The Meaning of Domestication in Enani's Translation

By

Basma Awad Sarhan

Lecturer in Linguistics – Department of English

Faculty of Arts – Mansoura University

Abstract

This paper investigates the meaning of domestication in Enani's translation in the light of Venuti's model of translation: foreignization and domestication. In fact, Muhammad M. Enani is one of the most well known translators in the middle east. The discussion is based upon selected pieces of Enani's various translations. Although employing any of Venuti's strategies is mainly an individual decision a translator makes, the result of this paper supports Enani's interest in employing domestication as the most appropriate strategy in literary translation. Furthermore, this paper shows how Enani develops Venuti's concept of domestication to include two sub-categories — so-called "regular" and "irregular". Enani's two terms are used to describe the quality of the final product of a translator.

Keywords*:* Literary translation, foreignization, domestication, Venuti, Enani.

مستخلص باللغة العربية

يهدف هذا البحث الي دراسة معني" التدجين" لفينوتي و هو احد استراتيجيات الترجمة مضاد في المعني مع التغريب و التي تمثل الاستراتيجية الثانية في نموذج فينوتي للترجمة و كذلك ترجمات محمد عناني و التي تختلف عن ترجمات مماثلة و لكن نثرا بأقلام اخرين. و مصطلح "التدجين" يعتبر المصطلح المفضل للبروفيسور محمد عناني – أستاذ الادب الإنجليزي بجامعة القاهرة – في ترجمته للعديد من الاعمال المسرحية و بالذات تراث شكسبير المسرحي و علي سبيل المثال هاملت. و لا يفضل دكتور عناني مصطلح التقريب او "التوطين" المستخدمان من العديد. و من ثم تبحث هذه الدراسة اختيار عناني "للتدجين" كاستراتيجية مناسبه لترجمه اعمال شكسبير المسرحية لتقليل "التغريب" في النص المصدر لصالح القارئ العربي مع الحفاظ علي المعني الأصلي الذي كان ينوي الكاتب نقله. تتميز الترجمات القائمة علي "التدجين" عند عناني باستخدام النظم و ربط صور شكسبير بالصور التي يتضمنها الشعر العربي القديم و المعاصر و لقد طور عناني فكرة فينوتي للتدجين لتشتمل علي نوعين "المنتظم" و "غير المنتظم" عند وصف العمل المترجم النهائي.

كلمات مفتاحية : التدجين – التغريب – فينوتي – عناني – استراتيجيات الترجمه

Introduction : Domestication

Foreignization and Domestication introduced by Venuti in the late 20th century, have come to be as common and as vague in translation studies as the old "literal" and "free". Their purpose, as two opposed strategies in translating literary texts, is more or less the same as the old, discarding terms which they now replace, namely as indicative of the difference between a target literary text which is close in idiom to the source text. Therefore, if the first, "foreignized" text reminds the reader of the source text in one or more linguistic features, so that, in extreme cases, it may be linked to the literature of the source language (in impression if not in specific linguistic features), the second "domesticated" text may belong to the indigenous body of literature in the target language. Venuti's terms primarily apply to the translation of literary texts: he favours the first strategy, blaming the second for the "false" spirit of the domestic target language, and calling for the use of certain features of the source text in the target text, as a reminder to the readers that they are reading a foreign text in translation. Attractive and easy to grasp in theory, the distinction between the two strategies may not be easy in practice.

To begin with, the call for foreignization may in effect be a call for imitating certain linguistic features which, if left unaltered, may sound unacceptable to the reader as either ungrammatical or as a sign of the work of a beginner who may not

be well-versed in their native language. Giving examples from English and Arabic, one may think of the question tag, so common in English, especially in conversation. You may read the following in a given dialogue:

- He's asleep, isn't he?

Which is normally translated as:

- أليس نائما؟
- تظن أنه نائم؟

Alternatively, a beginner could please Venuti by writing:

- إنه نائم، أليس كذلك؟
- إنه نائم، هل تظن ذلك؟

An Arabic reader would rarely accept either of the latter versions. Often enough, the editor will regularize them by substituting one of the former Arabic versions. This rule can sometimes be broken in poetry, where a great deal of change in idiom may be allowed as a poetic license. A. A. Hijazi writes:

- ياعم! أين طريق السيدة؟
- أيمن قليلا ثم أيسر يابنى.
- قال ولم ينظر إلى

- "O uncle! What is the way to Sayeda's shrine?"
- "A little to the right, then go straight left, my son,"
  He said, not looking at me.

