On Drama Translation:

Katerina Reiss's Text Types revisited[1]
with Reference to Shakespearean Translation into Arabic

Hoda Soliman Mohammed, Lecturer in English and Comparative Literature, Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Menoufya University.

Introduction

Katerina Reiss's distinction of texts has been a major contribution to Translation Studies in so far as translators now have to ask what type is at hand, instead of the old linguistic unqualified and undifferentiated concept of text (as an actual structure of words in a piece of writing). The only distinctions added by linguists are either structural or specific situational qualifications such as the para-linguistic features of a conversation or a speech addressed to a specific audience or any utterance where an account should be made of the tone, the position of both interlocutors and the general context of the utterance. Although Reiss's definition of text types concerns only the linguistic performance itself, her trail-blazing distinction between informative, expressive, and operative (or appellative) texts has been useful in proposing different translation strategies for the different types of language behavior. Her distinction has been useful and instrumental too in many examinations of translated works.

   This distinction remains, however, too general, and as yet incapable of explaining how the three types can and do often combine, whether in real life or in a dramatic work, and how such combination may call for different translation strategies. In drama translation, in particular, Reiss's classification seems to leave one or two questions unanswered: is the dialogic text to be regarded as ' expressive' (in so far as it is a literary text) whatever the information it is designed to give us about the 'action', the 'situation' or the ' characters'? How much of it may be explained in terms of power relations, along the lines established by Norman Fairclough in his *Language and Power*, or through traditional dramatic criteria?[2] In other words, can the information imparted by one character in a play be regarded as expressive? Are there any other demarcation lines than the ones suggested by Katerina Reiss?

Equivalence

        To achieve equivalence, as the primary aim of all translation activity, we now prefer to establish the kind of equivalence required either according to Koller's list or to the more precise distinctions established much earlier

by Austin.[3] Only what Koller calls 'text-normative equivalence' corresponds to Reiss's taxonomy; the others – such as ' denotative', ' connotative', ' pragmatic', or ' communicative', and ' formal' – are too general and difficult to use in judging the degree of equivalence in each type of text. In fact they are found to overlap in practice : ' formal' equivalence can be 'pragmatic or communicative'; it can also be 'denotative' at the same time. Even then, no translation, however 'equivalent' denotatively can be free of connotations. This is why we tend to prefer Austin's distinction between locution, illocution and   perlocution: although introduced within his ' speech act theory', the terms have been appropriated by critics, especially in so- called 'critical discourse analysis'[4]. This is no longer a fledgling pursuit but an interdisciplinary practice with roots in ' Practical Criticism', but with branches boasting lovely flowers and fruits, as fed by modern linguistic ' science'. Austin's three 'categories'--locution, illocution, and perlocution- are here used to refer to 'the actual expression', 'the intention of expression , and 'the effect of the expression' respectively. These are , or should be bound up, with Reiss's taxonomy so as to further describe how a text works in practice, and for our purposes, how an Arabic translation of a given text type – as conceived by Reiss – fulfills the text's function in terms of Austin's categories. They certainly help the examiner of a given translation to gauge the degree of equivalence achieved according to which function it serves according to Austin. In translating drama into and from Arabic, we have, however, other problems to contend with.

<u>MSA or Egyptian Arabic:</u>

  An unexpected problem in all dramatic translations is that few Arabic translations (and translators) seem to be aware of the fact that to translate' drama' is to translate for the theatre. Every translator of a text (from whichever language you choose) into a living European language, knows that his or her words will be addressed to an audience who share his or her knowledge of the language of the target text. Regardless of regional, cultural or individual variation, modern English can be regarded as a language spoken and written (and so capable of being understood, even appreciated) by most people. Not so with Arabic.

