



The translation of the absurd in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* into Arabic under the test of theatricality

Jamila Chtioui*

*Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Fez Polydisciplinary Faculty of Taza
Email: Jamila.chtioui@usmba.ac.ma

***Corresponding Author:** - Jamila Chtioui

*Si Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Fez Polydisciplinary Faculty of Taza
Email: Jamila.chtioui@usmba.ac.ma

Abstract:

This article is devoted to the study of theatrical translation, more specifically, the translation of the theater of the absurd into Arabic. The objective is to see if the Arabic translation of a play of the absurd will it be absurd, would it preserve the aspects of the absurd of the source play? Should we translate the sense or the senses? The game or the game effect? To this end, we analyze two Arabic translations of certain extracts from *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett in which the linguistic manipulation is clearly perceptible, where the play on words, in the dialogue as in the stage directions¹, constitutes an essential element for decoding. Artwork. The two translations under consideration are: one by Paul Chaoul², and the second by Rania Khellaf³. To circumvent the difficulties, the translators propose solutions, negotiate their choices before making a decision, but to what extent have their translations taken into account in addition to the theatricality of the original work, the absurdity emerging from the language? The results of the analysis reveal that the absurdity arising from the play on words in Beckett's work: *Waiting for Godot*, is not found in the Arabic translations of the moment when the primacy was granted to the meaning, instead of the effect. play on words considered to generate the absurd.

Keywords: theater of the absurd, theatricality, translation, dialogue, stage directions, transfer, meaning, effect, pun, rhythm.

Introduction

To translate a play, the translator must agree to go towards the Other to bring him back to himself, to retrace his steps in those of this Other, and to follow in his footsteps. It is a question of deconstructing in order to reconstruct, of discovering the genesis of the source piece in order to be able to develop that of the target piece. Without this, translating is equivalent to explaining. And then it should be added, that the theatrical translation like dramaturgy, carries within it the story of its genesis of which acting is the core.

This means that if the theater is a game, its translation should be just as much. Moreover, the supreme attention must be directed towards the ludic side of the theater since one speaks about the theater of the absurd. The question then arises as follows: If translating theater is a ludic practice, can the ludic be translated? The supreme challenge is offered by the play on words because we often tend to raise the tragedy of the betrayal inherent in translation, although voices are raised against the translatability of puns, all the more so in the theater absurd. So what does

¹ The stage directions in *Waiting for Godot* no longer constitute an hors d'oeuvre before any dialogue. Beckett makes us hear the voice of the absurd in the stage directions as well as in the dialogue, as well as in the correlations established in the two components of the theatrical discourse. The absurd for him embraces the entire theatrical body.

² Paul Chaoul, 1942 Lebanese from Beirut in Lebanon. Co-founder, poet, literary critic and poetry translator french

³ Rania Khellaf, Egyptian from Cairo, deputy editor at al - Ahram, poet and translator

a translator do when faced with a piece made by and through puns? A work whose play on words constitutes the condition of its existence, the guarantee of its qualification as a work that belongs to the theater of the absurd?

1. Translate the game to play the translated

Before any analysis, it is not without interest to see how dictionaries and linguists define puns and how they conceive of their translation. A first rather pointed definition, provided by little Robert "The game is a physical or mental activity, purely gratuitous, generally based on convention or fiction which has no other end in the mind of the person who engages in it. Than itself, with no other goal than the pleasure it procures [...] this activity organized by a system of rules defining a success and a failure, a gain and a loss [...] the act of playing, part which cheek [...]. The pleasure is born and grows as much from this pressure exerted by the rules governing the activity as from concern for the result; the win usually satisfies the players while the loss pushes the good among them to start over. For the same dictionary, the phrase pun" designates a "joking allusion based on the equivocation of words which have a phonetic resemblance, but contrast in meaning". Sacrificing meaning for the benefit of a sound resemblance creates play. This is also the opinion of Régis Boyer "There is play on words when a second meaning is superimposed on the first, an open door to perfidious allusions, to satire, irony, humour, the absurd or quite simply good humour." (BOYER 317-358) Sometimes satirical, sometimes ironic, the stuff of puns is not limited to spontaneous jokes or cerebral entertainment. In the theater of the absurd, puns are woven differently.

