The Implied Author in Naguib Mahfouz's *'Yumeet wa Yuhyi'* (*Death and Resurrection*)(*)

Tahany M. Saeed El-Garhy (PHD.)
Faculty of Arts – Beni-Suef University

Abstract

In this paper, the researcher attempts to study the idea of the implied author in Naguib Mahfouz's *'Yumeet wa Yuhyi'* (*Death and Resurrection*). The researcher discusses the implied author according to the theory of reading in the writings of the American theorist Wayne C. Booth, especially in his books *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961), *A Rhetoric of Irony* (1974), and *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction* (1988). The emphasis is on the vision of the implied author that the reader infers during the process of reading. The reader creates an imaginary picture of the implied author, reads between lines to understand the intended meaning of the presupposed author; immerses himself in his world, and lives with the characters. The reader grasps the implied author's perspective that is expressed through the multiple voices, known as characters, that the implied author uses as masks. Mahfouz was influenced by Jean-Paul Sartre's existentialism, which was the spark of thinking about the reader and the author. If Sartre's existentialism posed questions about the individual's existence, whether it should be free or enslaved, literary critics, like Wayne C. Booth concentrated instead on the existence of a reader and even an implied author in the text.

Keywords: Naguib Mahfouz , The Implied Author, Wayne C. Booth, Jean-Paul Sartre

(*) The Implied Author in Naguib Mahfouz's 'Yumeet wa Yuhyi' (Death and Resurrection), Vol.10, Issue No.4, October 2021, pp.115-147.

الملخص:

يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة "المؤلف الضمني" في مسرحية نجيب محفوظ "يُميت ويُحيي"، ومفهوم المؤلف الضمني تناوله واين س. بوث في أوائل الستينيات. يحاول الباحث أن يظهر مدى اختلاف المؤلف الضمني أو اتفاقه مع المؤلف الحقيقي، وهل يطرح المؤلف الضمني قضايا ومسائل تحيد عن مقاصد المؤلف الحقيقي بعد الوقوف على خصائص المؤلف الضمني كما نفهم من النص. وجدير بالذكر أن نجيب محفوظ كان قارئًا للوجودية في أول تكوينه الثقافي عندما كان يدرس الفلسفة في كلية الآداب، وخاصة تأثره بجان بول سارتر والمذهب الوجودي.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

نجيب محفوظ – المؤلف الضمني – واين س. بوث – جان بول سارتر

> The "implied author" chooses, consciously or unconsciously, what we read; we infer him as an ideal, literary, created version of the real man; he is the sum of his own choices (Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* 74-75).

The present paper deals with the term implied author as introduced by Wayne C. Booth in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961) to lay bare the vision of Naguib Mahfouz in his absurd play *Yumeet wa Yuhyi* (*Death and Resurrection*), and the feeling of uncertainty which dominated the minds in the nineteen sixties. The implied author is not a flesh-and-blood author, but rather, an imaginary picture inferred by the reader. In *A Rhetoric of Irony* (1974), Booth writes: "It is true that the author I am interested in is only the creative person responsible for the choices that made the work— what I have elsewhere called "the implied author" who is found in the work itself" (11). In *Narrative Form* (1915), Suzanne Keen agrees with Booth in defining the implied author as "the version of the author projected by the text itself and sometimes also conditioned by our knowledge about the actual author's life and career" (36). Booth's theory focuses on how the implied author is represented in

the text, and on how the reader constructs an image of the implied author from the text. Booth argues that a literary text has "implied within it an author and a reader, and nobody can pretend to have understood the text unless he has made himself into that implied reader, and in some sense found the implied author" (*A Rhetoric of Irony* 126). A reading experience implies a communication between author and reader in which the reader attempts to interpret the meanings which the text communicates "in the sense that the implied author and the implied reader share fixed norms as normal for the fictional world and for their world as it is or ought to be" (Booth, *The Company We Keep* 143). Thus, the author presents thoughts that include images, ideas and feelings, and the reader judges the work according to the presented morals and thoughts. In *The Essential Wayne Booth* (2006), Booth writes: "there is no explicit spokesman here for the implied author, an intense activity is required in making moral inferences, inferences from oblique signs provided by speakers who could not themselves ever make them" (174). Clearly, Booth's concern is the reception process that relies on the reader's interpretation of the work that is, in reality, a reading of the author's vision.

Yumeet wa Yuhyi (*Death and Resurrection)* was published in 1969 together with five one-act plays and six short stories under the title *Taht el-Mazalla, (Under the Umbrella).* The Egyptian-Israeli war in 5 June 1967 precipitated an unprecedented psychological crisis especially after the Israeli occupation of Sinai. In an interview with Mahfouz in 1970, Mahfouz clarifies the reason behind writing drama in the wake of 1967:

> There is no doubt that today we live in the age of the theatre. The present moment [in our history], fraught with ideas and problems, can only be debated through the theatre….The novel needs calmness, consideration and settled conditions, and because of this it must now step aside and let the theatre take control (El-Enany 207).

After 1967 Mahfouz felt personally responsible for presenting a real scene of the Egyptian society and the political life in Egypt. He wrote an absurd drama in which he expresses his view that agrees with Sartre's opinion: "the writer is *situated* in his time; every word he utters has reverberations. As does his silence" (Sartre, *What is Literature* 9). Mahfouz wrote for the theatre to express his agony, and to conquer a feeling of defeat. He aims to "disclose the world with the intention of changing it" (Ibid.,11). Mahfouz aims at stirring people's emotions to take action against the Israeli invaders, and to fight for freedom benefiting from Sartre's words: "We would be hunters of meaning, we would speak the truth about the world and about our own lives" (Ibid., 4). Mahfouz, like most of his contemporaries, was influenced by Sartre's existential philosophy which asserts the role of the writer to change as Sartre puts it: "One does not write for slaves" (Ibid., 69). According to Sartre, the writer is a free, creative man addressing free readers, and has only one aim—freedom. Mahfouz believed, like Sartre that: "readers, like the author, recognize this freedom only to demand that it manifest itself, the work can be defined as an imaginary presentation of the world in so far as it demands human freedom" (Ibid., 67).