  A specific problem which cannot be ignored, whenever one is trying to take the question of equivalence seriously, concerns the duality of Arabic – the existence of two 'levels' (so called by Badawi) which are so far apart

that no drama translation can afford to set aside. In every Arab country there is an 'official ' language, a classical variety pertaining to our cultural legacy, together with a modified version of it, modernized and standardized (Modern Standard Arabic – MSA), which stands apart from the spoken language–the vernacular , which in Egypt is called Egyptian Arabic, in Syria Syrian Arabic etc. Any attempt to equate either level with an English one will be inaccurate, if not altogether false. In the case of Shakespeare, the attempt to represent the language of the common people in, say, the play of the poor ' mechanicals' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, by using Egyptian Arabic, as reported by Enani, was a failure. Needless to say , the rewriting of the entire play in Egyptian Arabic by Samir Sarhan was even a bigger failure. It continued what Enani believes is an essential feature of the play , namely that it is *foreign* and distant in time, even in Shakespeare's day where the setting is in ancient Greece and the players are part human and part 'spirits'. A whole line of action at the level of two spirits (between Titania, Oberon Puck and the fairies)seems parallel to the human action. The whole play is enframed, to use a Hideggerian term, by preparations for the wedding night of Hyppolita and Theseus . The Elizabethan audience had to resort to 'a willful suspension of disbelief' in order to enjoy the play. The language of the 'mechanicals' is formally 'low'– with Bottom's blunders given prominence and indicated even in one of the rare stage directions in Shakespeare – but it cannot be equated with Egyptian Arabic which establishes an immediately and, often enough, a sense of realism that the play lacks or seeks deliberately to smudge. Enani's translation, in MSA, gives a taste of the distance in time and place by using a variety of pompous words by the ignorant Bottom, even before Puck (Robin Goodfellow) gives him the head of an ass. The contrast between the levels of learning and the bombastic style seems to achieve the sense of incongruity apparently intended by Shakespeare, as the master of revels explains to Theseus in Act 5. Some lexical equivalences are serendipitous as when Bottom mishears the word 'odorous' as an adjective for flowers and calls them 'odious' which in Arabic is the equivalent of changing (عطرة) into (عطنة). This is, however, a rare case of paronomasia which cannot be imitated in Egyptian Arabic: the point is that no translation theoretician has yet handled this problem because the duality of Arabic seems our own special problem.

Assuming therefore that perlocutionary equivalence is the ideal in drama translation, and assuming that verse produces a different effect from prose, all Shakespearean verse should be translated into verse , and prose into prose. This is, however, has not been the rule in the Shakespearean

Arabic translation at least since the turn of the 20th century. Muhammed Iffat produced a verse translation of *Macbeth* in 1900, using the classical meters of Arabic and the single rhyme scheme. He produced a long lyrical poem, though punctuated by different speakers who may say more than is to be found in Shakespeare, for the sake of rhythm and rhyme.

Two more verse translations were produced by Muhammed Farid Abu Hadid and Zakhir Ghibrial in the 1950s and 1980s respectively. Their common fault was to stick to a single Arabic meter, producing a single 'tone' in a play relying on such a variety of 'tones'. Having learnt from such experiments with translating Shakespeare in verse, and following the example of Ali Ahmad Bakatheer who translated *Romeo and Juliet* in blank verse, Enani produced his verse version of *Macbeth* in 2007, where he tried, as he tells us in the introduction to his Arabic *Hamlet*, to imagine that Shakespeare was an Arab who now addressed his twenty-first century audience. How successful he was is a matter of opinion, but judging by the popularity of his 24 Shakespearean plays in Arabic, the Arab audiences everywhere seem to have positively responded to his 'experiment'.

Combining Austin's Categories

This is, however, only another facet of the main problem: can you maintain your faithfulness to the source text, that is, by sticking to locution or illocution, yet achieve perlocutionary equivalence? If the use of the vernacular is ruled out, how can one manipulate classical Arabic (MSA) in order to suggest the different language levels in the Shakespearean text? Amazingly this can be done by combining what is called 'page-drama' with 'stage drama'. Reiss's 'text types' will be of little help here: what one needs is Christiane Nord's *skopostheorie*. To begin with, one should ask the apparently natural question (though rarely asked in effect) what is the purpose of this translation? If it is ultimately intended for the stage, can it also have a literary value as a text to be read (not necessarily aloud) and enjoyed? Khalil Mutran, early in the twentieth century, asked this question and gave us a brilliant practical answer—his *Hamlet*.