In the test of translation, it has always survived, taxed with untranslatability. The incompatibility between the different languages and the representations of the world justifies the preliminary objection and hinders any translation activity. "*The transition from L1 to L2 during the translation of poetic texts, frozen sequences and puns reveals the existence of several degrees of loss; [...], the blockage is almost total.*" (Regattin 133) However, these proclamations of the untranslatability of puns come up against the moment when the translator tolerates his impotence in the face of the opacity of the original. It is the mourning of the absolute translation which makes the happiness of translating (RICOEUR 19), and which will instill in the translator the desire to complete his task because there are some who, blocked by the lexical fields which diverge and the syntaxes which do not not coincide, stop at the threshold of the process. However, it is this gap that creates the pleasure of translating. The pleasure therefore begins when the translator accepts the risk and decides to complete his task. The playful effect must captivate the *reader*⁴'s hearing and capture his sight. In other words, his sensory perception must be totally enchanted.

2. The Absurd of *Waiting for Godot* in Arabic

The classical Arabic language is a specific language, "*The main characteristic of its morphological system lies in its derivational structuring which makes it a paradigmatic system of schemes, combining complexity and rigor*" (ROUMDHANE, GOMBERT et BELAJOUZA 7-15). This says that from the root, Arabic builds by derivation, by means of affixes and especially internal inflection, all of its vocabulary. It is a language; it should be specified, variant from one region to another, in particular between the various countries of North Africa and the countries of the Arabian Gulf. The two Arabic translators of *Waiting for Godot*, being Eastern, the sound [g] becomes with them [ġ, ġ], while for North Africans it is [ħ, ġ]. On the other hand, the translation must take into account:

- That the French language contains four consonant sounds that the target language does not have (besides the [g], there is the [gn], the [v] and and [p])
- That it makes the connection, you and venerates the capital letter.

These incompatibilities⁵ are of extreme importance during the transfer, especially since it is a question of puns. This linguistic aspect is a key element in understanding the work. Behind the

⁴ We have adopted the neologism *reader* from Patrice Pavis, which designates that the receiver of a theatrical work is both a reader and a spectator.

⁵ We have contented ourselves with citing only the incompatibilities which cause difficulties for the translators.

assonances, alliterations, paronomases, puns and tongue twisters lies an absurd joke that makes you think. The translation must produce in its Arabic-speaking reader what the original produced in his French-speaking reader.

2.1. Dialog

In *Waiting for Godot*, Beckett tackles lyrics in their most theatrical form, dialogue. This one has no purpose, on the verge of aphasia, does not advance. Trampling and lame like the protagonists. Sometimes folded in the form of synchronized monologues.

2.1.1. Assonance and alliteration

Remember that for a speech manipulator, the choice of first names is well thought out. Indeed, in Beckett's creation, the affectionate diminutives "Didi" and "Gogo" produce in some cases phonic effects. The diminutive "Didi" in "Estragon: (to Vladimir) Didi, dis", followed by the imperative of the verb "Dire" (to say) form, in addition to a phonetic effect produced by the incipient assonance through the reduplication of the syllable [di], close to stuttering, a semantic effect that expresses the pressure exerted on the other to "say". During the translation activity, the translator should be able to transfer both effects into the Arabic language: phonic and semantic. However, this line is translated as Chaoul "quul ya didī »⁶ (CHAOUL 45)(Transl: speak Didi) and by Khellaf only "dīdī..." (KHELLAF 62), (Transl: Didi). Certainly the meaning is established in both translations, but the phonic effect is non-existent

The task becomes more complex when the source text contains phonemes that do not exist in the Arabic language, notably the phoneme [p]. In the following dialogue the play on words appears through the phonemes [b] and, a cacophony settles around the first name of "Pozzo": Estragon: (faisant semblant de chercher): **Bozzo...Bozzo...** (Pretending to search): **Bozzo... Bozzo...**

Vladimir (de même): **Pozzo...**

(Similarly): **Pozzo ...**

Pozzo: **PPPOZZO!**

Estragon: Ah! Pozzo... Voyons... Pozzo...Oh! Pozzo... Let's see... Pozzo...

Vladimir: C'est Pozzo ou Bozzo? (BECKETT 29-30) Is it Pozzo or Bozzo?

istrağūn (...): būzzū ... būzzū ...

fladimīr (...): būzzū ... būzzū ...- būzzū: bbbūzzū!

istrağūn: ah! būzzū (...)... būzzū ...

fladimir: ismuhu būzū aw buzzu? (CHAOUL 53-54)

istrağūn (mutaḏahiran bi al-baht): būzzū ... būzzū ...

fladimīr (mitlahu): bbbūzzū!- būzzū: bbbūzzū 7!

istrağūn: Ah! būzzū ... būzzū ...

fladimīr: A- hwa būzū am buzzu? (KHELLAF 74)

The transformation of [p] into [b] leads to sound exhaustion in the translation. The auditory load produced when reading PPPOZZO has also disappeared, because the Arabic language does not use capital letters.