Wayne C. Booth was the first to write explicitly about the implied author especially in his essay entitled: "*The Self-Conscious Narrator in Comic Fiction before Tristram Shandy*" (*PMLA* 1952) in which he writes: "it is evident that in *all* written works there is an implied narrator or "author" who "intrudes" in making the necessary choices to get his story or his argument or his exposition written in the way he desires" (164). For Booth, the implied author is not a real author, but rather a creator of the actual work. The implied author is a 'second self' who expresses his viewpoint and conveys his ideas through the characters. He intrudes with his point of view to direct the incidents according to his vision. As an independent entity, he interferes in constructing the events according to his perspective. In *Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother*, Booth argues that "the implied authors are in one sense *more* genuine, and of course far more admirable and influential in wiping out

the selves they do not like, the poets have created versions that elevate both their worlds and ours" (Phelan, *A Companion* 85). Booth claims that the implied author's influential 'intrusion' helps the reader not only to read the text but also to praise and admire its author to the extent that "the author's thoughts have at least in part become ours…'all that enters our heads', including images, concepts, and emotions" (Booth, *The Company We Keep* 140). The reader attempts to interpret the speeches given by the characters to grasp the unspoken message that is translated as: "Issues of authorial intention (under the banner of the "implied author") and of the moral dimension of fiction—the values implicated in or invoked by such acts of communication" (Walsh 5). In this regard, the writer's duty towards the reader is fulfilled when he "creates an implied author suitable to *this work* often means giving up a beloved fault or taking up an alien virtue. The writer's responsibility to the work can thus be translated as 'the writer's responsibility to the implied author': he or she should write fictions that require the creation of the cleverest, wisest, most generously committed ethos imaginable" (Booth, *The Company We Keep* 128). The whole burden falls on the reader who interprets the text to reach to the intended meaning of the implied author, Booth writes: "The value of any work is the value any reader sees in it, and there can be no disputing of taste in values" (Ibid., 84). The reader interprets what is between the lines and fills the gaps that the author leaves in a different way according to his/her experiences in life. The informed reader sometimes accepts the image that the writer creates of himself, the implied author, or rejects the presented image, Booth writes:

> Whether we call this implied author an "official scribe," or…the author's "second self" – it is clear that the picture the reader gets of this presence is one of the author's most important effects. However impersonal he may try to be, the reader will inevitably construct a picture of the official scribe who writes in this manner—and of course that official scribe will never be neutral toward all values. Our reactions to his various commitments, secret or overt, will help to determine

our response to the work (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 71).

The reader constructs a picture of the implied author relying on his life experience and on his understanding of the text, Iser writes: "Reading sparks off an ideational activity in the course of which each individual reader will have to discard and replace the ideas formed through information provided and knowledge invoked; it seems that this process, always active as the reader travels inside the text and executes the instructions given to him, actually gives shape to his identity" (*Diacritics* 63). It is the reader who gathers the elements of the implied author detached from the real author who is observable from the text, Booth writes: "reading is the glorious meeting of authors and readers in texts" (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 403). Wolfgang Iser agrees with Booth's interpretation of a literary text as "an arena in which reader and author participate in a game of the imagination" (Tompkins, *Reader-Response Criticism* 51). Unlike the real author, the implied author is a mixture of the real author's and the reader's experience of the text and the world. Booth argues that the reader infers the implied author from the total form of the text, Booth writes:

> Our sense of the implied author includes not only the extractable meanings but also the moral and emotional content of each bit of action and suffering of all of the characters. It includes, in short, the intuitive apprehension of a completed artistic whole; the chief value to which this implied author is committed, regardless of what party his creator belongs to in real life, is that which is expressed by the total form (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 73-74).

Booth argues that the implied author is different from the real author; he embodies the "extractable meanings"; the meanings which a reader realizes from the text, these meanings may be different from the real author's meanings. For Booth, the implied author's concerns may differ from the concerns of the real author. Booth's idea of the implied author in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* is text-guided for Wolfgang Iser and his perception about the implied reader. Booth argued with Iser about the

implied author and reader in an interview in summer (1980). Iser explains the concept of the implied author in a different light. Unlike Booth, Iser writes:

> The image of the author gradually gaining shape in the mind's eye of the reader presupposes consistency-building, without which no image, even of an author, could be entertained in one's imagination. Consistency-building in turn is governed, of course, by the reader's preferences, predilections, codes and also his unconscious disposition. Consequently, this very process is bound to be selective, and its outcome indicates both the implications of the text and the preferences of the reader. The reader's relationship with the author therefore results from a sequence of imaginings, in the course of which he ideates the author as crony or as prospective friend, and he can only experience such a "bonding" because he has been caught up in the very ideas which the text has stimulated him into producing (*Diacritics* 69).

The implied author according to Iser is "the reader's preferences, predilections, codes and also his unconscious disposition", whereas the implied author according to Booth is the author's second self as the reader understands it. The implied author maybe inferred through: "'Theme,' 'meaning,' 'symbolic significance,' 'theology,' or even 'ontology'—all these have been used to describe the norms which the reader must apprehend in each work if he is to grasp it adequately" (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 73). Booth tries to emphasize the idea that the implied author is a textual structure, and that the reader constructs it, not very far from the characters of the text. In *A Dictionary of Narratology*, Gerald Prince presents an inclusive definition of the implied author depending on Booth:

> The implied author is the author's second self, mask or persona as reconstructed from the text; the implicit image of an author in

> the text, taken to be standing behind the scenes and to be responsible for its design and for the values and cultural norms it adheres to (Booth). The implied author of a text must be distinguished from its real author. In the first place, the same real author (Fielding, Sartre) can write two or more texts, each conveying a different picture of an implied author (Amelia and Joseph Andrews, Nausea and "Erostratus"). In the second place, one text (having, like all texts, one implied author) can have two or more real authors. The implied author of a narrative text must also be distinguished from the narrator: the former does not recount situations and events (but is taken to be accountable for their selection, distribution, and combination); furthermore, he or she is inferred from the entire text rather than inscribed in it as a teller (42-43).

