assumption in this paper is that critiquing the adaptations of world literature as children’s literature have focused on cultural and ethical aspects of the adaptations and not investigated other equally-important aspects that have significant implications for practicing and researching translating for children. The study provides a gestalt analysis of Kilani’s translation of King Lear (Shakespeare, 2011) adopting a contrastive descriptive methodology to answer the following translations:

1. Can children’s literature be adapted without simplification of its lexical content?
2. Can children’s literature be adapted away from cultural/ideological considerations?
3. What are Kilani’s contributions to translating and introducing Shakespeare to the children of the Arab world?
4. What are the strategies that can be adopted to adapt children’s literature without sacrificing the stylistic or cultural components of the ST?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The twentieth century witnessed an evolving interest in researching the translation of children’s literature worldwide. The seeds of children’s literature were sowed in the 16th and 17th century in the form of religious writings that aimed to educate children religiously and morally, but children’s literature as a gradually-independent literary form emerged during the eighteenth century when the authors of children’s books underplayed the didactic and educational tone steadily and replaced it with a balanced focus on components that address the metacognitive skills of children and arouse them intellectually and aesthetically (Leonardi, 2020). Throughout its journey of development, children’s literature continued to distance itself from taboo topics like violence, carnality, horror and death (Leonardi, 2020; Oittinen, 2000; Oittinen, 2006) and concentrated on entertainment, adventures, fairy tales and similar topics. The studies that investigated the strategies and implications of translating children’s literature reached consensus that the main tendency in translating this literary form was that of adaptation which allowed “a greater degree of freedom in terms of cuts, omissions, additions, explanations, simplifications … in order to conform to the target audience’s context, norms and culture, thus displaying a certain degree of ideological manipulation” (Leonardi, 2020, p. 116).

Leading scholars in researching children’s literature maintain that such adaptations emerged as a result of the ancillary status of children’s literature compared to other well-established and canonized genres (Even-Zohar, 1990; Klingberg, 1986; Shavit, 1981). Both Even-Zohar (1990) and Shavit (1981) believe that children’s literature cannot be researched in isolation of other prevalent literary forms, and this applies to translated children’s literature which is also influenced by its secondary status vis-à-vis the predominant literary tradition in the target language. Since children’s literature, as a whole, is an evolving literary genre with a marginal position compared to other literary forms, the dominant tendency in translating this literary form is to align the Target Text (TT) with the cognitive, cultural as well as ideological needs of the target group(s) rather than mirror the ST norms and patterns and reflect them neutrally. This is postulated by the assumptions of the literary polysystem theory which claims that the approach adopted in translating a
work of art keeps a direct relationship with the status of the literary form compared to other literary genres. The following figure reflects the relationship between different literary forms in an expanding circle model which is knotted at the bottom (point of origin) and loose at the top (scope of evolution).

![Figure 1. The Marginal Position of Children’s Literature in the Literary Polysystem](image)

While researchers like Klingberg (1986) and Shavit (1981) lamented the negative role of child literature’s adaptations in consecrating its inferior status compared to other literary forms, others highlighted the role of the target readers/groups, editors, publishers, local communities in embracing the translation strategy of adaptation (Leonardi, 2020; Oittinen, 2000; Oittinen, 2006). It is widely recognized that writing for children does not target the age group of children exclusively; rather it takes into consideration the agency of adults, parents or educators, in selecting, reading and even guiding the children about the types of books to read. In *The Illustrated Treasury of Children’s Literature*, Martignoni (1955) highlighted this agency by addressing the book to both children and their parents who may invest in quality family time to introduce their little ones to literary texts from the English language heritage by exposing them to the songs and stories of Shakespeare, John Keats, Hans Christian Anderson and many others.