In Hijazi's lines, the foregrounding of the old man's answer is meant to be more important than his action (not looking at the boy); and, in similar situations, the idiom of Arabic may be flouted. A writer may like to give prominence to

something said, but which they feel is outrageous or shocking, and therefore requires a break in grammar. This is done, obviously, to attract the attention of the reader; but while it occurs more frequently in English than in Arabic, in both languages the flouting of grammar is noted and regarded as deliberate, i.e. to produce a certain effect on the reader.

Theoretical Framework and Enan's Meaning of Domestication

In his book *The Translator's Invisibility,* Venuti (1995) distinguishes between domesticating and foreignizating translation. Domesticating translation attempts to conform to the culture of the target language even if it causes losing some of the cultural or stylistic content or style of the main text. In contrast, foreignizating translation attempts to recreate the syntax, cultural content and style of the source text. It is a source-culture-oriented translation in which a translator keeps an exotic flavor of the source language and culture in their target text to remind readers that they are reading a translated text which is originally written in a different language (Feng, Jianwen, 1993).

While Venuti supports and considers domestication as a kind of "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values" (1995, p.20), Nida supports domestication, as he focuses on the target reader.

Enani (2003) supports domestication as he considers the literary text as a novel literary work "النص الأدبى المترجم يعتبر عملا أدبيا جديدا" (ص ٣). The literary translator should not pay attention only to referential content but should also create the original effect of the source text on the reader. Therefore, Enani asserts that the translator should be aware of literary and critical knowledge, and should master the linguistic aspects of both languages. Enani maintains:

> المترجم الأدبى لا ينحصر همه فى نقل دلالة الألفاظ أو ما أسميه هنا بالإحالة reference أى إحالة القارئ أو السامع الى نفس الشئ الذى يقصده المؤلف أو صاحب النص الأصلى، بل هو يتجاوز ذلك إلى المغزى significance وإالى التأثير effect الذى يفترض أن يعتزم المؤلف إحداثه فى نفس القارئ أو السامع، ولذلك فهو لا يتسلح فقط بالمعرفة اللغوية ...بل هو يتسلح أيضا بمعرفة أدبية ونقدية، لا غنى فيها عن الإحاطة بالثقافة والفكر، أى بجوانب إنسانية قد يعفى المترجم العلمى من الاحاطة بها. (المرشد، ص ٦)

In his book, *Modern Translation Theory*, *he* provides a question about the appropriate approach that translator should follow to achieve his goal. He asserts that the answer to this question basically depends on the translator's goal: does he want to produce formal correspondence or creative equivalence:

> أى منهج الترجمة الذى يصل بالمترجم الى غايته...إذا كان الهدف هو اخراج عمل أدبى جديد فلابد أن يقرر المترجم (وهو فى أحسن حالاته أديب مبدع) ما اذا كان سيرمى إلى إخراج المقابل—الذى قد يرقى الى مستوى المثيل—أم إلى أخراج البديل؟ (ص٨٩)

In fact, Enani prefers creative equivalence so as to create a new literary work which sometimes reaches the level of the original text as he says "وقد مكننى هذا "البديل

من أن أظبط الصياغة العربية لأخرج المقابل (الذى كثيرا مايصل إالى درجة المثيل) (p. 125). He adds that in his translation of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, the creative equivalent was always his aim "كان الهدف الذى وضعته نصب عينى فى البداية (وأرجو أن يكون نصب عينى كل مترجم أدبى أيضا) هو إيجاد المقابل الذى قد يرقى الى مستوى المثيل" ص١٣٠.

Domestication is therefore the way of reproducing the original meaning of the source text, using the linguistic and cultural characteristics of the target language to achieve the same effect of the original text on the target reader. He makes a distinction between regular and irregular domestication. By regular domesticating translation, the translator can reproduce a new literary text close enough to the original text with the same effect.