What Mutran did in the early decades of the last century was what was precisely done in its last decades, (and even today) namely editing. Mutran was an Arabic poet who belonged to the "revivalist school", Al-Baroudi, Shawqi and Ibrahim; he believed in the Arabic tradition, extending over a thousand years and still capable of being enjoyed side by side with literature written in MSA. As director of the Egyptian National Theatre Company he was well aware of the difficulty of presenting classical Arabic *verse* in

dramatic form: for one thing, such ancient variety of Arabic verse could not be understood, let alone enjoyed, unless accompanied by commentaries and even glossaries. Spoken classical Arabic verse belonged to the printed page, to formal occasions, and to learned literary books: MSA, born and developed by the press was easier to understand by the public. He knew from his experience as a poet that his main audience would consist of the intelligentsia. However, such educated men and women in Egypt were not then familiar with the theatre. To expect such an exclusive audience who responded to the printed poems to understand and enjoy a play in classical Arabic verse was quite far-fetched. Surely, he thought, they could respond to a play in classical Arabic *prose,* especially if such a variety of Arabic was basically in MSA, but adopted to suggest belonging to the classical Arabic of the tradition. As modern directors and interpreters (actors) of Shakespeare roles do not emphasize the verse rhythms of the original lines(David Warner's Hamlet in the 1950s stands out in this connection) there was no need for the translator to echo the meters of Arabic poetry : prose was more maleable and could be better handled by the actors in Egypt. So, Mutran's first decision, that is, to translate verse into prose, was dictated by theatrical necessity. His work was not ' source text-oriented' but 'audience-required': the images which enliven the original text would be presented intact, and the structure of the dialogue and the soliloquies would be preserved, but both actors and audience would have an easier medium to handle: and, as MSA, occasionally redolent of classical Arabic rhythm, the texture of the play should carry out the required perlocutinary function – if not the "locutionary" and /or the " illocutionary" ones.

<u>The translator as editor</u>

This is the first part of Mutran's editing process. His second, more drastic part consisted of *condensing* the play. Again, as directors of *Hamlet*the world over do, Mutran reduced the length of the play from nearly 3,800 lines to about 2,500, that is nearly the length of *Macbeth*, one of the shortest plays in the canon. What he jettisoned and what he kept were mainly dictated by his conception of the expected audience response. To account for his choices should require an independent study. This should take into consideration the kind of other dramas presented in the 1920s in Cairo and Alexandria, both the tragic variety adopted mainly from the French by, say Aziz Eed (for the Fatima Rushdy troup) and by Yousef Wahbi for the Ramses Theatre, and the musicals presented primarily by Munira al Mahdiah, as well as other farces and social satire by Naguib Rihani. Obviously this should take us outside our main area of research as it

also requires a study of the translator's task as editor-cum-dramaturge. What we are concerned with here is how Reiss's 'text sorts' theory requires an elaboration of perhaps each of 'sorts', but, for our purpose how her distinction is inadequate in dealing with drama translation.

Let us have a closer look at the devices, linguistic in the main, which are used in identifying Reiss's 'textual brands'. As a general rule an informative text should be addressed to the 'mind', relying more on denotation, clarity and brevity. Semantic variations aside, it should be capable of being quickly understood by the implied addressee without arousing much emotion: a scientist reading a report on the climate is assumed to be conversant with the topic (and the scientific terminology) and so would have no difficulty grasping the purport of the text. On the other hand an expressive text should seek to express emotion and arouse an equal or similar kind of emotion in the receptor (reader or hearer). The 'style' should be alive with figures of speech, and may semantically rely more on connotation than on denotation. Certain linguistic tricks may be found to serve the purpose of evoking the reader's or listener's emotional response which may include, apart from the lexical items charged with this task in each language, aesthetic qualities, such as rhythm (in both prose and poetry) and the structure of the text both at the macro level (how its parts cohere) and at the micro level that is, at the level of each sentence. As the choice of lexical items is bound up with semantic considerations which vary from one language to another, it is therefore hard to formalize about them; but the structural features are often found to be shared by most modern languages and, in our case, by both English and Arabic. Though rhythms vary from one language to another, we always have *a regular beat* in verse; and though rhyme varies, one can always appreciate *rhymed* verse.