The recent approach to literature adaptation that is inspired by Bourdieu’s theory of cultural change refutes Shavit’s assumptions about the low status of adapted children’s literature in the literary polysystem. Topical studies about the adaptations and appropriations of literature explore the implications of Bourdieu’s theory for researching translation from a socio-cultural perspective focusing on the dynamics that influence the translator’s choices of translation strategies (Hanna, 2016). One such contribution which researched the adaptations of Shakespeare as children’s literature is *Shakespeare in Children’s Literature: Gender and Cultural Capital* by Hateley (2008). This work shows “how nineteenth-century and modern authors use Shakespeare to coincide with and produce supposedly ‘ideal’ gendered readers that ultimately work to promote normative patriarchy” (Sasser, 2011, p. 155).

Although Shakespeare’s works are known for their complex themes and rich lexical content, their authoritative status in world literature and the universality of their themes have created a sustained interest in their presentation to all age groups including children. Unsurprisingly, Shakespeare’s works were presented as children’s literature not only through translation but also in adaptations using the original language of the source texts, i.e., the English language. There is a common understanding that the works of Shakespeare address the elite due to the complexity of language and thought; yet, these works have become an integral part of “popular culture” (Hateley, 2008, p. 1) and accessible to all age groups including children. Frey (2001) explained how Shakespeare’s plays were introduced to young age groups, and not only adults, from an early stage in their production. The presentation of Shakespeare’s works to the age group of children in English goes back to the beginning of the seventeenth century when the Bard’s works were represented as songs, stories, novels as well as play adaptations that targeted children in schools and beyond. The writer reviewed children’s works of literature which adapted some of Shakespeare’s works like *Romeo and Juliet*, *Henry V*, *Macbeth* and others, explaining that the purpose behind these adaptations was for the children to “get a taste of Shakespeare without confronting his texts directly” (p. 148). Another book which reviewed Shakespeare’s adaptations as children’s literature is *Shakespeare as Children’s Literature* by Richmond (2008). This publication provided a comprehensive review of Shakespeare’s adaptations for children between the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century (Ford, 2009).

Examples of adaptations of Shakespeare’s works include *Tales from Shakespeare* by Mary and Charles Lamb (1807), *Family Shakespeare* by Harriett and Thomas Bowdler (1807) besides adaptations of Shakespeare’s texts for school teaching in the middle of the nineteenth century (Frey, 2001; Richmond, 2008). These adaptations downplayed the
presence of inappropriate content in the plays to make them readable by children. For example, the adapted plays did not incorporate certain content in the STs such as violent scenes and the appearance of ghosts. The twentieth century saw a continued interest in adapting Shakespeare’s works to different degrees ranging from simple adaptations like *The Children’s Shakespeare* by Edith Nesbit (2000), first published in 1900, to highly transformed adaptations that altered the trajectory of the plot, characterization and other elements like *Bravo, Mr William Shakespeare* by Marcia Williams (2000), first published in 1956. The latter adapted Shakespeare’s tragedies and history plays like *King Lear, Anthony and Cleopatra, Richard III*, as comedies (for more on the adaptations of Shakespeare for children at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth century see (Richmond, 2008)).

In the Arab world, producing and publishing children’s books came late compared to the West (approximately two centuries later) thanks to the modern translation movement that prospered at the beginning of the twentieth century. Although early attempts at writing for children started at the beginning of the twentieth century, Arabic language children’s literature is still believed to be in its infancy as an independent literary genre focusing on the texts’ pedagogic function which is mainly concerned with educating children linguistically, culturally as well as politically. According to Mdalil (2003), “This tendency, which is decreasing in the Western societies, is still very much alive in the Arab societies, where children’s literature is basically meant to teach children, to remind them of the dichotomy between good and evil” (p. 301). The institutional and intellectual interest in developing children’s literature and improving its quality is recent represented by a number of initiatives in some Arabic countries and is yet to be further encouraged and materialized. One way of reviving the interest in developing children’s literature is through researching the translation of world children’s books or other works of literature to target the young generations. The following passage highlights the current status of children’s literature in the Arab world:

In the Arab world, children’s literature primarily has a didactic function. It is meant to impart values like patriotism, love of Islam, and appreciation for Arab culture and heritage and for the Arabic language … The authors tend to have a conservative worldview, and they may aim to indoctrinate children politically… Frequently texts are dry and moralizing, and illustrations are not appealing to children and unsuitable to the story. (Dunes, 2011, p. 172)