Some examples of domestication from Shakespeare's Hamlet

It is his interest in the reader that makes Enani, as a translator, opt for domestication. In his introduction to his Arabic *Hamlet*, Enani says, "My guiding principle has been to produce an Arabic text. If Shakespeare had been an Arab, what form could his Arabic *Hamlet* take, I asked myself." The answer would, of course, be a text immersed in the idiom of Arabic. "What is the use," he asks, "of insinuating to the reader that the characters in the play are Danes? After all, Shakespeare never bothers to include any Danish linguistic features in any part of the play." In fact, especially in the soliloquies, Shakespeare, for all his

manipulation of syntax, proves himself devoted to his native English in a manner all his own. Although sometimes described as "the grammarian's despair", he has, through stylistic devices discussed at length, as Abbott shows (*A Shakespearean Grammar*, 1966) developed more than one "grammar" all his own. When a playwright appeals to all audiences, the elite and the groundlings, they must use a fully *domestic* language.

Domestication in Enani means two things: domestication in Venuti's sense, that is, a language of the target text close enough to the language of the target audience, and a language in the target text reflecting the 'domestic' quality of the source text. The latter point may appear a little vague or self-evident as Shakespeare is using the language of his people. However, as the major producer-directors of Shakespeare's plays have often insisted (such as Laurence Oliver), the playwright decidedly wrote a choice of the language spoken (and written) in his day. In his introduction to John Bartlett's *Concordance of Shakespeare's Works*, 1992, we learn that Shakespeare often adapted vulgar, obscene and swear words to fit his dramatic situations. We know, however, that many of the words thus used have changed their meaning down the centuries. It is therefore part of the job of the domesticating translator to capture the meaning of Shakespeare's words *when first they were heard and read by his audiences*.

This is what many modern editors of Shakespeare do, the most remarkable being Harold Jenkins in his authoritative 1984 edition of *Hamlet*. In his Longer Notes, he devotes the most pages to the famous soliloquy "To be or not to be" (III.i.56ff). of special significance in this context is his support for Professor A.W. Verity's (MacMillan) edition of *Hamlet* (1953) where two points are explained. The first concerns the phrase "take arms against a sea": the reference, he says, is to an old Danish (and Swedish) custom meticulously observed in pre-modern times. When a soldier is beaten in combat, he is dressed in his full armor and commits suicide by jumping into the sea. So, the meaning is "to die by committing suicide".

Although the idea of committing suicide is confirmed by Hamlet's drawing of a dagger, many critics have claimed that the intended victim would be his uncle, not himself. Other critics have thought that the idea of killing, though suggested by the text, is not to be linked to this initial existential question. Jenkins sums up the various interpretations which the critics have had of this question as follows:

> (1) The 'question' of 'To be or not to be' concerns the advantages and disadvantages of human existence, the discussion of which includes the recognition of man's ability to end his existence by suicide. (2) The 'question' concerns the choice between life and death and hence focuses on suicide throughout. (3) The 'question' is whether Hamlet shall end his own life. (4) It is whether Hamlet shall kill not himself

> but the King. (As between 'the proposed killing of Claudius' and 'the killing of himself', Wilson Knight ultimately decides in favour of both— *The Wheel of Fire*, rev. 1949, p.304). (5) Still more particularly, the 'question' is not simply whether Hamlet shall pursue revenge against the King but whether he shall proceed with his actual scheme (for the performance of a play) which he has already set in motion. (For this see esp. Alex Newell, 'The Dramatic Context and Meaning of Hamlet's "To be or not to be" Soliloquy', *PMLA*, LXXX, 38-50). (Jenkins, 1984, p. 485)

The distinction between the interpretation of the question in "relation to its immediate context" (Jenkins, 484) and one that enables us to see "Hamlet's situation in its most universal aspect" (Jenkins, 484) is not without significance to the translator. The speech, it will be noticed, does not use a personal pronoun or make any reference to Hamlet himself. The question is given in infinitives, and when the occasion comes for an agent (a subject) to be used, we have the plural 'we' which one may safely assume refers to the human race. The structure "who would …when he can" is obviously generative rather than referential. "We" is repeated three times; "us" twice. Even the structure mentioned above loses the pronoun "he" when repeated.