The fact that languages share certain qualities may tempt one to gauge the perlocutionary effect by resorting to such common features.[5] This may work indeed in certain cases, and we have seen how principles of structures applied to English can be (and were, in fact) applied to Arabic. This is not, however, a general rule. Major translators have demonstrated that macro-, not micro-level. Verse may successfully be translated into verse, prose into prose, and dialogue into dialogue, but the structure and sound of sentences and individual words, that is the 'tonal' pattern at the micro level will always be subject to the peculiarities of each language. Let us therefore examine some cases where a translator deliberately shuns the production of a parallel macro-level text in the target language. For our purposes let the macro-level

structural patterns be prose and verse, as there may be more easily and sharply contrasted, and the differences appear prominent.

The Verse or Prose dilemma

A genius in verse translation, regardless of the kind of poetry handled, Enani has chosen to give us some of his Shakespearean plays in prose—not in a mixture of prose and verse, as reflecting the Shakespearean text, but as prose from beginning to end. Of the 24 Shakespearean plays he has done so far into Arabic, 21 are in verse(where the prose is confined to prose in the source text) while 3 are exclusively in prose. These are *Julius Caesar*, *Richard II* and *Henry XIII*. Another play stands out as having appeared in three different Arabic 'versions', namely *Romeo and Juliet*. A comparison of the three versions may demonstrate that this translator has 'come of age' as Omayah Khalifah maintains: but the differences are relevant to my argument in this essay, namely that each was produced for a different purpose, with the perlocutionary function paramount in the translator's mind. Let us leave this for the moment until we have examined the reasons behind the three prose translation.

In his introduction to *Julius Caesar,* revised and somewhat improved in the third edition, Enani claims that his choice of prose was dictated by the need for a more *accurate* rendering of the historical material (Enani,2009). This is illustrated by two versions of Anthony's speech on the corpse of Julius Caesar: one in prose (as published) the other in verse as a possible alternative.

Let us for example look at lines 219-225:

Iam no orator, as Brutus is;
But as you know me all, a plain blunt man,
That love my friend; and that they know full well
That gave me public leave to speak of him
For I have neither wit, nor words nor worth,
Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech
To stir man's blood: I only speak right on:

(III.ii.219-225, *Julius Caesar*)

In these seven lines, Anthony sums up the qualities of a good orator at the time:

1. Wit (البديهية الحاضرة)
2. Words (الألفاظ المنتقاة)
3. Worth (المكانة المرموقة)
4. Action (براعة الأداء)

5. Utterance   (حسن الالقاء)
6. Power of speech   (ذلاقة اللسان)

This corresponds to the following 8 Arabic lines as published:

لست خطيبا مفوها مثل بروتس
لكننى – كما تعرفون جميعا – رجل بسيط ساذج
يخلص الحب لصديقه ' وهم يعرفون ذلك خير المعرفة –
من سمحوا لى أن أتحدث عنه أمامكم !
فأنا أفتقر الى البديهة الحاضرة,والألفاظ المنتقاه
والمكانة المرموقة ,وبراعة الأداء ,وحسن الالقاء
وذلاقة اللسان التى تثير مشاعر الناس !
لكننى أتحدث عفو الخاطر وحسب !

(عنانى, 1991)

Later Enani gives an alternative, versified version, which, he claims, to have ' reduced' the ideal of accuracy:

-اننى لست خطيبا مصعقا مثل بروتس
بل أنا – قد تعلمون – ساذج بل وغرير
أخلص الحب لمن صادقت حقا وهمو لا يجهلون !
كلهم يدرك ذلك .. ولهذا سمحوا لى
بحديث صادق اليكم !
أين لى حذق البديهة ؟ أين لى سحر الكلام ؟
أين لى شرف المكانة؟ أين لى حسن الأداء؟
لست ذا فن باءلقاء الخطب
لا ولا عندى أفانين الأدب
كى أثير العقل والقلب لديكم
بل أنا ألقى كلامى
كيفما يأتى لشفتى!