Translating Shakespeare’s plays has always been a prelude to cultural revival in the Arab world in one way or another. Shakespeare was first translated for adults with the rise of the translation movement during al-nahda, and the early translations of Shakespeare embraced adaptation as a translation strategy (Omar, 2012; Omar, 2020) that aimed to introduce Shakespeare to the Arab audience. Translating Shakespeare for children was pioneered by Kamel Kilani who is considered “The leading Egyptian writer of children’s books written in Arabic for the first half of the twentieth century” (Morrison, 2015, p. 48). One may wonder what could the reason(s) be behind choosing Shakespeare’s works as STs to be translated to address the children age group? It is worth mentioning that the STs that were selected by Kilani to adapt as children’s literature comprised an array of masterpieces from the Arab and Islamic culture such as his series of stories from the life of Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, and stories about the famous Juha, besides stories adapted from world literature and heritage like *King Midas* (the legend of King Midas from Greek mythology), *Robinson Crusoe*, adapted from Daniel Defoe’s novel, some Shakespeare’s plays and others (al-Hajji, 1995).

Obviously Kilani was establishing a children’s library which prepares the young generation to become the future intellectuals of the nation by introducing them to high cultural values from their own culture and other cultures worldwide. Kilani’s translations of Shakespeare appeared in the thirties of the twentieth century when the Bard was presented to adults in adaptations that were far from matching the original texts both in language and style. Kilani’s adaptations of Shakespeare fall under Hanna’s (2007) description of Khalil Mutran’s translation of *Othello* as ‘decommercializing Shakespeare’. These adaptations granted the children the prestigious status that Mutran is believed to have given to his adult readers by exposing them to “high culture” literary works (Hanna, 2007, p. 28). As such, Kilani’s adaptations of Shakespeare were accomplished in anticipation of their future role in preparing intellectually-motivated Arab readers who are open to reading books from and about other cultures. Undoubtedly, when Kilani decided to adapt Shakespeare as children’s literature, he had in mind Hateley’s (2008) idea on ‘the future agency’ of reading children’s literature in the sense that “children’s Shakespeare pushes an audience toward reading Shakespeare as an adult” (Gailey, 2020, p. 331).

Kilani received wide acknowledgement by researchers and translation professionals for his contributions to children’s literature in the Arab world (Abu-Nasr, 1996, Stephens et al, 2018). He is described as the founder and pioneer of children’s literature as he is believed to have revolutionized this literary form by writing and translating over 250 children’s books. During that time, children’s literature was of three types: translated works, lyrical poems by poets like Ahmad Shawqi and Muhammad al-Harawi and children’s magazines (Morrison, 2015). Kilani’s translations presented Shakespeare in sophisticated language and style that competed with the original texts in every sense of the word. Despite the wide recognition and critical acclaim granted to Kilani for his achievements in establishing children’s literature as an independent literary form, very few studies researched his writing style and translation strategies. In a paper presented to the first international conference on the origin and evolution of children’s literature in Arabic language, Muhammad (2016) explored Kilani’s role in enriching children’s lyrical stories by analysing his adaptations of Shakespeare.
This study aimed to examine unexplored aspects in translating for children from English into Arabic. The assumption in this research is that critiquing translation works as children’s literature has focused on adaptations that aimed to enculturate ST’s values as fits the expectations of the target readers while neglecting adaptations whose purpose was to intellectualize TT readers about the values and discourse embraced by other cultures through acculturation. The following sections will discuss the research methodology and analysis vis-à-vis the research questions about translating for children.

III. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a mixed comparative and descriptive methodology which is inspired by Toury’s model of descriptive translation studies (Toury, 1997). According to descriptive translation studies, any mutation that influences the result of the translation process in the form of loss or shifts (Catford, 2004) needs not be studied in the framework of equivalence between the ST and TT. Rather, it should be examined vis-à-vis its implications for the translation process as a whole for a practical understanding of what actually happens during the translation process away from any prescriptive categorization of the dos and don’ts of translation.