She also does not make the connection. If we observe the dialogue: «Estragon: Pozzo? / Vladimir: Les os» (BECKETT 93) (Transl: Estragon: Pozzo? / Vladimir: The bones" (BECKETT 93), we clearly perceive the repetition of the syllable [zo] in "Poz zo" and "les os" (linked). However, in the two literal translations of Shaoul and Khellaf: "Istragon: būzzū? / fladimīr: al- -i zām." (CHAOUL 107) (KHELLAF 135), the sound is not heard.

Sometimes it is the musicality inherent in Beckett's work that must be conveyed. To translate the following dialog:

⁶ For transcription _ phonetic We We are referred at the website:

https://www.casadevelazquez.org/fileadmin/fichiers/publicaciones/Normes_annexes/EdCVZ_TablTransArabe.pdf . See appendix after the bibliography.

Vladimir: À force de frotter. (By dint of rubbing).
 Estragon: Qu'est-ce que tu veux. (What do you want?)
 Vladimir: C'est le nœud. (This is the knot.)
 Estragon: (C'est fatal. [...])It's fatal. [...]
 Vladimir: It's not bad. (Il n'est pas mal.) (BECKETT 35)

The decisions of the translators are as follows:

fladimir: min farṭi al- iḥtikāk
 istražūn: māḡā turīd?
 fladimir: innahā al- .oqda
 istražūn: innahu maḥtūm. [...]
 fladimir: there bass.(CHAOUL 57)

fladimir: innahu al- iḥtikāk
 istražūn: hāḡā amrun ḥatmiy
 fladimir: innahā al- 'oqda
 istražūn: innahu al- iltihāb. [...]
 fladimir: there yabdu sayi'al-maḡhar.(KHELLAF 79)

While Chaoul literally translates the dialogue, Khellaf disturbs him, sometimes opting for deletions and additions: Estragon's line: "What do you want" is replaced by: " hāḡā amrun ḥatmiy "(Lit: it is fatal), and the source line "It is fatal" is translated: " innahu aliltihāb " (Lit: it is an inflammation). There was therefore a deletion of Estragon's question: "What do you want?" and an addition of "It's an inflammation". However, neither deletion nor addition guarantees musicality in the translation.

2.1.2. Paronomasia and the pun

In addition to the difficulties relating to the transfer of the phonic effects produced by alliterations and assonances into Arabic, we cite other examples concerning the translation of paronomases and puns:

Vladimir (à Estragon): Fais voir. Transl: (to Estragon): Show me.
 (Estragon lui montre sa jambe; à Pozzo, avec colère). **Il saigne!** Transl: (Estragon shows him his leg; to –Pozzo, angrily). He's bleeding!
 Pozzo: C'est bon **signe**. Trad: That's a good sign (BECKETT 44)

fladimir (ilā istražūn): arinī!
 istražūn yurihi saḡahu. he has pūzū, bi- –ḡaḡab) innahu **yanzif**.
 būzzū: - hāḡihi '**alāmat –a jayyida**.(CHAOUL 66)

fladimir (ilā istražūn): arinī!
 istražūn yakšif 'an sāḡihi. he has būzzū, biḡaḡab) innahu **yanzif**.
 pūzū: hāḡihi '**alāmat –un tayiba** (KHELLAF 92)

The use of "' alāma '" and " yanzif " to translate "sign" and "bleed" does not preserve the effect of the paronomasia of the initial dialogue.

The same goes for the pun, which is a playful process allowing a guessing game between the speaker and his interlocutor. As soon as this process leaves its territory; the collective identity imagination of the source readers, it loses its linguistic function, unless the source language provides it with equivalents. As evidenced by the Arabic translations of «Pan dort» (BECKETT 49). Pozzo's poetic expression alluding to *Pandora's box* is translated by the two translators " Bān yanām." (CHAOUL 70). (KHELLAF 90) (Transl: Pan sleeps) "*Practically professional translators solve the problem with a footnote (this is the case of Khellaf) [...] which is an admission of impotence*" (CHAMBON 449). Except that in her footnote, the translator does not mention the playful meaning of the word in her source language. The definition brought in isolation to "Pan" in which it specifies that; (Lit: maybe it is the god of pastures and music according to Greek mythology) adds nothing. Although by resorting to the footnote, the

translator reserves her text only for the reader, her spectator cannot read the footnote, unless he holds the text while attending the performance.