(عنانى, 2009)

The difference is not, however, obtrusive enough to support his argument. He may have been more convincing if he claimed that he was invoking the oratorical Arabic translation which was mainly in prose; though the reason we later came to know from other sources (among which were interviews with the translator) was that this prose version was destined for the stage in the early 1990s, and the director who literally ' commissioned' it (Sanaa Shafie'e) was in such a hurry that Enani had no time for the beauty of the verse. " He kept breathing down my neck," Enani told me in an interview, 2016," and repeatedly said that the actors were raring to start the rehearsals. I just *had* to meet his 'cruel' deadline", Enani added. As it happened, the project never materialized, though four or five

years later a version of Enani's text was staged at *At-Tali'ah Theatre* in an ultra-modernist form, with a good deal of equivocation about the murder of the leader, as the topic was regarded a little too sensitive in the post-Sadat murder.

Polemical Topicality

The prose texture of Enani's*Julius Caesar* is too reminiscent, however, of Mutran's style in Shakespearean translations. The idiom of classical Arabic used is almost lapidary in style throughout, with the exception of the opening scene where Roman commoners use a vernacular echoed by Enani's lowering of the level of his MSA so as to make it reflect that of the English, complete with the humour transmitted in a variety of paronomasia. The 'exaltation' of the prose style, felt to be capable of compensating for the lack of verse rhythms, however, served another purpose not mentioned by Enani, namely to invoke a sense of the 'pastness' of the action (to use Eliot's term). The Arabic rhetoric used was that of a thousand years ago, and it showed that though Enani cared primarily about perlocution, his effort produced locutionary and illocutionary results.

Many years later, though still in the 1990s, Enani translated *Richard II* and *Henry XIII* for the BBC Arabic service. Shorn of the paraphernalia of theatre production, the language had to do *by itself* the full job of presenting the dramatic text. The radio speaks to the ear and to the imagination, and the dialogue has to be delivered in such a way as to keep the audience ear 'glued' to the sounds. Silences are reduced to an absolute minimum and cohesiveness maintained to ensure perfect coherence. Knowing the destiny of his dramatic translation, Enani did two thing which he had learnt from writing in the 1960s for the Egyptian radio (radio dramas of thirty minutes each). The first was to avoid long sentences, by breaking up complex English sentences into paratactic ones. This should ensure, he thought, an even flow of ideas, not interrupted by embeddings of any sort. The second was to avoid learned words, in favour of simple lexical items. This he knew would harm the sense of 'pastness' referred to above, but then each play had an immediate relevance to the events of the period in which it was produced. (Queen Elizabeth I was not pleased with *Richard II*, complaining that it obliquely referred to her. " Don't they know that I am Richard II?" She exclaimed). Perhaps Enani wanted the Arab listeners to the broadcast plays feel that they also had implications for the prevalent political situation in the Arab world.

Skopostheorie in Practice

Now the three versions of *Romeo and Juliet* offer the best proof of my point. Translating drama is undertaken primarily for the theatre, but only secondarily for the reading public. So, his first *Romeo and Juliet,* published in 1965 in *The Theatre Magazine,* was deliberately designed for the stage *at the time*. Its MSA is, for all intents and purposes, the same in which *all* translated foreign texts were produced. Enani knew, none better, what the actors do with texts in verse or in 'canonical' classical Arabic: being uneducated as a rule in the right way of delivering either, they often made a mess of their lines. Here was another factor affecting the easy style of the first *Romeo and Juliet*. In other words you have to consider the possibility of delivering your lines intact as well as how the audience would receive them a Shakespearean problem not found in English- speaking countries. In 1964, Enani had published in the same magazine a prose version of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and everybody, judging by the press reviews at the time, loved it. Students at the Higher Institute of Dramatic Arts presented scenes from that translation professionally at the 400th birth anniversary of Shakespeare and a member of the cast was the late renowned theatre critic, and future wife of Enani, Nehad Seleha.

The second version of *Romeo and Juliet* was a musical adaptation designed to be presented at the so-called 'Riverside Theatre' on the Nile bank (now gone and replaced by a Nile restaurant- boat – a high class one. This version is naturally different from the original work, with songs 'created' or 'adapted', and a Western score by the composer Gamal Salama. It was the nearest thing to Jay Lerner's adaptation of Shaw's Pygmalion into *My Fair Lady* . It was irremediably flawed, however, by Enani's attempt to present the *full action* of the play *plus* the music and songs. Notwithstanding its flaws, the musical version shows the perlocuationary function at work from beginning to end. As the Riverside Theatre in Zamalek was an open air theatre, performances could not continue beyond October, and in its last performances the audience felt a chill in the air which spelt the end of the whole experiment.