Now if the translator accepts either interpretation (2) or (3), they will be justified in supplying a first-person pronoun. Abdul-Qadir Al-Qitt has no hesitation: (أحيا أم

(أموت؟ is his Arabic version. Could we assume that he may have thought of الحياة أو الموت؟) or indeed (الوجود أم العدم؟) but decided to have an operative verb, which is more idiomatic in Arabic. If the translator chooses the first interpretation, they would give us (نكون أم لا نكون؟) but if bound by the immediate text, the question would be (أكون أم لا أكون؟). Still other Arabic translators, especially in the acting profession, have given us (الكينونة) and refer to the soliloquy as (مونولوج الكينونة). But how can the translator satisfy Wilson Knight's claim that the "question" is both personal and general (concerning human existence)? Unfortunately, the verb in Arabic must have an agent: is it to be "I" or "we"? Whichever the translator opts for, it will be equally acceptable.

A usual consideration emerges here and it does appear to be part of Enani's concept of domestication, as will be shown. "To be or not to be" as *the* question, has lived in Egypt in its Arabic version, that is, (أكون أم لا أكون؟), for whatever reason, for too long to be changed. The audience always expects, according to Enani, to hear (أكون ...) and will be disappointed if they do not. In effect, the Arabic version of the question is closely associated with *Hamlet*— the play as well as the character, Enani insists, citing as proof an amusing incident in which a distinguished member of the audience, then the Dean of the Institute of Dramatic Arts, objected to the way in which actor-director Mohamed Sobhi "distorted *Hamlet* beyond recognition: in vain did I wait for (أكون أم لا أكون؟)". The Dean's

speech carried so much weight that no subsequent director of *Hamlet* could dare change the traditional— hence domestic— phrase. The translation acquires the force of the source text is supported by S Bassnett and A. Lefevere's *Constructing Cultures.*

Although Enani's strategy is on the whole close enough to full domestication, he rejects the traditional (أكون أم لا أكون) which is choice number 3 in Jenkins' categorization (see above). Accepting Wilson Knight's view that both (1) and (2) are implied, Enani opts for the general (نكون) which necessarily includes (أكون). In his endnotes to his Arabic translation of *Hamlet*, 2004, Enani cites the troubles of 'being' or existence in general, not as witnessed or suffered by Hamlet himself but by everyman, as it were. Let us then be reminded of what Hamlet says in the play:

> To be, or not to be: that is the question:
> Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
> The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
> Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,

(Appendix A) P. 31

Now in lines 70-76 we have a particularization of the general 'troubles' in line 59. All the ills given in this review of the 'whips' of time—i.e. the 'slings and arrows' (Line 58) may be found to exist in Denmark and, indeed, in the world at large, but

specifically in Hamlet's case. Enani believes that this supports his plural (نكون) especially that the 30-odd lines contain three "we"s and two "us"s.

In this way, Enani believes that he has followed Wilson Knight's double reference to the singular and plural, as Jenkins explains that the reference to human existence "includes the recognition of man's ability to end his existence by suicide" (p.485). This is made possible by the fact that the general includes the particular. However, the rest of the sentence contains a paradox which has been behind a great deal of misunderstanding, especially in Arabic when translated out of context. The culprit here is the phrase "end them" (line 61). It is explained by Jenkins in his textual notes thus: "*end them* not by overcoming them but (paradoxically) by being overcome by them" (p.284). The logic of this paradox is obviously tortuous: the death of the sufferer means the end of suffering and, consequently, the end of the troubles which have caused the suffering. To reduce the effect of the paradox and to help the audience grasp the point directly, Enani gives us the Arabic:

أن يحمل السلاح كى يلقى بنفسه
فى موج بحر هائج من المتاعب
وهكذا يقضى عليها حين ينتهى
إلى الموت الذى قد لا يزيد عن رقاد! (ص ١٩٨)

What the translator has done is simply to make explicit the implied relation between 'end' and 'death' by making 'end' functions as a noun and a verb whilst

both are turned into Arabic verbs. Instead of breaking the syntax before "to die" so as to give power to the hiatus, Enani ends the third line with a verb which may in delivery be followed by a pause, thanks to its long-drawn final vowel. The rift in the divided syntax is replaced by a verb with power to link the end of troubles to the end of man.