Prince points out that the morals and values in the text denote the presence of the implied author who differs from the real author because he is imagined by the reader. His role is multifaceted and changeable according to the character that he masks in as he possesses multiple personalities with different voices in the text. In sum, the implied author's voice is unheard, except inside the reader's consciousness. In his translation of *Selections of D. H. Lawrence's Poetry*, Enani writes an introduction in which he asserts:

> We used to assume that there is an implied author in every literary work, if the work is a novel, we will have a certain image of this author. If he tells the events and analyses the characters, we describe him with a term like 'omniscient'. If he tells the events and speaks in the 'first-person', we consider him a character in the novel, and we understand the events and the characters and views from his point of view; which is called 'focalization'. In lyrical poetry, the poet addresses us directly, and this is known in Arabic poetry, and, here, we say that the poet does not wear a mask, but in modern criticism this is controversial. The poet may speak

> through an imaginary persona, which we call a mask which the poet wears. In dramatic poetry, the implied author wears many masks of several characters which we call dramatis personae (36, My translation).

Here, Enani argues that the implied author has different features in the different genres of literature. He also agrees with other critics that the implied author is different from the actual author. Enani agrees with Booth that the implied author is the alter ego that the reader perceives during reading. The implied author masks himself in several personalities with different voices. Each voice expresses a point of view of a particular character and is focalized through that character. The implied author is a fictional persona created by the writer to be presented on stage. In *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, M. H. Abrams writes:

> Persona was the Latin word for the *mask* used by actors in the classical theatre, from which we derived the term dramatis personae for the list of characters who play a role in a drama, and ultimately the English word "person," a particular individual. In recent literary discussion "persona" is often applied to the first-person narrator, the "I," of a narrative poem or novel, or the lyric speaker whose voice we listen to in a lyric poem (135).

The real author's role is to produce the language that carries meanings, whereas the reader's concern is to interpret this language to construct an image of the implied author based on his/her point of view. The implied author is a construct inferred by the reader, Booth writes: "The author is present in every speech given by any character who has had conferred upon him, in whatever manner, the badge of reliability" (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 18).

In the present paper, the analysis of the concept of the implied author as presented in Naguib Mahfouz's play *Yumeet wa Yuhyi* (*Death and Resurrection)* will reveal that the play centers on the value of 'freedom'. In the Nobel Lecture (1988), Mahfouz concentrated on the principle of

freedom, Mahfouz said: "I am the son of the Islamic civilization that establishes a union between all Mankind under the guardianship of the creator, based on freedom, equality, and forgiveness." Mahfouz privileges the value of freedom that reflects his great influence of Sartre's works, Sartre writes: "Man cannot be sometimes slave and sometimes free; he is wholly and forever free or he is not free at all" (*Being and Nothingness* 441). Man has to choose either to be free and enjoy all rights or to be enslaved and have no rights.

The literal meaning of the title, *Yumeet wa Yuhyi*, is highly meaningful and expressive since it alludes to verses in the Holy Qur'an and has religious connotations. It carries significant meanings that God is the Creator Who gives life and causes death. Allah said: "How can you ignore God when you were lifeless and He gives you life, when He will cause you to die, then resurrect you to be returned to Him?" (*The Qur'an* The Cow 2: 21). Here, the word death comes prior to life to imply that death follows life, and life, in turn, ends with death.

Yumeet wa Yuhyi (*Death and Resurrection*) is an absurd drama having an open end and frustrated characters living in a futile world in which violence dominates. The dialogue in the play is mainly between Man and Woman, and between the two characters and a Giant who comes from nowhere. Also, there are dialogues between Man and Doctor, Man and Echo, Man and a blind Beggar with a stick in his hand, then, dead people rise from their graves at the end of the play. A sarcastic laugh and an echo of the dead ancestors are heard to frighten Man who shouts calling for the Doctor as indicated in the stage directions: "Call the doctor. Where are you doctor?" (Selaiha 143). Nehad Selaiha argues that Giant stands for a superpower, Echo for the inner conflict, Beggar for the ordinary people who beg for freedom, Doctor for a social reformer, and Woman for home (13). The dialogue is characterized by its brevity and briskness, repeating certain words and phrases as indicated in the exchange between Man and Doctor:

Man: I feel dizzy.

Doctor: Honesty makes you dizzy, does it? The fifth symptom.

Man: Perhaps I exaggerated a bit.

Doctor: Dizziness followed by exaggeration. The sixth symptom.

Man: I think I'd better hold my tongue.

Doctor: Dizziness followed by exaggeration followed by silence. The seventh symptom.

Man: Ha…Ha…Ha… (148-49).

Mahfouz uses repetition to put emphasis on the psychological state of Man after the defeat. The implied author of *Death and Resurrection* helps to make clear the inner suffering of the protagonist who is presented as a voice of despair and anger in the play, Man says "Even happiness could sometimes turn to dust and shame in our hands…. particularly now, in my moment of defeat" (136). Man is depicted as a warrior who longs for freedom as indicated in the following extract:

Man: How I miss the flame of life when it flares and glows on the edge of imminent danger.

Woman: And if your foot slips but once, you're dead and buried.

Man: And the loud war cries that send the rats scurrying to their holes. And the thrill of anxiously calculating the chances of life and death.

Woman: And your face, blood stained and terrifying?

Man: And the heart proudly throbbing at the triumph of right and dignity (137).

Man is shattered between life and sacrifice; he is chased by a threatening sound that he fails to stop. He is torn between the past with its gone glories and the miserable present with its dangers that drives him to near-madness.

In *Yumeet wa Yuhyi* (*Death and Resurrection*) the implied

author can be inferred from the exchanges taking place between the characters. One can argue that the implied author sometimes agrees with the real author's intended meaning, though in other times he differs with these intentions, having his own independent character in the play. In other words, the implied author may stand in a distance from the real author. This is evident from the beginning when the reader encounters the first characters to appear: Man and Woman. Although the real author glorifies freedom and struggles to attain it, the implied author's behavior seems to go against these ideas as indicated in Man's words: "Cowardice will always remain the bane of man's peace of mind" (136). Man's suffering and discomfort separate him from life and prevent his peace of mind. Man and Woman speak their thoughts in an interior monologue, the message of the blind Beggar contradicts with the real author's opinion and the Giant's evil attitude opposes the real author's good attitude as in the following extract:

> Man: Go away I don't want your help. I'll fight my enemy single-handed.
>
> Giant: It'll be two against one in this case (161).