The comparative analysis was conducted on two levels: The first level adopted a general comparison between the ST and TT dealing with genre-related properties of the texts including plot, characterization, style and structure; the second level of comparison benefited from data collection on the lexical content of the ST and TT including collocational patterns, idiomatic expressions as well as culturally-embedded metaphors and images. The aim behind the collected data was to identify the type of adaptation embraced by the translator in light of the arguments presented in the literature review and to answer the research questions about Kilani’s contribution to translating world literature as children’s literature into Arabic.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This section provides a descriptive analysis of Kilani’s translation of King Lear by discussing genre-related features of the ST and TT on the one hand, and analysing certain lexical properties of the TT, drawing comparisons between its content and the ST’s content whenever possible, on the other hand. The first part of the section will analyse four generic components of the ST and TT: Characterization, plot, structure as well as style. As for characterization, it is noticed that Kilani preserved the main characters in the play and excluded secondary characters. Out of eighteen characters, Kilani presented thirteen characters excluding the following characters which are considered minor, compared to other characters in the play. The characters that were missing in the TT include: The Duke of Cornwall (Regan’s brutal husband), Oswald (Goneril’s steward and accomplice), Curan (Gloucester’s servant), Old Man (Tenant of Gloucester), as well as Servants to Cornwall.

The translator used the technique of foreignization in presenting the characters by borrowing their names from the source text, as shown in the table below. It is believed that the use of borrowing is mutually exclusive with the translation strategy of adaptation as it introduces foreign elements to the TT and the readers. However, in translating children’s literature, translators may resort to this technique to convey the idea that the topics/values which are reflected in the TT originated in a different environment and culture and may not necessarily apply to the target culture (Habtoor & Al-Qahtani, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters’ Presentation in the ST and TT</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. King Lear</td>
<td>الجلستير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goneril</td>
<td>حليبل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Regan</td>
<td>ريدان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cordelia</td>
<td>كراديا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Fool</td>
<td>الباولي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Earl of Gloucester</td>
<td>الجلستير الفاسد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Earl of Kent</td>
<td>كنت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Edgar / Poor Tom</td>
<td>إنحسر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Edmund</td>
<td>انحدر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Duke of Albany</td>
<td>البيلسي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. King of France</td>
<td>الملك الإنجليز</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Duke of Burgundy</td>
<td>الأمير الإنجليزي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Doctor Attendant to Cordelia.</td>
<td>طبيب كرديليا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the ST’s plot and structure, Kilani’s translation preserved the plot of the ST with some variation in the play’s structure, unlike the early adaptations of Shakespeare’s plays which transformed the plot and characterization of the plays considerably (Omar, 2012; Omar, 2020). Although Kilani’s adaptations coincided with the emergence of those adaptations by being published in the thirty of the twentieth century, the translator followed a different pattern of adaptation by preserving the plot of the ST’s. In the example of King Lear, both the ST and the TT consist of five acts. But while the ST acts are divided into scenes, the TT acts are subdivided into short narratives with subheadings that
have cognitive and didactic functions. The following table provides a description of the subheadings employed under the five acts with their back translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts’ divisions in TT</th>
<th>Back translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Old age, Lear’s daughters, Goneril’s speech, Regan’s speech, Cordelia’s nobleness, Lear’s wrath, the king’s festival, Cordelia’s farewell</td>
<td>I: In Goneril’s palace, Goneril’s malevolence, the minister’s loyalty, the Fool’s intelligence, the story of the bird and the raven, the king’s courtiers, Lear’s prayers, the Fool’s sense of humour, at Regan’s palace, the minister’s imprisonment, Lear’s arrival, filial rights, Goneril’s arrival, the old man’s rage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prologue: the story of an old man</td>
<td>Act IV: Prince Gloucester, the prince’s two children, Edgar’s escape, the kingdom’s advisor, the spy, the prince’s advice, the prince’s tragedy, the prince and the farmer, the prince and the mad man, the dialogue between the prince and his son, in the fields, the return of the loyal daughter, the doctor’s advice, Cordelia’s soliloquy, the old man’s awakening, the dialogue between the old man and Cordelia, apology of the repenting father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prologue: the story of an old man</td>
<td>Act V: Cordelia’s defeat, the three villains, the end of the three villains, the repentance of the defeated villain, Cordelia’s end, the suffering of the bereaved father, Lear’s end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Prologue: the story of an old man | }