Now the third *Romeo and Juliet*, mostly in verse, was published in 1993, while work on it had started a year earlier, but was interrupted by the translator's cancer treatment. It is here that we see how the efforts of both locution and illocution can *profitably* be maintained. Khalifah (2016) believes it shows the work of the mature Enani, and she is no doubt right as far as locution and illocution are concerned; but as for perlocution, it remains to be seen how actors not trained in delivering classical Arabic,

even as MSA, will be able to give us a pleasant evening with the star-crossed covers.

To conclude, expressive text as applied to literature includes other sub-categories. Prose should, however 'literary', be different from verse. Still as the practice of major literary translators show, both sub- types can be used alternatively, either in the same translated text or exclusively in other texts. This is demonstrated by the translation of certain Shakespearean texts by M.Enani. The upshot of the investigation has shown that more work has to be done on Reiss's theory to make it applicable to different texts, especially to drama.

Notes

1. Text types, Translation Types and Translation Assessment, tr.A.Chesterman, in A.Chesterman (ed.) *Readings in Translayion Theory*, Helsinki,1989.

2. Fairclough, N. *Language and Power*,1989.

3. Koller,W. (1979/ 1989) ' Equivalence in Translation Theory', translated from German by A. Chesterton, in A. Chesterton *Readings in Translation Theory*, Helsinki, 1989. For a good summary of Koller's taxonomy, cf. Enani's*Modern Translation Theory*(in Arabic) Pp.70-73.

4. It was J. Austin who broke new ground in 1962 by distinguishing between locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary speech acts
   (1962/1986 p.101). Briefly described, a speech locutionary act is the act of saying something, that is the production of a meaningful linguistic expression and the basic act of speaking. The term will be used, for the purpose of this study of translation, as referring to the semantic/ pragmatic aspect of the words uttered, described by Austin as "the rhetic act of contextualizing the utterance- inscription" (p.95). An illocutionary act refers to the type of function the speaker intends to fulfill, or the type of action the speaker intends to accomplish. For our purposes it refers to the intention of the speaker: what the words aim at, or what is traditionally described as the 'power of speech'. A perlocutionary act is , however, the effect of the utterance on the

addressee, described by Austin as " what we bring about or achieve by saying something" (p.109). In other words, it is the result hoped for by the speaker. In drama, it refers to how the words spoken by characters should affect the audience. Austin's terms are thus adapted to suit the features of speech in drama and to serve our translation purposes.

5. In his introduction to the second edition of his Arabic translation of *Julius Caesar*, Enani says that the language used has several levels which include both verse and prose, as well as the 'high' [so -called 'literary'] style *and*, where necessary, the 'low' [so – called 'conversational'] style of the semi or uneducated characters. He gives us an example of the opening scene and its translation, as follow:-

Flavius:
Hence! Home, you idle creatures, get you home
Is this a holiday? What, you not
Being mechanical, you ought not walk
Upon a laboratory day without the sign
Of your profession? Speak, what trade art thou?
First Citizen:
Why, sir, a carpenter.
Marcellus:
Where is thy leather apron and thy rule?
What dost thou with thy best apparel on?
You, sir, what trade are you?
Second Citizen:
Truly, sir, in respect of a fine workman,
Iam but, as you would say, a cobbler.
Marcellus:
But what trade are thou? Answer me directly.
Second Citizen:
A trade, sir, that I hope I may use with a safe conscience;
Which is, indeed, sir, a mender of bad soles.
Marcellus:
What trade, thou knave? Thou naughty knave, what trade?
Second Citizen:

Nay, I beseech you, sir, be not out with me; yet if you be out, sir , I can mend you.

Marcellus:

Thou art a cobbler, art thou?

Second Citizen:

Truly, sir, all that I live by is the awl:

(I.i. 1-27)

Enani's translation:

فلافيوس: انصرفوا ! عودوا الى منازلكم أيها العاطلون !

هل اليوم عطلة؟

ألا تعلمون أنه يجب على أبناء الحرف

ألا يسيروا فى الشارع فى أيام العمل دون ما يرمز

لحرفهم؟ قل لى أنت ما هى صنعتك؟

نجار: أنا نجار يا سيدى!