Giant declares his conspiracy against Man. The word "single-handed" is selected carefully by the implied author to imply Man's weakness. Mahfouz creates this contrasted image to declare the inequality between Man and Giant. Giant represents the over-power which Man sometimes faces helpless because it is beyond his abilities. Here, the implied author plays his role and appears side by side with the author to make Giant a second sign of what is going on inside Man's mind; his apprehensions and fears which cannot be cured. Human life is always surrounded by giants of all kinds; fears of all kinds, and people are tortured by evil powers like corruption and greed as indicated in Mahfouz's words: "We were all living in an area of unseen powers—spies hovering in the very air we breathed, shadows in broad daylight" (*The Nation*).

The implied author is hidden in the voice of the stage

directions to introduce the play. The play opens with a description of the setting that attracts the reader's attention to focus on the events. The action throughout is set outdoors in a bare stage that is divided into two areas: the front area that occupies nearly most of the stage, is highly lit to focus on Man. Mahfouz adopts expressionistic devices like lighting, and sound effects to reinforce the meaning visually as indicated in the stage directions: "the stage is horizontally divided into two areas: the front area which takes up nearly two thirds of the total space is brightly lit and clearly visible.…The back area which lies in the shadows is occupied by broad steps resembling the '*Pharaonic mastabas'*; there we dimly detect the silhouettes of recumbent figures suggesting sleep or death" (133). The reader is confronted with two opposites at the same time on stage: light and dark, life and death. The back area is elevated in a form of ancient Egyptian *mastabas*,(*) and resting apparitions signifying sleep or dead people who are dimly seen to reflect the dark side in Man, and his deep feeling of despair and disappointment. This back area is set in darkness to suggest death, and to create an upsetting atmosphere that is enhanced by the description of the dead who lie on their burial place together with the emptiness and the silence that surround the place. The first symbol used in the play is the *palm tree* that stands in the centre and resembles the *palm tree* in Samuel Beckett's *Act Without Words* where the hero "turns, sees tree, reflects, goes to it, sits down in its shadow, looks at his hands" (87). The second significant symbol is the silent waterwheel that suggests the isolation of Man in an unfriendly world. The incidents are played out in Man's distorted mind to create a sense of hostility and to offer the reader a feeling of loneliness, emptiness, and uncertainty.

The setting is obscure with its division into two areas that

(*)In Encyclopaedia Britannica, Egyptian *Mastaba*, (Arabic: "bench") means rectangular superstructure of ancient Egyptian tombs, built of mud brick or, later, stone, with sloping walls and a flat roof. A deep shaft descended to the underground burial chamber.

combine the world of the dead with the world of the living. The reader gets perplexed with this division that poses questions like: what is the relationship between the world of the dead and life? What is the relationship between the ancient Egyptian *mastabas* which stand for forefathers and the outside world? It is obvious that the dead and the ancient Egyptian *mastabas* are signs of past ancestors. The question which the real author wants to pose is: what are we going to do with the past? It is the author's hope of victory that drives him to wake the dead to face the enemy as indicated in the stage directions:

> (It appears as if his movement has woken up the sleeping figures and drawn them out of their inertia. The first rolls down the steps until he reaches the front of the stage and pulls himself up slowly and heavily like someone waking up. Another follows, repeating the same movement sequence, and he is followed by many others, male and female, all repeating the same movements until the stage fills with them) (173).

The setting which is described in the stage directions corresponds with the implied author's view and not with that of the real author. The real author sees that the setting indicates the absurdity of life and its meaninglessness but the implied author sees that the setting brings both life and death in a direct confrontation with each other. The world of the living faces the world of the dead. The living people are attracted to the dead represented in the sign of the ancient Egyptian *mastabas*, where the living cannot dispense with the dead, they depend on them in their resurrection, or their stepping towards the future. The view of the real author, here, contradicts with the view of the implied author who sees that the world of the dead draws them backwardness. The juxtaposition, here, between the world of the dead and the world of the living refers implicitly to the influence of T.S. Eliot and his death-in-life and life-in-death ideas in *Burial of the Dead* in *The Waste Land* (1922), and also the influence of Salah Abdul-Saboor's words in his poem *Departure*: "And death in the desert is my resurrection to eternity / If dead I should live for as long as I desire in my city of light" (Enani 171). Eliot's and Salah

Abdul-Saboor's influence on Arabic drama was paramount during the sixties. In the stage directions we read:

> (The stage is horizontally divided into two areas: the front area which takes up nearly two thirds of the total space is brightly lit and clearly visible; in the centre of it stands a palm tree, and on one side we see a silent waterwheel. The back area which lies in the shadows is occupied by broad steps resembling the Pharaonic *mastabas*; there are dimly detect the silhouettes of recumbent figures suggesting sleep or death. The general character of the stage design is abstract) (133).

The description of the setting, with its shapeless figures signifying dead ancestors, paves the way to the other incidents, and helps to give meaning to the play. Mahfouz opens the play with an event that takes place offstage to alert the reader's imagination. The onstage silence is interrupted by loud sounds of insults and abuses that come from two people who are quarreling offstage; they stay aside, concealed from the eyes as indicated in the stage directions: (The rising of the curtain is accompanied by the loud sounds of a scuffle between two people coming from offstage left. Curses, threats and blows are heard) (133). The offstage fight relates the stage audience with the real world since it shifts their attention to concentrate on a peculiar and unexpected sound offstage, Booth writes: "The postulated reader like the implied author willingly pretends that it is all true" (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 430). Mahfouz intentionally opens the play with this offstage action to explain why Man falls unconscious at the foot of the palm tree. Nehad Selaiha writes: *"*A man flung backward onstage from one of the wings in the exact manner of Beckett's hero in *Act Without Words*" (16). The one who is quarrelling with Man never appears onstage. Mahfouz does not present an explanation, but he leaves the reader to grasp the intended meaning. The struggle scene is a symbolic suggestion of another fight that is to follow. The opening and end of Mahfouz's *Death and Resurrection* relate life with theatre and may allude to the offstage actions that occur in Sophocles' *Oedipus The King* in which "the world is

understood as theatre and the theatre as its mirror: the model thus becomes specular, a *theatre-miroir*, or as *mise en ebyme*" (Witt 5).