2.1.3. Synonymy, resemblance and similarity

Synonymy is one of the linguistic devices used by Beckett in his work. The assembly of signifiers that refer to the same signified is reflected. The concept starts from the familiar to the sustained, from the current to the rare, especially when Pozzo lost his pipe, he wonders: «Qu'est-ce que j'ai fait de ma pipe? » (BECKETT 47), Transl: "What have I done with **my pipe?**", then: « Mais qu'ai-je donc fais de **ma bruyère!** » (BECKETT 48), Transl: "What have I done with my heather?" (BECKETT 48) To which Estragon replies: «Il a perdu sa bouffarde», Transl: "He lost his puff", before Pozzo resumes: « j'ai perdu **mon Abdullah**», Transl: "I lost my Abdullah". The term ranges from simple to rare. From the neutral name "the pipe" to the brand "Abdullah", the term takes on multiple colors to end up with only one in the Arabic translation: " ġalyūn " (CHAOU 59,60,61) (KHELLAF 81,82,83).

In the following dialogue it is to the polysemy of the verb retain that attention must be directed: Pozzo: Oh! Il est parti! Sans me dire au revoir! Ce n'est pas chic! Vous auriez dû le **retenir**, (Transl: Oh! He's gone! Without saying goodbye to me! It's not fancy! You should have retain) Estragon: Il s'est **retenu** tout seul. (BECKETT 48), (Transl: He held himself back.)

« Se retenir"(Hold back) is used by Pozzo in the sense of: "you shouldn't have let him go", and by Estragon in the sense that Vladimir was able to control his urinary leakage.

būzū: oh! raḥala dūna an yūwaddi ← any! hāḍā gayr there iq_ kāna ' alayhi an *yantāzīr*
istraḡūn: kāna yumkin an *yanfaḡīr*. (CHAOU 69)

būzū: oh ajal! laqad raḥala duna an yaqūla wadā'an! kayfa ' staṭā – a dālika! kāna bi imkānihi an *yantāzīr*
istraḡūn: kāna yumkin an *yanfaḡīr*.(KHELLAF 91)

Although the two translators voted the rhyme unanimously by translating "You should have held him *back* " and "He held himself *back* " as " kāna ' alayhi an *yantāzīr* " (Litté: he had to wait) and " kāna yumkin an *yanfaḡīr* " (Litté: he could explode), the pun created by the double meaning of the verb "to hold back" as well as the existing relationship between the action and what is said is now lost.

2.1.4. Proverbs

Familiar terms and quotations flood the room, falling within the socio-cultural imagination of the source language; they increase the difficulty of translation and accentuate the constraints linked to transfer. In what follows, we will see how the two translators got into it.

The perverted adage: « On ne descend pas deux fois dans le même pus» (BECKETT 84), Transl: "One does not descend twice into the same pus" which is the hypotext of "One never bathes twice in the same river" of Heraclitus, is translated by Chaoul: " there nanzil marratayn fi al-makāni ḡātihi " (CHAOU 99), (Transl: one does not go down to the same place), and by Khellaf: " lā yumkinuka an tartāda al- makāna ḡātahu marratayn " (Transl: you cannot go to the same place twice). In the absence of equivalents? Because here, even literarity is not guaranteed. The literal translation of "pus" in Arabic is "al- qayḥ " and not "al- makān " which designates the place.

In the same vein, let's observe the following two replicas extracted from two different places:

1. Vladimir: Quand on cherche on entend. (BECKETT 23), Trans: When we seek, we hear.
2. fladimir: andamā yabḥatu al- insānu, yasma , (CHAOU 103) (Transl: when the human being seeks, he hears)
3. fladimir ḥīnamā tabḥat, sa- tasma (KHELLAF 148), (Transl: When you seek, you hear)
1. Estragon: D'un autre côté on ferait mieux de battre le fer, *avant qu'il soit glacé*. (BECKETT 23), Transl: On the other hand, we had better strike the iron, before let it be frozen.
2. istraḡūn: wow hwa ḥāmin (CHAOU 47). (Transl: as long as it is hot).

3. *istrağūn: wa hwa sāh in* (KHELLAF 65). (Transl: as long as it is hot).

The two proverbs modified by Beckett are translated differently. In the first case, the addition of "insān"; (the human being), adds nothing to the translation of Shaoul, the Arabic reader already knows, that the proverb before it is diverted (man yabḥat yağid: who seeks finds) does not concern the animal species. If only because the impersonal pronoun has no equivalent in the Arabic language? This justifies Khellaf 's decision to lead the impersonal pronoun "on" to the personal "you".

In the second case: By the translation "[...] before it is frozen" by "[...]before it is hot", the two translators replant the proverb in its lands while the original playwright aims to uproot it by view of breaking, like all the playwrights of the new theatre, the horizon of expectation of the receiver.

2.2. The stage directions

It would be absurd not to approach the translation of certain stage directions of *Waiting for Godot* by Chaoul and Khellaf, given that the absurd in Beckett arises from language both in the dialogical and didascalical body.