This is not, however, the end of our 'troubles' with the opening line! There remains the mixed metaphor which Jenkins says critics have objected to. It is the apparently simple metaphor "a sea of troubles". That said, in Arabic it sounds perfectly acceptable, as metaphors in Arabic need not be based on precise correspondence between tenor and vehicle. In Shawqi, for instance, the Atlantic Ocean is referred to as "darkness", as the poet expects the reader to be familiar with its common description as "the sea of darkness" (بحر الظلمات). So in attacking the effort of certain Egyptian leaders to go to New York to defend the Egyptian cause (then, political independence), Shawqi says, "What have you done for our just cause when you, in championing it, crossed the sea of darkness?"

وأين ذهبتمو بالحق لما ركبتم فى قضيته الظلاما

A closer rendering of the text would give us 'sailed through' instead of 'crossed'; (الحق) would be 'justice' or 'right' and (قضيته) 'its cause'. Other mixed metaphors may be found everywhere in Arabic poetry; perhaps another one, still in Shawqi,

should clinch the point. Consider the opening line of his long poem "Major Events in the Nile Valley" (كبار الحوادث فى وادي النيل). This line says, "The ship was under way and engulfed by water, with hope leading it and all abroad".

همت الفلك واحتواها الماء وحداها بمن تقل الرجاء

Now if one tries to establish a correspondence, however tenuous, between the "trouble" of Hamlet's soliloquy and the personal and social ills referred to in lines 71-4, one's effort will come to grief. The difficulty may be increased when one sees that the same "troubles" are compared to heavy burdens, likely to break one's back: can any of the specific ills mentioned apply to Hamlet as a person? Does he, or someone else in the play, suffer from the law's delay, the proud man's contumely, the insolence of office, or the pains of unappreciated love? Could Hamlet be thinking of Ophelia? The rest of the scene precludes this possibility. Surely one needs not worry about correspondences, but should look for the other meaning of "sea of troubles" which Jenkins describes as "ancient", namely a sea that is turbulent or not navigable. In form, it belongs to what Christine Brooks-Rose calls a "genitival metaphot" (*A Grammar of Metaphor*, 1953). One famous example occurs in Wordsworth, viz. "fields of sleep" in the "Immortality Ode". We are familiar with it in Arabic, e.g. "a man of generosity" (رجل الكرم). Strangely,

the idiom "to fish in troubled waters" (يصيد في مياة مضطربة) is translated with the adjective given as (عكر), that is, turbid or muddy or murky.

It may be difficult to assume that this other meaning is a major sense in the metaphor, but may we ignore it altogether? Enani thinks otherwise and so gives us the following rendering of the image:

أن يحمل السلاح كي يلقي بنفسه
فى موج بحر هائج من المتاعب (ص ١٩٨)

In applying his own concept of the domestication strategy, Enani shows it to be complex in practice. Primarily, it involves the usual employment of a style, in its broadest sense, which corresponds to the target language in practically all aspects. The translator should meanwhile look for the original effect which the source language may have had on the original audience and try to replicate it in the target language. Ideally, both sense and effect of a given word or expression should be combined in the translation, as Enani does, with a measure of success. If a conflict appears, which is rare, the contemporary sense and the assumed effect should appear to be complementary, which Enani believes is hard but possible. Enani calls his method "regular domestication" (on which more later).

Enani's contribution to domestication includes his effort to render English poetry into Arabic verse, and prose into prose. Put like that, the formula must suggest *imitation* in the layman's language, but it nowhere approaches imitation in

Dryden's sense. John Dryden, poet, dramatist and antiquarian of the Restoration Period, produced good many translations, mainly from Latin. He identifies three types of translation as far as the target text is concerned, as Enani states. The first is *metaphrase*, that is, a word-for-word translation. This was old method of translating the Bible from Greek into modern European languages (cf. Appendix to Enani's مرشد المترجم, 2000). The second type in Dryden's categorization is what he calls *paraphrase*, by which he means translating of every sentence regardless of syntax, as well as the precise meanings of individual words. This method developed into what we now call 'free' translation, though the term is frowned upon by translation scholars. The third type is what Dryden calls *imitation*, which is used primarily in rendering literary texts. It means that the translator appropriates the source text and rewrites it in the target language.