مارولوس: أين اعذن المريلة الجلد والمسطرة؟

ولماذا ترتدى أفخم ثيابك؟

وأنت يا سيد ! ما صنعتك؟

الاسكافى: الحق يا سيدى أننى لا أقارن بالصناع المهرة !

فما أنا اءلا مرقع – ولا مؤاخذة !

مارولوس: ولكن ما هى صنعتك ؟ بلا لف ودوران؟

الاسكافى: هى صنعة يا سيدى أتمنى أن أؤديها باءخلاص وأمانة –

فأنا أرقع ما انخرم وأصلحه!

مارولوس: ما صنعتك أيها الوغد ؟ أيها الوغد اللكحى ما صنعتك؟

الاسكافى: أرجوك يا سيدى ! لا تخرم فى الكلام معى !

فاءذا خرمت .. رقعت لك !

مارولوس: ماذا تعنى بهذه الألفاظ البذيئة؟

كيف ترقع لى يا سليط اللسان؟

الاسكافى: أرقع لك يا سيدى .. حذاءك !

مارولوس: أنت اسكافى اذن؟

الاسكافى: حقا يا سيدى ! كل ما أحيا به هو المخراز !

لا شأن لى بأمور التجار .. أو أمور النساء !

لكننى جراح فحسب .. جراح الأحذية القديمة ..

فعندما تكون على شفا الموت .. أنقذها!

وكم من فضلاء محترمين .. داسوا على صنع يدى !

فلافيوس: لكن لماذا تركت دكانك اليوم ؟

ولماذا تصحب هؤلاء الرجال وتطوف بهم فى الشوارع؟

14

(عنانى- 1-1-2009)

Works Cited

Aaltonen, S. (1993) " *Rewriting the Exotic: The Manipulation ofOtherness in Translated Drama"*, in Picken, Catrina (ed.)Processdings of XIII FIT World Congress (Pp.26-33) London: Institute of Translation and Interpreting.

- - - (2000) *Time Sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Austin,J.L., *How to do things with words?* Oxford, ClarendmPress(1962-1986).

Bassnett- McGuire, Susan (1985) " Ways through the Labyrinth:Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatrical Texts". In Hermans(ed.) *The Translation of Literature:Studies in Literary Translation* (Pp.87-103) London.

- - - (1990)"Translating for the Theatre: Textual Complexities, *Essays in Poetics*, 15,71-84.

Grace, George W. (1987) "The Translation of Casual Speech: Locutionary Versus Perlocutionary Translation", *Ethnolinguistic Notes*, 3 (28),7-10.

- - - (1986) Perlocutionary Translation, *Ethnolinguistic Notes* 3(26),13-16.

Hickey, L. (1998) " Perlocutionary Equivalence: Marking, Exegesis and Recontextualization", in Hickey (ed.) *The Pragmatics of Translation*(Pp.217-32)-Clevedon: Mulilinguial Matters.

Hu, Qian (1993)" On the Implausibility of Equivalent Response", *Meta*, 38 (3), 449-67.

Khalifah, Omayah. (2016):"A Translator Comes of Age", *Rewriting Narratives in Egyptian Theater, Translation, Performance, Politics*. Edited by Sirkku Aaltonen and Areeg Ibrahim. Routlege advances in theater and performance studies.

Nida, E.A. (1964) *Towards a science of Translation*, Leider,E.J.Brill.

- - - (1980)" The Nature of Dynamic Equivalence in Translating",*Babel*, 22(3), 99-103.

Pavis, Patrice (1989) "Problems of Translating for the Stage: Intercultural and Post-Modern Theatre", in Scolnicov, H.& Holland, P. (Eds), *The Play out of Context: Translating Plays from Culture to Culture*, Cambridge University Press.

- - - (1992) *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*: London: Routledge.

Pym, Anthony (1992) *Translation and the Text Transfer*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Robert, Gaines (1979) Doing by Saying: "Towards a Theory of Perlocution", *Quartely Journal of Speech*, 65 (2), 207-17.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (1990) Linguistic Transcending or Cultural Transfer? A Critique of Translation Theory, in Bassnet and Lefevere (eds) *Translation, History, Culture* (Pp.79-86) London and New York.