2.2.1. The initial stage

Literally translating «Route à la campagne» (Country Road) as "ṭarīk rīfia " Chaoul feminizes the Arabic route: " ṭarīk " whereas it is a masculine term in the Arabic language, while Khellaf preserves its masculinity. Chaoul, faithful from the beginning, seems to reveal his veneration for the Beckettian work if not for the Lebanese dialect because " ṭarīk " is feminine there.

«[...] Sur une pierre» ([...] On a stone) is rendered " alā al- arḍ " (Transl: on the ground) in the translation of Chaoul and " fawqa murtafa «mina al- arḍ " (Transl: on a height of the earth) in that of Khellaf. Looks like stones don't exist in their land. The simplest would have been to translate "stone" by "saḥra". If not to convey the absurdity of the play. In this case "munḥafaḍ mina assamā" (Transl: a low land) would have rendered Beckett's "tree"! It should still be specified that if one perceives a Estragon in relation to "a stone" as well as all the expressions which accompany it in the stage direction such as "he is struggling with both hands", "gasping", " stop, exhausted", "panting", "start again", "giving up again", in addition to the reply "Nothing to do, it would be difficult not to think of the myth of Sisyphus. Beckett wanted her a stone, not a rock or a hill.

He also wanted his Estragon to wear a «chaussure» (shoe) and not a boot: (.āli ar-raqaba). Khellaf, by specifying the kind of shoes Estragon is wearing, tries to justify the effort put into removing his shoe.

Through the gerunds «en ahanant» (in panting) et «en haletant» and (in panting) which are in a relationship of similarity, syntactic, semantic phonics and morphology, Beckett's stage direction touches its aesthetic as well as comic gueltes. Even if it means guessing the articulatory effort that the actors must provide in the face of the doubly present hiatus. The synonymous gerunds rendered literally in order in the translation of Chaoul " ḡāhidan " and " zāfirān mina at-ta'ab " and in that of Khellaf " yalhaṭu " and " munhakan ", lose all their specificities and dispossess the didascalie of its aesthetic added value.

2.2.2. Other stage directions

The stage direction which takes the form of two rhymed verses: «Il tend la main vers *Vladimir* qui s'empresse de s'en saisir» (BECKETT 115), Transl: "He holds out his hand to *Vladimir* who hastens to *seize it* ", no longer rhymes either in Chaoul 's literal translation: " yamuḍdu yadahu naḥwa fladimīr al- laḍī yo «aḡil li al- imsāki bihi " (CHAOU 127), nor at the translator: " yamuḍdu yadahu al- laṭī yosri'o ilā attašabbuti _ bihā " (KHELLAF 183), (Transl: He stretches out his hand which he hastens to seize with force)

The sound [t] alliterant in "Estragon **t**ire **t**rébuche **t**ombe" (BECKETT 115), (Transl: Estragon shoots stumbles falls) no longer alliterates in the target language. The stage direction literally, but differently translated by the two translators: "istrağūn yashāb, yatarannah, yasqoṭ" (CHAOU 127)

127), "istrağūn yašud, yata ʿaṭar, yaqa "'(KHELLAF 183), renders nothing of the phonetic effect of the source stage direction.

The same observation can be made in the translation of the fold-out didascaly of alliterations and assonances, « froissé, froidement.» (BECKETT 10) (Transl: crumpled, cold) (BECKETT 10), rendered 'muta ʿalliman biburūd " (CHAOU 36)(Chaoul, p. 36), and "muta ʿaddīyan, bi- burūd " (KHELLAF 48).

The cerebral rotation effect produced in the reader of the original work, produced by the rotation from [d] to [p], when Pozzo asks Lucky to "dance" «danser» and then to "think" «penser» (BECKETT 55), is no longer felt in the literal Arabic translations "yarqos " and " yofakir " (CHAOU 78), (KHELLAF 104).

2.3. The intersections between stage directions and dialogue

didascalic discourse and dialogic discourse is revealing. The linking or rather the unlinking of the protagonists with each other on the one hand, and on the other with Godot, is in almost constant relationship with the linking or unlinking of the words that enter into the fabric of language. The following excerpt attests to our point:

Vladimir: **Liés?** Related?

Estragon: **Li-és.** Li-és.

Vladimir: Comment, **liés?** How, related?

Estragon: **Pieds et poings.** Foot to fists.

Vladimir: **Mais à** qui? Par qui? May s to whom? By whom?