Kilani’s use of subheadings in organizing the acts aimed to introduce the narrative component to the text in an attempt to facilitate the reading process since the plays are adapted to be read by children rather than acted on the stage. During the time Kilani translated and wrote for children there was no theatre that targeted the children age group in Egypt or other Arab countries. Besides, storytelling dominated the scene in Arabic children’s literature since its inception in the early twentieth century. In a bibliographical study about the genres used in Arabic children’s literature, al-Hajji (1995) concluded that story-telling (the narrative mode) prevails in Arabic children’s literature hitting a percentage of 53.8%. Kilani presented the narrative element at the expense of dialogues and monologues which he condensed making the play look like a novella. The translator supported the narrative fabric with contextual cues about the moral lessons of the text. These are reflected by the use of words loaded with expressive meaning to unveil the ethical and behavioural traits of different characters such as ‘Goneril’s malevolence, the minister’s loyalty, the Fool’s intelligence, the Fool’s sense of humour, filial rights, the old man’s rage, the old man’s suffering, the Fool’s song, the forest’s devil, the loyal prince’. This amplification serves a cognitive function that helps the children to understand and learn some values in a smooth and indirect manner. Also, narration adds an aesthetic aspect to the text and makes it more entertaining for the children by creating a mixture of dialogue, narration, and lyrics.

This takes us to a discussion of the stylistic aspects of the ST and TT. One of the stylistic aspects of the ST is the author’s tendency to mix prose with verse, which applies to almost all Shakespearean works unexceptionally. In King Lear, three characters mix verse with prose and these are the Fool, Edgar as Poor Tom and Oswald (Lennard, 2010). Kilani was careful to preserve this stylistic component in the TT because they enrich its cognitive and aesthetic aspects; the translator went even as far as amplifying the lyrical component, and by doing so he made a great contribution to introducing lyrical stories to the emerging sub-genre (Muhammad, 2016). Nagarajan (2017) explained that “in King Lear, the songs are sung by the Fool” in order to “provide in a pithy form the background of common sense and folk wisdom that Lear has flouted” (p. 360). Kilani amplified this function of the lyrics by extending their use to other characters like Lear and Kent. Amplifying the lyrical content of the play responds to the cognitive and stylistic requirements of adaptation because the adapted songs or dialogues speak wisdom using simple meter and harmonious rhythms.

Another stylistic aspect of Shakespeare’s texts is the sophisticated language which is distinguished for the prolific use of highly expressive lexical patterns, and this will be discussed in the second part of the analysis. This section will unveil more about Kilani’s translation strategies and his contributions to adapting world literature as Arabic children’s literature. The discussion will also answer the research questions on whether it is possible to translate for children without simplification or adaptation of the ST’s cultural content. These two research questions will be answered by examining the lexical content of the ST and TT including collocational patterns, idiomatic expressions as well as
culturally-embedded metaphors and images. The analysis will discuss examples from the lexical patterns of the TT and compare them, whenever possible, with examples from the ST.