Imitation is the closest type in Dryden's taxonomy to domestication but, Enani warns, it is fraught with the dangers of departing in certain ways from the source text. Successful translators, if success is to be measured by popular appeal, are quite aware of this: they know that however anxious they are to represent the source text, their desire to maintain their honest domestication of the foreign text will now and then allow them to add or omit something from it. Others who are eager not allow their domestication to alter anything significant in the source text

may occasionally be tempted by the attractions of the target language and almost involuntarily add some of these attractions to the target text.

In Enani, one can find both regular and irregular domestication. The first is a method whereby a target text is so close to the source text and so similar to other texts in the target language that one is tempted to regard it as part of its corpus. Most of Enani's Shakespearean translations belong to this type. The best example of the second type is Pope's translations of Homer's epics in 1725. It is reported, Enani says, that after their publication, Pope used to say whenever he came across an expression he liked in English, "I wish I had put it in my translations". In *Hamlet*, which Enani translated into familiar Arabic, one occasionally comes across an example of irregular domestication. In the scene where Ophelia returns to Hamlet the gifts he had given her, she says:

For to the noble mind
Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind. (III.i. 100-1)

And in Enani,

فأثمن الهدايا عند صاحب القلب النبيل تذوي قيمته

أذا تحول الذى أهدى عن الحنان واستبانت قسوته

The English one-and-a-half lines (5 feet plus 10) are in the iambic metre, with almost no modulations (زحافات) and an occasional rhyme, because confined to the

one and a half lines. The merging of the 15 English feet to produce ten Arabic feet (تفعيلات) is a usual trick of the trade, especially in domestication. A translator who prefers foreignization would keep the line divisions, nor would they care for metre and rhyme. In regular domestication, both metre and rhyme are sacrificed in verse, strangely, as well as, naturally, in all prose translations of Shakespeare. However, in what Enani calls irregular domestication, there could be additions and deletions from the source text, as mentioned earlier.

Additional examples of domestication from *Measure for Measure* and *The Merchant of Venice*

A lyric (song) sung in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* is translated twice, once by Ibrahim Abdul-Qadir al-Mazini, then more recently by Enani in his published Arabic version of the play. A comparison will show which version is irregular and therefore belongs to Dryden's category of "imitation", and which belongs to Enani's regular domestication. Here is first the English text:

> Take, O, take those lips away,
> That so sweetly were foresworn;
> And those eyes the break of day,
> Lights that do mislead the morn;
> But my kisses bring again, bring again;
> Seals of love but seal'd in vain, seal'd in vain. (III.i 1-6)

Here is al-Mazini's version:

أرجعو لى الشفاه اللواتي كن يطفئن من أوار الصادي
وأعيدوا لى العيون اللواتي هن فجر يضل صبح العباد
واستردوا إن استطعتم مردا قبلاتي من الخدود النوادي

And here is Enani's version:

إليكن عني فتلك الشفاة عذوبتها حنثت باليمين
وتلك العيون فجر مبين ضياء يُضل مسير الصباح
و لكن أعيدوا لي القبل أعيدوا لي الرُواء
طوابع حب طواها الأجل و ضاعت هباءً!

Both are acceptable translations, as both convey the substance of the lyric, and both are in metre and in rhyme, and both add something to the source text. Any comparison must be based on the kind of omissions and additions made, that is, with reference to the source text. The change of sense in the opening line strikes us as odd in al-Mazini; he omits the reason for the speaker's wish to break with the owner of those lips, accusing them of perjury, though sweetly enough. Also omitted is the fact that the speaker believes that his kisses were seals of love and that, as such, they were in vain. The tone of the lyric, suggested by 'bring again' (repeated twice) shows that the speaker may have a glimmer of hope in having his beloved back. This is precluded in the added words "if you can!" This clause has the implication of 'you can't!' The only added word in Enani's version is (الرواء) which may be glossed as "sweetness"— not a serious deviation from the tone of the source text. Al-Mazini's additions are, however, drawn fully from the Arabic

tradition. The first uses a metaphor from quenching one's thirst, the second from kissing on the cheek, not on the mouth.