Estragon: A ton bonhomme to your man

Vladimir: **Liés à** Godot? [...] (Un temps) **Pas encore.** (Il ne fait pas la liaison.)(BECKETT 27)

Vladimir: Bound **s in** Godot? [...] (Pause) Not yet. (It does not make the connection.) (BECKETT 27)

After the link question «Liés? » (Related?) Escorted by the affirmation of an unbinding: " Li-és ", the link rebounds in «pieds et poings» (feet and fists) and "Mais à qui?" (but to whom) only to fade out completely in "Liés à Godot?", and "Not yet", forced by the stage direction «Il ne fait pas la liaison» (He does not make the connection). The latter does not exercise its power solely on "saying it" but also on doing it; the act of bonding colonizes the dialogue. In translating this excerpt, translators should take into account the correlations established between the text to be spoken and the text to be read, as well as the recurrence of binding and unbinding. Without this, the translation would be a transposition of words from one language into another:

fladimir: muqayadayn!

istrağūn: muqaya-dayn.

fladimir: kayfa muaqyadayn?

istrağūn: bi arjulinā wow aqdāminā

fladimir: bi man? wow mimman?

istrağūn: bi sāhibika

fladimīr: bi ḡūdū? muqayadāni bi ḡūdū? [...] (samt) laysa ba ʿd» (CHAOU 51).

fladimir: muqayadayn?

istrağūn: muqaya-dayn.

fladimīr: māḡā taqsid bikalimat muqayadayn? (Litté: What do you mean by related?)

istrağūn: fi al- asfal (Litté: Below)

fladimir: walakin muqayadayni bi man? wa man qāma bi taqyidinā (But, bound to whom, and who bound us?)

istrağūn: birağulika (Litté: Avdec your man)

fladimīr: bi ḡūdū? muqayadayni bi ḡūdū? [...] there maḡāla li- ʿsuʿāl (tawaqquf) fi hāḡihi al- laḡḡa " (KHELLAF 70).

None of the discursive interactions abounding in the quoted extract is rendered in the Arabic versions, whether in Chaoul's literal translation or Khellaf's explicit translation. "Not yet" is muted for khellaf, if only because the Arabic language does not know the liaison. From then on, their

unanimous abstinence from translating the didascalie "he does not make the connection" is legitimate!

In the excerpt: Pozzo: « [...] sans avoir l'air de, comment dire, de **fléchir**? (A Vladimir) vous dites? [...] (Il **réfléchit**)» (BECKETT 37), (Transl: [...] without seeming, how to say, to flex? (To Vladimir) you say? [...] (He thinks), the paronomastic exchange between the reply and the didascalie, "flex" and "he thinks" is suspended in the Arabic translations which remain at the threshold of the denotative level:

Khellaf: būzzū: "[...] dūna an abdū, kayfa aqūluhā, dūna an abdū **mutaradid –an.** (ilā fladīr) , udran? [...] (**yufakkir** bi .umq)" (Transl: " to seem 1318say" and "he thinks deeply ") (KHELLAF 84)

Shaul: būzzū: "[[...] dūna an yabdū ← alaya, kayfa aqul? Annī **tarāja't?** (ilā fladimīr) ,afwan,[...] (**yufakkir**)" (Transl: " like whether I have 1318say" and " think ") (CHAOU 61),

However, "Réfléchir" in french" could also mean "to bend doubly"? The spectator of the translated plays will not be able to see a flexing and reflecting Pozzo, bending and folding back, will then be content to see him only thinking.

Joins the previous examples: «Estragon (faisant quelques **pas appuyés**). **Pas encore**» (BECKETT 98) (Transl: Estragon (taking a few brisk steps). Not yet» (BECKETT 98), where the reader catches the echo of Estragon's: "pas appuyés" (steps supported) in the syllable [pa] of "pas encore" (not yet). The negation is strongly pronounced.

Istraḡūn: (yaḡtū bid'a ḡatawāt mustanidan) laysa ba'd (CHAOU 111).

Istraḡūn: laysa ba 'd (KHELLAF 159)

The past participle "supported" which qualifies "the steps" of Estragon is translated by Chaoul " mustanidan " (Transl: leaning), thus qualifying Estragon and not his steps. Neither the meaning nor the pun effect has been preserved. Khellaf, for her part, dispenses with translating the whole of the didascalie and is content with her " laysa ba 'd" (Transl: Not yet).