The following tables provide examples of three types of lexical patterns including conjunctions, collocations, idioms, and metaphors. The main feature which is shared by this variety of lexical patterns is their expressive power and articulateness, which is a distinctive feature of Shakespeare’s language. The first table will present examples of synonyms joined by means of the conjunction word ‘and’. It is noticed in the cited examples that the translator joined the synonyms by means of conjunction as a form of amplification to contextualize difficult/high register vocabulary. Table 3 also provides examples of the strategy of paraphrasing which also serves to disambiguate the meaning of articulate vocabulary while exposing the children to high-register vocabulary to reinforce their cognition of different concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>AMPLIFICATION AND PARAPHRASING OF SOPHISTICATED VOCABULARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amplification</strong></td>
<td><strong>Back translation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الأكتراث</td>
<td>Devils and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الاتباع والشتيتين</td>
<td>Injustice and cruelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الظلم والفساد</td>
<td>hardship and adversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>النطق والفتنة</td>
<td>discord and dissonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الهزيمة والأسف</td>
<td>remorse and regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإسهال والصر</td>
<td>Boredom and irritation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>توما وخلنا</td>
<td>Callousness and perniciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الوعود والوعيد</td>
<td>Threatening and intimidating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>السوء والعناد</td>
<td>Your intransigence and stubbornness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحزن والنداء</td>
<td>Praise and commendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الهمسه واللماء</td>
<td>Hypocrisy and pretense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المزخرفة والمزهدة</td>
<td>Conceal it and veil it away from his sight and eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الأحباط وفيما الأمرات</td>
<td>Contempt and apathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الظلم والكوارث</td>
<td>Calamities and misfortunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإساءة والشكيل</td>
<td>Abuse and torture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جماليات وخصائصهم</td>
<td>Their clanging and clattering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الهمسه والنداء</td>
<td>I sentence and issue the verdict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الجرح والزمرد</td>
<td>Fortitude and patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>السلم والإغفاء</td>
<td>Forgiveness and clemency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the translator employed the strategy of amplification for cognitive reasons to enrich the vocabulary of the little readers while reducing the cognitive load of sophisticated vocabulary by using conjunctions that join the word with a synonym or paraphrasing the meaning of the word between two brackets. It is obvious that the translator was careful to simulate rather than simplify the articulate language of the ST. For this purpose, he used high-register vocabulary in Arabic to expand the vocabulary base of the readers and at the same time reflect the style of the ST. Besides his use of expressive vocabulary, the translator used complex lexical patterns such as collocations and idioms which represent another feature of Shakespeare’s style and language. The following table provides examples of collocational and idiomatic patterns in the TT.
shows. apocalyptic and the story of Jesus Christ. Kilani preserved Biblical references to the apocalypse as the following table explicit in view of the pagan context in which the play is set. Biblical images in author explained that the images which were inspired by the Book of Revelation in 2007, 5.3.17). Kilani underplayed the pagan aspect of "gods, goddess, godson". All these references to deity are ins ST's non-cultural metaphors. The analysis will investigate the translation strategies used by Kilani to process two types of references dominating to deity in the TT.

The last part of this section will provide comparative examples from the ST and the TT about the translation of cultural metaphors. The analysis will investigate the translation strategies used by Kilani to process two types of cultural metaphors and images: non-Biblical metaphors of deity and Biblical metaphors from Christianity. As for the ST’s non-Biblical metaphors, they reflect the pagan setting of the play. Deity is referred to in King Lear 28 times as "gods, goddess, godson". All these references to deity are inspired by the following conceptual metaphors:

**GOD HAS A PLURAL IDENTITY**

**GOD HAS A FEMALE IDENTITY**

**GOD HAS A HUMAN TRAIT**

Only one time the ST refers to deity as having a unique representation “as if we were God’s spies” (Shakespeare, 2007, 5.3.17). Kilani underplayed the pagan aspect of King Lear by deleting all references to deity as having human qualities and ambiguating the reference to deity as “divine care”, as reflected in the only example in which Kilani refers to deity in the TT.

On the other hand, King Lear abounds in Biblical metaphors which are inspired by Christianity. Given the conspicuous “Christian content of Shakespeare’s corpus” (Lefler, 2010, p. 212), it is hardly a surprise to find Christian references dominating King Lear, despite the pagan background of the play. Wittreich (1984) analysed King Lear within a Christian framework and provided a critical reading of the presence of apocalyptic images in the play. The author explained that the images which were inspired by the Book of Revelation in King Lear are implicit rather than explicit in view of the pagan context in which the play is set. Biblical images in King Lear include images of the apocalypse and the story of Jesus Christ. Kilani preserved Biblical references to the apocalypse as the following table shows.