Enani's contribution to the translation of verse includes the choice of the right type of verse to suit the source text in Arabic or in English. The common form of verse in Shakespeare's plays is the iambic pentameter line. This rule is abandoned when writing a dialogue or a song, like the lyric cited above. This consists of four lines of rhyming tetrameters, followed by a rhyming couplet of regular pentameters, with a modicum of modulations. It is not part of the dramatic action but is given as a break: the stage directions say "A Boy Singer enters" (and exists). Some directors omit the song as redundant, other expand the occasion as part of the comic tone in *Measure for Measure*. Regardless of its dramatic function, the lyric has a tripping metre, enforced by repetitions. The Arabic version should preferably be written in a metre with a single foot repeated a number of times (المتقارب). The other metre, (الخفيف), chosen by al-Mazini for his translation, is almost stately, too much like classical Arabic verse. Often enough, one comes across a passage by a character in the play suggesting an overflow of emotion carried along by images that make up this complex metre (consisting of two different alternating feet). A good example of using this metre at such overpowering moments occurs in *The Merchant of Venice*. When Portia realizes that Bassanio, her sweetheart, has chosen the right casket and can therefore marry her, she goes aside and as though

thinking aloud or talking to herself (and naturally, to the audience) says in rhyme and metre:

Portia: (aside)

How all the other passions fleet to air,
As doubtful thoughts, rash-embraced despair,
And shuddering fear, and green-eyed jealousy.
O, love, be moderate, allay thy ecstasy,
In measure rain thy, scant this excess.
I feel too much thy blessing; make it less
For fear I surfeit. (III.ii. 108-114)

And here is Enani's rendering in what he calls regular domestication, using the same metre as the one used by al-Mazini in his translation of the Shakespearean lyric above:

بورشيا : (جانبا)

كل ما عدا الحب من مشاعر ولى ومضى فى الهواء مثل الهباء
من ظنون وبعض يأس شرود أو خوف وغيرة حمقاء
أيها الحب رحمة بى ترفق لا تذبنى بسكرة وانتشاء
أمطر الفرح بين جنبي لكن اقتصد وابتعد عن الغلواء
يغمر النفس منك فيض هناء وأنا أخشى تخمة الامتلاء

(*تاجر البندقية* ط ٤ ـــ ص ١٥٧)

Nothing will, in effect, show the difference more clearly between the rhythm of the above lines which Enani believes belong to the "meditative style" (cf. Enani's *On*

Style Translating Style) and the rhythm of the many songs in *The Merchant of Venice*, which are by definition lyrics, than the metre and rhyme. In translating both types into Arabic the translator should stress what Enani has called the difference in rhythm, so that the Arabic reader can feel that difference when reading the two types of verse. The lines of the lyrics are shorter, with fewer feet per line than other types, and more rhyming words. The first lyric occurs in the casket scene (2-7). When the Prince of Morocco accepts and is thus deceived by the look of gold, he opens the casket to find a paper with the following written on it:

All that glisters is not gold;
Often have you heard that told.
Many a man his life has sold
But my outside to behold;
Gilded tombs do worms enfold.
Had you been as wise as bold,
Young in limbs, in judgment old,
Your answer had not been inscroll'd.
Fare you well: your suit is cold.
(The Merchant of Venice, II.vii, 65-73)

Enani's Arabic rendering reads:

ما كل براق ذهب
مثل يدور على الحقب
كم باع شخص روحه
حتى يشاهدني وحسب
بل إن دود القبر يحيا للعجب
فى قلب تابوت محلى بالذهب
لو كان ذهنك ثاقبا كشجاعتك
وحويت في جسم الشباب حصافة الشيخ الهرم
ما جاء هذا الرد طي رسالتك
اذهب وداعا لقد خسرت خطبتك (*تاجر البندقية* ص ١٠٤)

While the source text has 9 rhyme words, one in each line, Enani's translation occurs in 10 lines, divided by rhyme into a sestet and a quatrain, each having its own rhyme scheme. The sestet begins and ends with the key word (ذهب), with the only word added (للعجب) obviously for the sake of rhyme. Enani believes that rhyme are essential components of the lyric (perhaps to justify the addition of the word mentioned above, in Line 6).