Let's observe at the moment, the reply: "Estragon«(du tic au tac: Catulle) (BECKETT 51) (Transl: from tick to tock): Catullus". By deviating from the stage direction "du tic au tac" towards "du tac au tac", Beckett aims to use more vowels for more effect. The "du ", the "tic" and "the tac" of the stage direction are answered by "Catullus"; by reversing the 'tac' to 'cat-', and converting the 'du' to 'tu'. The discarded stage direction, Chaoul and Khellaf, are satisfied with translating "Catullus"; Chaoul the "Catulle" imprint (CHAOU 72), when Khellaf baptizes him "Adam" (KHELLAF 100). Whether it is this one or that one, the vocal resonance arising from the junction of the two components of the theatrical discourse: didascalie and reply, i.e. from "du tic au tac" and "Catullus" is no longer heard in translations.

3. The translation of Waiting for Godot in Arabic, de-absurdiasation / de-theatricalization

After the analysis comes the observation. It is clear that the absurdity of *Waiting for Godot* rests not only on the absurdity of the situation, but essentially on the verbal game which is its genesis, whereas in the two translations, only the first exists. It is true that the addressee of the two versions finds himself before a vertiginous because it is cyclical structure, in a desert and indefinite space-time with handicapped, sick, aphasic vagabonds, struck with oblivion who clownishly fiddle with harmless objects and who are incapable of perform no action, but was that enough to make both translations absurd, or at least theatrical? One thing is certain, is that the scenic acting and the verbal acting go hand in hand in the original piece and inseparably weave the fabric of the theatrical absurd. "[...] preserve the influx of playing, the vocal energy (must) [...] Try to preserve the order of the words and (as much as possible) the same number of words [...]"; (DEPRATS, Traduire Shakespeare pour le théâtre) should have been the issue. Because for a line to be played, its writing must suggest what makes it exist and can only exist as it is written. The careful question that Chaoul and Khellaf asked themselves: what does the playwright mean? Didn't get them to interpret let alone translate. The question that had to be asked is how did the playwright say what he said?

3.1. Translating the absurd; translate the senses for the senses: translate the effect

Concern about meaning in Arabic translations has prevented Chaoul and Khellaf from opening up to unexpected meaning. This one is in the theater of the absurd is unattainable, so why rush to conquer it? If not to prove its existence at least the meaning of its existence? The meaning is always deferred, postponed, unlike the "trace", which remains there, stubbornly in the text, trying to excite this witticism to conquer the inaccessible. The "trace" is a presence, it is the pun that accompanies the reader to understand Beckett's work, but meaning is absence, and it is this fugue of meaning that has vainly pushed translators to believe they can grasp the elusive, at the moment when it was necessary to grasp this "trace" or this play on words which establishes the song of each translation. However, "If this song is lacking, the translation is only a series of dead words, exact perhaps but without necessity and without theatrical effectiveness" (DEPRATS, Traduire Shakespeare pour le théâtre), Therefore, a play fatally hides the secret of its genesis. But already, what the trace bears witness to is a rhythm. To translate the theater would therefore be to translate the rhythm of the voices which say, such and such a sound for such and such a word and such and such a sentence.

The totality of the alliterations, assonances, paronomases, puns, verbal and phonic effects, pauses and punctuations, constitute the trace of the meaning that the two translators should have taken into consideration, and the fabric with which the original creator weaves his creation and which should have affected Chaoul and Khellaf. Which was not the case, although they were vigilant about punctuation, because of its importance in translating the bodily commitment that the supposed actor will adapt in the target piece, this remains insufficient, because the verbo-body or this alliance of the spoken text and the gestures, vocal and physical, accompanying its enunciation, constitute a whole that cannot be sacrificed to the detriment of the other. Chaoul and Khellaf tended to " [...] provide [...] a series of information that the target audience needs to understand a situation or a character " (PATRICE 140), but the verbo/corps setting cannot be transferred by the simple transposition of this information, especially since the stage directions that convey this information in *Waiting for Godot* have an iconic and poetic function. Joined to the dialogue, they intertwine and are incorporated semantically linguistically but above all scenically.

3.2. Translate While Waiting for Godot; writing genesis

It's no wonder the scenic writer, who here is Beckett, indulged in language in *Waiting for Godot*. Scenic writer, his vision migrates from the page to the stage and is fundamentally punched in the mind of the reader. The piece constitutes precious dramatic material for the receiver/interpreter/translator, seeking to set up for the text a chain of coherences which utter and extend over the set of verbal signifiers ; dialogues and stage directions. Hence the need for the genetic analysis of the target text for the translator. The latter already knows that the playwright, as he writes a text, forms a staging project that is part of the total organization of the work. The genetic analysis of the Beckettian piece therefore consists for the translators, not only of a means of reestablishing the multiple stages of its elaboration from the first written germ covering the aspects of theatricality: of orality, of gestuality and of the verbo-body, up to to its stage production, but also to restore the absurd which makes the source piece particular. The translation is a work process where it is necessary to redo the way of the writing of the other, which is here Beckett and to enter the factory of the writing.