The play is based on the interior monologue of a beautiful Woman who is the first character to appear on stage. As the curtain rises, she appears suddenly and unexpectedly in 'abstract clothes' that match with the abstract place in which the play is set as indicated in the stage directions: "Her clothes conform to the general abstract character of the set, and are difficult to locate geographically" (133). Woman moves nervously back and forth down the stage between the palm tree and the silent waterwheel as if waiting for someone who never comes. The screams that are heard offstage made Woman felt worry. The stop-gap ellipsis in her speech is an evidence of her anxiety. In an interior monologue, Woman says:

> Woman: God in heaven ! .. Will these sound never be still .. ? Will
>
> your sun never shine on a tranquil contented earth?
>
> (listens with growing anxiety)
>
> Is it some old sin that I have to expiate? An affliction inherent in my blood? Or simply errors that we have lacked the honest will to put right! (134).

Woman expresses her annoyance and dissatisfaction with the offstage loud sounds, hoping these "curses, threats, and blows" to cease (133). She wonders when these sounds will disappear from this universe. She listens anxiously, and then poses rhetorical questions that increase the reader's curiosity and suspense: "Is it some old sin that I have to expiate? An affliction inherent in my blood? Or simply errors that we have lacked the honest will to put right!" (134). The sin she means is the original sin of Adam and Eve which she feels that she inherited as woman.

The dramatic conflict in the play is gradually drawn from outside to the depths of the character's mind. While Woman invites Man to life, or to live in the present, Man is living in the past. The echo of the past,

which is death, is louder than the real sounds of life. The division on stage, that appears from the beginning between life and death, light and dark, reality and allusion, is in reality a division inside Man who lost hope in life. He clings to the dead ancestors; he hears their voices, addressing them, and seeking their help. This notion becomes clear when Man looks to the "*mastabah*" engulfed in darkness, adhering to the past because he is ashamed of the defeat and aspires to achieve freedom and peace. Rasheed El-Enany writes:

> *Yumeet wa Yuhyi* (*Death and Resurrection*) examines the trepidations of a young man faced with a menacing danger and torn between his love for life and sense of dignity. In the end, the play appears to laud freedom as an absolute value that should be maintained even in the face of death (204).

The reader feels the weakness of Man the first moment he appears on stage as his power is consumed up during the offstage quarrel with a cruel enemy. He falls unconscious at the foot of the palm tree after this painful struggle. Woman hurries towards Man and shows sympathy. She sits beside him under the palm tree to alleviate his pains and to solace him. As Man wakes from the coma, he begins to hallucinate in fragmented words: "father! , mother! , My wife! , It's you! " (134). His words reveal a hesitant Man who conceals a feeling of worry and anxiety. His fragmented speech expresses a sense of insecurity and confusion. The dialogue between Man and Woman does not reveal the relation between them. Their encounter puts Man face to face with himself and proves his ability to escape seduction since Woman fails to hinder him from his national duty as indicated in the following extract:

> Woman: … I am offering you the only real happiness in the world.
>
> Man: Even happiness could sometimes turn to dust and shame in your hands.
>
> Woman: How ungrateful!
>
> Man: I am not denying our vows. I only fear them, particularly

now, in my moment of defeat. From my gory position they look fearfully and blindingly attractive.

Woman: Is this how you feel about the blossoming of the heart, the glowing radiance of the flowers, the time of picking the fruit?

Man: No, it is only that I remember with sorrow the madness and its crushing weight, the flabby muscles, and the sagging energies (135).

In his speech with Woman, Man describes how he is frustrated, and ashamed of the defeat, and how he loses hope of the future. Their exchange reveals despair. However, Man attempts to overcome his feeling of hopelessness, and the emptiness simplified by the dead people around him. Though he pretends to be strong, he proves weak as he faces a real challenge offstage and onstage.

The implied author is the voice that produces echo and threatens, only Man hears him. It is the voice of the past which governs the present, or the ancestors who die. It is clear from Man's speech to Woman, in which he refers to the echo, that it is the secret of all suffering, sometimes the sound of the echo becomes very oppressive to Man. The action is focalized through the interior monologue of Man, the key character in the play, who suffers from schizophrenia since he has 'visual and auditory' hallucinations (p. 18). Man's words are 'wild fancies' that cannot be trusted. Man appears as if hallucinating or addressing an imaginary voice that comes from the subconscious as he is pointing to the '*mastaba'*. In an interior monologue, Man addresses the steps:

Man: (Addressing the steps).

Can you hear what we say?

(After a while a voice echoes: 'Can you hear what we say?')

Man: How did you cope with death , and how did he treat you?

(A voice echoes his question).

Man: (as if to himself, his eyes still on the steps)

They are echoing me. Yes! There's a deep meaning there that no intelligent man can miss. There ! They're beginning to move !

(The recumbent figures are completely still throughout)

They are presenting me with an old precious image … See ! The battle is thickening .. Martyrs are falling … ! The fighters are sealing the walls of the fortress in swarms like ants … The fortress has surrendered… Hark ! the cries of victory are thundering, piercing the walls of hundreds of years ! (Turning to the Woman) Did you see ? Did you hear ?

Woman: There was nothing to see, or hear.

Man: Their triumphant cheers soaring above the bodies of the martyrs have shaken me to the core.

Woman: These are but wild fancies churned by your passion for blood (140).

The lack of communication between Man and Woman is evident since Man is addressing the dead ancestors in Woman's presence. Man has his own world that he created for himself to compensate his feeling of loss after the defeat. He dreams of victory and longs for freedom. He imagines the glorious cheers of the fighters above the martyrs' bodies, and "the heart proudly throbbing at the triumph of right and dignity" (137). The glory of triumph erases all the grief incurred by the defeat. Man experienced a sense of pride and self-respect after the dread he lives during the battle. His deep sorrow turns into happiness. The scene of the soldiers fighting and destroying the tower, the martyrs are falling, the cheers of victory with the echo voice of the dead, are all images of the past trying to enforce itself on the present. The implied reader knows that "the characters are not real and their hopes and fears are only imaginary" (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 424). This scene of victory is focalized through the consciousness of Man in a form of an interior monologue.

Mahfouz does not rely on words alone when communicating his vision, but rather on the interior monologue of Man to reveal his subconscious and what passes in his mind. Ignoring Woman's speech,

Man is addressing the dead; he pours out all his hopes and sensations in an interior monologue. Mahfouz writes: "The internal monologue…is a method, a vision and a way of life; and even though I use it, you cannot say that I belong to its school as such. All that happens is that I sometimes encounter a Joycean moment in my hero's life; so I render it in Joyce's manner with some modification" (El-Enani 181). Man isolates himself from the outside world. The echo of the dead is an implied sound that comes from inside, only Man hears it.