The analysis will investigate the translation strategies used by Kilani to process two types of references dominating to deity in the TT.
Another Biblical metaphor which reflects Christian beliefs sees Cordelia as a Christ figure (Grene, 1996; Waldron, 2017). Some researchers associated the Christ figure with different characters other than Cordelia such as Edgar, Kent, and Lear himself (Lefler, 2010). But the leading argument across different interpretations of the play associates Cordelia with Jesus Christ “based predominantly on her selfless love for her father and her innocent death” (Lefler, 2010, p. 212) and as “She is implicated in the repentance and redemption of her father and these two concepts are central to Christian belief” (Waldron, 2017, p. 76). One of the images that are invoked by the story of Jesus Christ is reflected in Lear carrying his dead daughter. This image “has been likened to the famous pieta of Michelangelo, which depicts Mary holding the Jesus after the crucifixion” (Waldron, 2017, p. 76). Kamil Kilani’s translation of King Lear presented all these images explicitly as shown in the following table.

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST Biblical Image</th>
<th>TT Biblical Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“He hath commission from thy wife and me To hang Cordelia in the prison” (Shakespeare, 2011, act 5, p. 48)</td>
<td>“ذلك_seم القضاء، ولا مرد له – وليت حكايتها مسالمة في السجن (Shakespeare, trans. 2011, act 5, p. 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Re-enter KING LEAR, with CORDELIA dead in his arms…) (Shakespeare, 2007, 5.3)</td>
<td>(كامل حالتها بين إرهاة، وهو يصبح مغزومًا، نادم… (Shakespeare, trans. 2011, act 5, p. 48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion shows that the strategies used by Kamil Kilani in translating King Lear include foreignization, amplification, paraphrasing, and deletion. Interestingly, the analysis reveals that the strategies employed by the translator and discussed above involve incongruity if researched from the perspective of adaptation. Both amplification and deletion are known as techniques adopted in adaptation, but this does not apply to the other techniques of foreignization and paraphrasing. Another notable congruity in Kilani’s translation of King Lear is the fact that it is an adaptation which preserves the cultural content of the ST and its linguistic complexity, contrary to the expectations of research about the translation of children’s literature or translating texts as children’s literature. The shifts that affected the ST were related to its genre features rather than linguistic or conceptual content. The analysis also reveals that Kilani’s adaptation focused on amplification rather than simplification of the ST’s style and language showing a certain level of sensitivity to pagan references while preserving the ST’s cultural connotations consistently.

V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This paper researched Kamil Kilani’s adaptation of King Lear as children’s literature. Kilani’s adaptation provided a novel model of adaptation which departed from the omnipresent cultural adaptation model and replaced it with a model of acculturation through translation. This goes contrary to the expectations of earlier research about translating for children. It is widely assumed that translating for children is expected to embrace an enculturation model which consecrates the values of the Target Text (TT) at the expense of the ST’s cultural content. According to the polysystem theory, this is what gave children’s literature its periphery nature. Kilani’s translations did not see children’s literature as a periphery literary form. Rather, Kilani’s adaptation highlighted children’s literature as an independent creative literary form which mixes different genres in one text and embraces a high-culture adaptation model of acculturation. Although Kilani’s translations of Shakespeare are dressed as adaptations, they embrace a model of cultural interaction in which the translator reflected the cultural content and values of the ST unequivocally and limited his adaptation to genre-related components without sacrificing the stylistic functions of the ST.

**REFERENCES**


[4] Bowdler, T. & Bowdler, H. (Eds.). (1807). *The Family Shakespeare in Ten Volumes*; in which nothing is added to the original text; but those words and expressions are omitted which cannot with propriety be read aloud in a family. London: Longman.


Lamis I. Omar is Assistant Professor of Translation at Dhofar University, Oman, and professional translator and interpreter since 2001. She holds a doctorate in Translation Studies from Durham University, the UK. She has experience in teaching different courses including translation, ESL, culture in the classroom, and literary criticism formerly in Damascus University and currently in Dhofar University. Her research interests include translation studies, cognitive metaphor theory, Shakespeare’s metaphors and applied linguistics.