4. Conclusion

At the end of this article, it should be remembered that we have examined the Arabic translation of Beckett's work *Waiting for Godot*. Careful analysis of certain extracts has shown that the two Arabic translations of Paul Chaoul and Rania Khellaf, although they literally attempted to meet the theater's first requirement, theatricality, failed to meet its second; the absurd. The enthusiasm felt in the opening pages fades as attention shifts to the what instead of the how. Because translating explains nothing. The desire for clarity comes up against each time the striking order of the words, the syntactic pulsation, the consonant framework of a sentence, the thickness of the absurd piece. The quest for meaning in *Waiting for Godot* should have been a quest for effect. Instead of striving to catch the absence/meaning, one should allow oneself to be captivated by the presence/the play on words.

Corpus

- Beckett, Samuel. *Waiting for Godot*. Paris: Midnight, 1952.
- CHAOUL, Paul. *fi 'ntizar ġūdū*. Beirut: Al-Mada, 2018
- KHELLAF, Rania. *fi 'ntizar ġūdū*. Cairo: Silsilat Afak Alamia, 2018

Mentioned works

BOYER, Regis. "Words and puns in Prevert, Queneau, Boris Vian, Ionesco, Essay on methodical study." *Studia Neophilologica* 40 (1968): 317-358.

CHAMBON, Jacques. "The pun and its translation." *La traduzione nell'insegnamento delle straniere linguistics* (1984): 449-454.

DEPRATS, Jean-Michel. "Translating Shakespeare for the Theatre." *Palimpsests, Translating dialogue. Translating theater texts*, 1 (1987): p. 53-65.

PAVIS, Patrice. *Theater at the crossroads of cultures*. Paris: Jose Corti, 1990.

QUINTALLET, Jacques. *Knowledge of a work, Samuel Beckett, Waiting for Godot*. Breal, 2021.

Regattin, Fabio. "Translating Wordplay: An Integrated Approach, Translation Workshop 23." *Diacronia Translation workshop*, 23, p. 129 (2015): 129-151.

RICOEUR, Paul. *On the translation*. Bayard, 2004.

ROUMDHANE, Mohamed Nouri, Jean Emile GOMBERT and Michel: BELAJOUZA. "Cognitive Psychology of Learning to Read. Comparative Perspectives." *learning to read; Comparative perspectives*. Tunis: Presses Universitaires de Rennes & Center de, 2003. 7-15.

LES ÉDITIONS DE LA CASA DE VELÁZQUEZ

TRANSLITTÉRATION DE L'ARABE

L'orthographe usuelle de certains mots arabes passés dans l'usage, tels que oued, souk, fondouk, mufti, vizir, etc., sera conservée. Tous les autres devront être transcrits selon le système détaillé dans le tableau ci-dessous et suivis de leur traduction entre guillemets à l'intérieur de parenthèse. Pour faciliter la lecture dans le cas d'un ouvrage spécialisé, un glossaire des termes arabes utilisés pourra être placé en fin de volume.

Le pluriel sera marqué par l'ajout d'un « s » au singulier arabe, composé en romain après un trait d'union (*sayyid-s ; ħāfiḥ-s ; muhtasib-s*), sauf pour certains mots comme *'ulamā'*, *qṣūr*, *awqāf*, dont l'usage du pluriel arabe est le plus courant. La *tā' marbūta* sera transcrite par *a* (état absolu) et *at* (état construit).

L'article al- ne prend la majuscule qu'en début de phrase. S'il s'agit d'un nom propre ou du premier terme d'un titre, seul le mot déterminé par l'article prend la majuscule (al-Andalus). Il n'est pas pris en compte pour l'organisation alphabétique de la bibliographie ou de l'index (al-Gazālī, par exemple, sera indexé à la lettre G).

TRANSCRIPTION	LETTRE ARABE	TRANSCRIPTION	LETTRE ARABE
ʾ / ʾ (sauf à l'initiale)	ء	d	ض
b	ب	t	ط
t	ت	z	ظ
ṭ	ث	ʿ / ʿ	ع
ḡ	ج	ḡ	غ
h	ح	f	ف
ḥ / h	خ	q	ق
d	د	k	ك / ك
ḏ	ذ	l	ل
r	ر	m	م
z	ز	n	ن
s	س	h	ه
š	ش	w	و
s	ص	y	ي

Voyelles longues		Voyelles courtes		Tanwin		Gémination			
á / ā	أ / آ	a	ا	=	ـَ	ww	و	yy	ي
ī	ي	i	ي	=	ـِ	Diphthongues			
ū	و	u	و	=	ـُ	aw	ا	ay	أ