Man feels that he is chased by audible hallucinations that send him in a state of confusion, frustration and fear. The onstage muteness is broken by sounds of unseen creatures that disturbed Man in his daydreams. These sounds are the internal thoughts of Man. The audience are left to understand the dramatic situation, and the psychological state of Man who is challenged by a hidden voice that haunts him from left and right.

Man: His sneering laugh turns the air in my lungs to dust.

Woman: The best thing to do is to stop your ears.

Man: But I was given ears to listen with.

Woman: Listen to my passionate cooing.

Man: And what cooing that has been .. It has aborted my resolution .. Goodbye.

(A distant echo of mocking laughter).

Man: Farewell.

Woman: Ignore the noise and sleep in peace.

Man: No. I have to silence it before I can sleep.

Woman: Just one more word .. that I may not despair.

(He puts his fingers in his ears) (142).

The reader can deduce that the echo of the ancestors represents the past. The sneering laugh of Echo is combined with the other surrounding elements (the silent waterwheel, and the ancient Egyptian *mastabas* with the dead people inside) to frighten Man. The echo

produces a sarcastic laugh that Man cannot stop to sleep, but rather, it practices oppression over him. The disguised echo is used to frighten Man, Booth writes: "Many dramatized narrators are never explicitly labeled as narrators at all. In a sense, any speech, every gesture, narrates; most works contain disguised narrators who are used to tell the audience what it needs to know, while seeming merely to act out their roles" (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 152). The definition of the disguised narrator, according to Booth, may be applied to the relation between Man and Echo in the play, where Echo is disguised to tell the audience what they need to know. Echo is dramatized in the play to repeat the last words of Man's speech, abstaining from telling any further information about himself or Man. Man is presented as if he were speaking to himself or hearing sounds because he is suffering from hallucination.

Mahfouz depicts recumbent figures on the darkened part of the stage to suggest the dead ancestors who lie asleep (133). The speaking characters are attached to the abstract setting that the stage directions describe at the beginning: the ancient Egyptian *mastabah*, the palm tree, the waterwheel, and the lying dead people inside. The young Man faces a real challenge in these abstract elements, until he imagines a man laughing mockingly at him:

(A roar of savage sarcastic laughter is heard offstage left)

Man: Do you hear how he provokes and mocks me?

Woman: It's only a reckless wind where grief runs riot.

Man: He's challenging me! (141).

Mahfouz introduces a schizophrenic character who has auditory hallucinations that are chasing him in his daydreams. The outer silence that surround Man is put in contrast with his inner revolution that is unrested because he is haunted by imaginary fantasies that come from the subconscious. He fails to stop the sound of Echo, the sarcastic laugh or the mocking voice of the enemy. He feels that he is threatened by an external danger that he is unable to face. He imprisons himself in his fears that hinder him from feeling comfort, Mahfouz writes:

Man: Only the dead can reveal to me the truth about life. Only the dead.

Echo: The dead.

Man: She's gone. But she won't go far. I can never be totally free of her , nor do I want that. But I need to know the truth.

Echo: The truth.

Man: Speak plainly. Don't talk like rocks.

Echo: Rocks.

Man: Tell me of death and life.

Echo: life.

Man: What is a hero?

Echo: Hero.

Man: Is he a warrior?

Echo: Warrior.

Man: Or a man of peace?

Echo: Peace.

Man: Damn! Damn! Damn! (142-43).

The scene between Man and Echo reveals that the real author's view about immortality corresponds with the implied author's opinion. The author depicts Echo as if he were a real character occupying a space in the play. The repeated words voiced by Echo are significant since they reflect the implied author's attitude towards the protagonist; to be Man's reflection with the unfulfilled answers of questions asked by him. Man, who asks these questions is unable to find answers for them; answers come as just echoes which do not satisfy the hearer even Man himself. The fragmented words of Echo are as follows: "the dead, the truth, Rocks, Life, Hero, Warrior, Peace". Mahfouz means that the dead are not dead but alive and they are granted immortality with their heroic deeds. They are immortal heroes and warriors who defend the country to attain peace. The following extract is evidence of this:

Man: (pointing to the 'mastaba'-like steps).

Our ancestors thought differently about death, and were granted immortality.

Women: They are dead, thoroughly and fully dead.

Man: (addressing the figures in the background)

Say you are immortal.

(A voice from the back echoes 'immortal') (139).

The repetition of the word 'immortal' reveals the implied author's tendency to exceed the real world preferring its substitution or alternative in an imaginary one which may be better or more stable and genuine than the first. The implied author takes immortality as a compensation for depressing life to take refuge in another world loaded with the fulfilled hopes of the unconsciousness. The martyrs will have a great reward in heaven, Allah said: "don not think of those who have been killed in God's way as dead. They are alive with their Lord, well provided for, happy with what God has given them of His favour; rejoicing that for those they have left behind who have yet to join them there is no fear, nor will they grieve; [rejoicing] in God's blessing and favour, and that God will not let the reward of the believers be lost" (*The Qur'an* The Family of Imran 3: 179).

Man's love of the past, and his inability to shake it off is evident in pointing to the dead in the darkness. Man cannot get rid of the past inside him; his hesitation between past and present is his real sickness, almost like a plague or epidemic. For Man, death is a kind of escape from life since it offers the end, and then a new resurrection. The voice of Echo proves that Man is infected with a plague that becomes disseminated among people, it may allude to the plague in *Oedipus*. Man suffers a sense of general weakness, powerlessness, futility, insecurity, and vagueness after the defeat. The conversation between Man and Echo results in inviting Doctor who advised Man to have confidence in science to be cured. Doctor is "dressed in the same abstract manner as Man and Woman, but wearing a beard and carrying a medical case" (143). Doctor

enters to check Man to set his hand on the symptom as in the following extract:

Man: In this case any sentence could be taken as a symptom of the plague.

Doctor: This definitely shows that you have no confidence in science.

Man: On the contrary. I am very enthusiastic about science…

(The doctor shakes his head doubtfully)

Man: (pointing to shadowy steps at the back) I come from an old stock renowned for their conquests in the field of science. They were its first champions.

Doctor: Pointing to dark, coupled with boasting, constitutes the third symptom.