1. Conclusion

Enani's literary translations show that their language does belong to the target language, that is, what Lawrence Venuti calls domestication as opposed to foreignization. The latter, which Venuti prefers, should carry some linguistic features of the source language, as though to remind the reader that a given text is only a translation. In opposing this, Enani expands the meaning of domestication in

two ways. First the target text should use the language of its immediate readers; secondly, it should represent the meaning for the original audience of the source text. By learning the effect that the meaning of the source text has had, the translator should attempt to present both original meaning and effect, to contemporary audiences in their own language.

The performance of domesticating translators may be divided into 'regular' for lack of a more precise term, and 'irregular'. By 'regular', Enani means to describe his own type of domestication, saying that this means first to know what the text had meant when first written, then to transmit that meaning in the language of his people. When performed by a gifted writer or poet, such a regular domestication may be capable of producing translations of literary quality close enough to original work in the target language. In regular domestication, Enani believes, the translator gives the reader a faithful picture of the source text and offers more ways of understanding and enjoying it. Other genuine writers and poets may like a source text so much that they appropriate it. They proceed by trying to reproduce it in their own language, amplifying certain features and reducing others.

End-Notes

I am very grateful to professor Enani for the many hours he gave to me in face to face as well as telephone conversations for giving me access to his valuable drafts of the translation of Hamlet and other texts & his valuable comments he made on my research.

1- Dr Enani is known as the doyen of Arab translators and one of the leading figures in translation and creative writing in the Arab world, he has more than 170 books to his name. Enani is a multitalented encyclopedic figure whose works cover a wide range of literary genres, including novels, plays, poems, and short stories. In his literary works, he usually employs middle Arabic to appeal to as many readers as possible. This article attempts to monitor Enani's unique employment of 'domestication' that has attracted the attention of readers and critics alike.

REFRENCES

Abbot, E.A. (1966) *A Shakespearean Grammar*. Dover Publications.

Bartlett, John. (1969) *A Complete Concordance To Shakespeare*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (1998). *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data.

Das, K. B. (2005). *A Handbook of Translation Studies*. Atlantic Publishers & Dist.

Dryden, J. (1680/1697/1992). Metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation . Extracts of 'Preface to Ovid's Epis - tles' (1680), and 'Dedication of the Aeneis' (1697), in R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds.) (1992). Theories of Translation, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Enani, M. (2005). *Modern Translation Theory: An Introduction to the Translation Studies Discipline*. Cairo: Longman.

Enani, M. **(2020).** *On Translating Style into Arabic and into English.* Anglo Egyptian Bookshop.

Feng, Jianwen. (1993). *Domestication and Preservation of the Exotic Flavor*. Foreign Language Education, 1, 11-14.

Holmes, J. S. (1988). *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Jenkins, H. (1982). *Hamlet (The Arden Shakespeare).* Routledge.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application*. London and New York: Routledge.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures In volved in Bible Translating,* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Rose, C. (1958) *A Grammar of Metaphor*. Secker & Warburg.

Schleiermacher, F. (1813/1992). *On the Different Methods of Translating.* In Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (eds.). Theories of Translation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Venuti, L. (1995/2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation.* London and New York: Routledge.

شوقي، أحمد. (٢٠١٢/١٩٢٦). *الشوقيات*. مؤسسة هنداوي.

القط، عبد القادر. (١٩٩٨). فن المسرحية. مكتبة لبنان.

المازني، إبراهيم. (١٩٦١). ديوان المازني. مؤسسه هنداوي

عناني، محمد (٢٠٠٠). مرشد المترجم. ا لشركة المصرية العالمية للنشر - لونجمان

Appendix B

Here is a part of Hamlet's soliloquy, as rendered into Arabic by Enani.

{يدخل هاملت}

هاملت: نكون ياترى أم لا نكون؟ هذا هو السؤال!
فهل من الأشراف للإنسان أن يكابد النبال والسهام عندما
ترمى بها أقداره الرعناء
أم يحمل السلاح كي يلقى بنفسه
في موج بحر هائج من المتاعب
وهكذا يقضى عليها حين ينتهى
إلى الموت الذى قد لا يزيد عن رقاد!
وبالرقاد تنتهى كما يقال أوجاع الفؤاد
وألف صدمة مما تورث الطبيعة
لهذه الأجساد!
وتلك ذروة ما أجدر الإنسان أن يطلبها ! موت هو الرقاد !