Soliman,Hoda (2016), An Interview with M.M.Enani, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.

Zuber-Skeritt, Ortum (ed.) (1980). *The Languages of Theatre.Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*. Oxford: --Pergamon Press.

- - - (1987) *Page to Stage: Theater as Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

المراجع العربية:

محمد عنانى- يوليوس قيصر- طبعة ثانية منقحة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب- **1991**.

محمد عنانى- يوليوس قيصر- طبعة ثانية منقحة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب- **2009**.

Abstract
On Drama Translation:
Katerina Reiss's Text Types* revisited
(with reference to Shakespearean Translation into Arabic)

The theory of text types, introduced by Katerina Reiss towards the end of the 20th century has been a major contribution to *Translation Studies*. It revolutionized our approach to the translation of various texts by establishing parameters for each text type, requiring the translator to observe stylistic differences in the target text commensurate with those of the source text. The idea of equivalence was thus given a new linguistic relevance as the form of the target text became part of the equation. One would now expect an expressive text to be translated differently, in terms of style, from an informative text. Katerina Reiss's types are, however, found to be too general and translators have tended to suggest more than one subtype in each category.

This paper argues that the category of expressive text as applied to literature includes other sub-categories. Prose should, however 'literary', be different from verse. Still as the practice of major literary translators show, both sub-types can be used alternatively, either in the same translated text or exclusively in other texts. This is demonstrated by the translation of certain Shakespearean texts by M.Enani. The upshot of the investigation has shown that more work has to be done on Reiss's theory to make it applicable to different texts, especially to drama, which have a special nature in which the expressive and the informative overlap. Experienced literary translators, Enani is one example, set rules which refuse rigid boundaries between text types.

ءاعادة النظر فى أنماط النصوص عند كاترينا رايس
(بالاشارة ءالى ترجمة شكسبير ءالى اللغة العربية)

قد كانت نظرية أنواع النصوص التى وضعتها كاترينا رايس فى أواخر القرن العشرين بالغة الأهمية فيما يتعلق بنظريات الترجمة , وخصوصا مبحث دراسات الترجمة البينى تقسم رايس النصوص إلى ثلاثة أنواع: الاخبارى والتعبيرى والداعى للعمل (الانشائى). ولكن هذه الأقسام تتسم بالتعميم. ولذلك فإن المترجمين الممارسين وجدوا أنها تحتاج الى مزيد من التفصيل والأقسام الفرعية. فهل تعتبر الدراما الحوارية نصا تعبيريا لمجرد أنه أدبى؟ و هل يمكن اعتباره اخباريا اذا كان يقدم معلومات الى القارىء؟

ويتعرض البحث لترجمة الدراما على ضوء نظرية رايس, فيعتبر أن الأسلوب النثرى لابد أن يختلف عن الأسلوب الشعرى فى الترجمة , ولكن الواقع يقول ان ترجمة النظم الى النثر قد تفى بالغرض , ومن ثم فمن الجائز أن ينتقل المترجم بحرية من النثر الى النظم ومن النظم الى النثر خصوصا فى الحوار, والمثال الحاضر لدينا هو مثال ترجمات شكسبير. فترجمات محمد عنانى معظمها منظومة ,وهو دائما ما يقول فى مقدماته أن الشعر لابد أن يترجم نظما,ومع ذلك فهو يترجم عدة مسرحيات نثرا مع أن الأصل منظوم.وهو يبرر ذلك بأنه يسعى للدقة الشديدة فى ترجمة النصوص التاريخية , ضاربا المثل بترجمته *ليوليوس قيصر* . فهو يورد جزءا من خطبة أنطونى فوق جثمان قيصر نثرا (كما هى فى الترجمة المطبوعة) وبعض سطورها مترجمة نظما حتى يبين أن النظم أشد فى الدقة. ولكن التأثير طفيف وحجته ليست متسقة. والأرجح أنه استخدم أسلوب خليل مطران فاستعاض بالنثر البليغ عن النظم فى احداث التأثير, والخلاصة التى انتهى إليها البحث أن نظرية تقسيم الأساليب التى وضعتها رايس تحتاج الى مزيد من التفصيل.