Man: But I'm not one of those who .. I am all for the modern age.. I am fanatical about it.

Doctor: Fanatical ?!

Man: What I mean is, I am no enthusiastic about it. I only turn my ancestors in moments of stress, when I absolutely have to. (147-148)

The implied author in this quotation sides with science, following the steps of his ancestors who were respecting science. Perhaps the implied author is here the real author, Mahfouz himself who refers to his ancient Egyptian origins, known for their scientific contributions in all aspects of life, especially in physics and engineering, as well as in medicine so he says: "I come from an old stock renowned for their conquests in the field of science. They were its first champions" (148). The implied author believes in science to the degree that he considers it his only cure. Here, the real author agrees with the implied author's opinion. Doctor shakes Man's head doubtfully:

Man: Do you know what I think? You're not really diagnosing.

something that I have. You're simply trying to prove that there is a plague.

Doctor: Now you're attacking me! This shows that you cower in the face of aggression and turn belligerent in response to kindness. This is definitely the tenth symptom.

Man: You're beginning to make me angry.

Doctor: Anger when tolerance is indicated is the eleventh symptom.

Man: (Sarcastically) Tralala…La…La…La…Bum…

Doctor: Now you're raving. The twelfth symptom.

Man: Tell me Doctor, have you ever treated an important influential person of this plague?

Doctor: Indeed I have... (149-50).

All the given answers of Man to Doctor are elusive, and do not present a sufficient description of his disease since they are common symptoms. Doctor finally tells Man that this is a plague that has infected all the people including himself, "That goes without saying. None of us has escaped" (150). Man's encounter with Doctor does not result in any kind of cure, but rather, Man refuges again to the "*Steps*" in which the dead are buried.

Giant appears as a dreadful character or a monster that challenges Man. When Giant enters, Man discovers that he is a relative of the laughing character as he seems to be pursued by him. The Giant-Man scene represents the eternal struggle between good and evil and how Man is struggling to conquer evil that stands for cruelty and love of domineering. Unlike the giant, Man is weak, powerless and under pressure. The implied author disguises himself in the Giant's voice to reveal the inner conflict of Man. The Giant-Man scene is a symbol of Man's inability to live in inner peace. According to Rasheed El-Enany:

> Mahfouz dramatizes mankind's most haunting dreams of power, continued life and the solution of the mysteries of existence. In his contempt for the weak and indifference to

their suffering, he smacks of Nietzsche's superman who rises above good and evil (153-154).

The encounter between Man and Giant proves that Man longs for power since he wakes up to a bitter reality that the strong overmasters the weak, and the law of the forest dominates. It is a world in which people fail to communicate. Man tries, in vain, to make a mere gesture of courageous dignity before the giant to conceal a feeling of weakness, anxiety or to escape the inner disturbing thoughts. The Giant's villainous attitude opposes the real author's good attitude as indicated in this extract:

Man: Go away I don't want your help. I'll fight my enemy single- handed.

Giant: It'll be two against one in this case.

Man: How?

Giant: You're making me into your enemy. I'll have to defend myself.

Man: You mean you will fight me because I refuse your help?

Giant: No. But because you want to drive me out of my place and obstruct my most essential function in life.

Man: Don't take me so lightly. I may not be a giant, but I'll fight even death itself.

Giant: If death is what you want, death you shall have (161).

One can argue that the Giant does not stand for a superpower because it cannot stand for any reality, it stands for the feeling of weakness. It is Man's inability to change his fate which tortures him. Giant exits without helping the protagonist, but rather, he struggles with him. Then, Man meets a blind Beggar who comes from the place where the dead bodies lie as indicated in the stage directions:

(A blind man enters, feeling his way with a stick; he bends his head in the direction of the man, straining his ears).

Beggar: Anyone there?

Man: Yes.

Beggar: Was it you who called me?

Man: No.

Beggar: It was your voice. My ears never deceive me.

(The sarcastic laughter swells) (167–168).

While the real author qualifies freedom in the Man-Beggar scene, the implied author turns the idea upside down since his opinion about freedom is blurred and elusive. This view is represented by the Beggar's refusal to stay in the institution which stands for real freedom with its commitments and restrictions. He prefers to go out to the street, which represents chaos and disorder. Chaos and disorder do not stand for freedom whereas the institution stands for real freedom. There is no freedom without rules and laws otherwise it leads to chaos. Hence, the implied author contradicts the real author's view about freedom in the character of the Beggar who cannot bear the burdens of freedom and prefers to be enslaved by the street. In *On Liberty* (1864), John Stuart Mill writes:

> … everyone who receives the protection of society owes a return for the benefit, and the fact of living in society renders it indispensable that each should be bound to observe a certain line of conduct towards the rest (IV, 134).

Beggar appears as the one who does not express the real author's point of view because he rejects the protection that the society granted for him. He refuses to obey the rules imposed by the society which imply that it is his duty to work to earn money as a committed member in the society. He prefers the 'beggarly vagrant existence' for shelter and care. He chooses the life of a beggar. He hates restrictions and feels that he is imprisoned in work so he substitutes working with begging. This notion is evident in the following dialogue between Man and Beggar:

Man: (laughing)

This is the first time I hear of a beggar expelled!

Beggar: The head of the institution was ruff and rude and a shameless thief to boot.

Man: And nevertheless, he expected you to sing his praises?

Beggar: Some of the inmates rebelled. I was at the head of the mutiny.

Man: And so you opted for the life of a tramp.

Beggar: I have.

Man: But wasn't the institution with all its faults better than this beggarly vagrant existence?

Beggar: Freedom is better than security itself.

Man: You strike me as a very well-informed beggar! (170).

The exchange between Man and Beggar proves that the implied author's attitude contradicts with the real author's attitude about freedom since there is no freedom without security. Beggar exits and Giant appears again. It is apparent that the Man-Giant struggle is unbalanced and unequal since one is weak and the other is strong as indicated in the stage directions:

> (The Man turns round and advances intently towards the Giant who leaps at him. The Man pushes him away. The Giant holds him by the shoulders and flings him in the direction of the "mastabas'. The Man disappears in the shadows for a moment, then springs back like a ball that had hit a wall. He falls headlong on his face, then stands up swaying) (173).

The struggle between Man and Giant wakes up the dead, and they are united with Man as if there were a communication between Man and the dead and as if they responded to his call. Mahfouz stresses the idea that people should remain united in order not to fall prey to the outside enemies. Mahfouz ends the play expressionistically in a dumb show in which the dead people wake up at their burial place and walk to face the enemy. They march like robots "with firm rhythmical steps" (174).

Mustafa Riad writes: "The play ends in a tableau that features a march of the dead walking like zombies led by the man in the direction of the enemy*"* (*The Absurd*). The ancestors respond to Man's call and follow him towards one goal as if they were hypnotized or sleepwalking as indicated in the stage directions:

> (The sleepers are now fully awake, they hold themselves up straight, and their faces wear a determined look. The whole scene is conducted in mime. The Man marches in the direction of his enemy with firm rhythmical steps. The rest march behind him resolutely until all disappear, and only the sound of their steps is heard) (174).

The play moves towards an open end that any reader can change or alter. Booth writes: "Openness is not an end in itself, but a means to various ends" since it leaves questions open and moves the reader's imagination to suggest new details. (*The Company We Keep* 69). The play ends as it begins offstage where "the sound of the steps is heard and the woman removes her hands from her face, listens sadly, then looks faraway" (Selaiha 174). Mahfouz relies on sound effects to reinforce his expressionistic ideas: the sound of Man's march and the noise that comes from the offstage quarrel. The reader is left to imagine the battle. Mahfouz gives a picture that is taken from the Holy Qur'an in which he compares the resurrection of the dead to the doomsday: "Listen out for the Day when the caller will call from a nearby place. They will come out [from their graves] on that Day, the Day when they hear the mighty blast in reality. It is We Who give life and death; the final return will be to Us on the day when the earth will be torn apart, letting them rush out — that gathering will be easy for us" (*The Qur'an* Qaf 50: 42-43).

Conclusion

Clearly, Mahfouz's *Death and Resurrection* provides a good example of the deployment of what Booth terms the implied author. The present paper is an attempt to study the concept of the implied author in Mahfouz's *Death and Resurrection* and to argue that the implied author in the play is an independent identity, having his own views and attitudes which are sometimes different from the real author's. The implied author in the play is inferred from the situation of the characters and the procession of the events. While the real author has a strong belief in freedom and liberty, the implied author's view about freedom is unclear but is inferred from the Beggar's attitude, when he prefers to be enslaved in the street, in the chaotic freedom instead of the disciplined freedom in the institution. The characters' names are chosen to fulfill the implied author's purposes. Man and Woman represent the two elements of the human life, as if the implied author has more comprehensive understanding of the universe than the real author. The implied author is hidden in the text, and the reader reconstructs it from the details and events. The plot and the setting are perfectly woven to voice the real author's dissatisfaction with the distrustful condition in Egypt in the late sixties, and to uncover the tragic consequences of the military defeat of 1967. Obviously, the concept of the implied author in Mahfouz's *Death and Resurrection* has been effectively manipulated to present a general mood of psychological depression in Egypt in the wake of the 1967 setback.

References

Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Holt, Rinehart And Winston Inc., London 1988.

Beckett, Samuel. *Endgame: A Play in One Act Followed by Act Without Words: A Mime For One Player*. Authored and Translated by Samuel Beckett, Grove Press: New York, Inc, 1958.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Self-Conscious Narrator in Comic Fiction before Tristram Shandy*. PMLA, vol. 67, no. 2, 1952, pp. 163-185. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/460093. Accessed 3 Feb. 2020.

_____ *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London, 1961.

_____ *A Rhetoric of Irony*. The University of Chicago Press , Ltd., London, 1974.

_____ *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*. University of California Press, Ltd. London, 1988.

_____ "*Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother?", A Companion to Narrative Theory, edited by* Phelan, James and Peter J. Rabinowitz. Blackwell Publishing, Ltd., 2005, 75-88.

_____ *The Essential Wayne Booth*, edited by Walter Jost, The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London, 2006.

El-Enany, Rasheed. *Naguib Mahfouz: The Pursuit of Meaning.* London and New York, 1993.

Enani, M.M. *On Translating Style Into Arabic and Into English*, The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop, Cairo, 2020. p. 171

Iser, Wolfgang. "*The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach"*, *Reader-Response Criticism From Formalism to Post-Structuralism,* edited by Jane P. Tompkins, The Johns Hopkins University Press, London,1980. p.50-69

_____ et al. "Interview: Wolfgang Iser." *Diacritics*, vol. 10, no. 2, Summer, 1980, pp. 57–74. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/465093. Accessed 3 Feb. 2020.

Keen, Suzanne. *Narrative Form*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 1915.

Lindsey, Ursula. "The World of the Alley, Naguib Mahfouz's Cairo." *The Nation*. 25 Oct. 2018, Accessed 5 Feb. 2020. https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/naguib-mahfouz-world/

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. 3rd ed., London: Longman, Roberts & Green, 1864.

Prince, Gerald. *Dictionary of Narratology*. Great Britain, Scolar Press, 1991.

Riad, Mustafa. *The Absurd in Naguib Mahfouz Plays.* Sixth International Symposium on Comparative Literature, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University, 2001.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *What is Literature and Other Essays*. Harvard University Press, 1988.

_____ *Being and Nothingness*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes, Washington Square Press, USA, 1966.

Selaiha, Nehad. *Naguib Mahfouz: One-Act Plays 1*. General Egyptian Book Organization, 1989.

The Qur'an. Trans. by M.A.S. Abdel Haleem, Oxford University Press, 2004.

Walsh, Richard. *The Rhetoric of Fictionality: Narrative Theory and The Idea of Fiction*, The Ohio State University Press, 2007.

Witt, Mary Ann Frese. *Metatheater and Modernity: Baroque and Neobaroque*, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Madison, 2013.

Naguib Mahfouz – Interview. NobelPrize.org. Nobel Media AB 2019. Tue. 3 Dec 2019.

<https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/1988/mahfouz/interview/>

مراجع عربية:

عناني، محمد. "المختار من شعر د. هـ. لورنس" (القاهرة: الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب ٢٠١٨م) ص. ٣٦

محفوظ، نجيب. "الأعمال الكاملة الجزء ١٠" (القاهرة: دار الشروق ٢٠٠٦م) ص. ٥٧٣-٥٩٥