

## Enani's Contribution to the Cultural Approach to Translation

*Omayya Khalifa\**

This paper traces Mohamed Enani's journey in search of an appropriate medium and an integrated approach to translating Shakespeare. In his seminal article, "On Translating Shakespeare; A Translator's testimonial," the Late Mohamed Enani, a professor of English Literature and Translation Studies at the Department of English Language and Literature, Cairo University, a prolific translator, theorist, and dramatist, takes the reader on a journey through his stages of translating Shakespeare into Arabic in his attempt to overcome "central obstacles of language and tone." His ultimate aim was to present the contemporary reader with a pleasing Shakespearean experience. The contention of this paper is that this lifelong effort has transpired in establishing his idiom as the contemporary language of translating Shakespeare into Arabic. To validate this claim, the paper examines Enani's two translations of *Romeo and Juliet* in light of André Lefevere's theory of rewriting to prove how Enani has attained his ultimate aim of placing his translations in the canon and poetics of the Arabic language.

Enani's encyclopedic knowledge, his proficiency in both Arabic and English, and his expertise in both Arabic and English literatures enabled him to attain an integrated approach to translation. In his article, he traces the history of the introduction of Shakespeare to the Egyptian stage in the 1900s which was mainly through adaptations, the earliest being a "free—perhaps too free translation of *Macbeth*" by Mohamed Iffat (2016, 160). Enani underlines the fact that the predominant translation tradition in Egypt for a long time associated Shakespeare's English with the Classical Arabic idiom of the pre-Islamic times. This tradition was further strengthened by the efforts of the celebrated Lebanese poet, Khalil Mutran, who sought inspiration in Classical Arabic poetry. He contributed to this tradition through his translations of a number of Shakespeare's plays and his position as an early director of the Egyptian National Theatre Company which enabled him to supervise the early Shakespeare productions. This explains how, as Enani maintains, Mutran's "language was established as the Arabic equivalent of Shakespeare's

---

\* Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University.

This is a modified version of "A Translator's Coming of Age" published in *Cairo Studies in English: Essays in Honour of Galila Ann Ragheb* in 2008, 239–274.

*Cairo Studies in English* – 2023(1): 71–93. <https://cse.journals.ekb.eg/>

DOI: 10.21608/cse.2023.255178.1145

English” (158). His prose translations, from a system's approach perspective, have achieved a prominent position in the canon and the poetics of Arabic literature. In addition to the prose translations of Shakespeare, there were few attempts at using verse in translating Shakespeare. Enani cites Ali Ahmed Bakathir's translation of *Romeo and Juliet* in Blank verse as an example.

In the 1950s, within the framework of Taha Hussein's project of translating Shakespeare, the translators who participated in this project employed prose in their translations as the tradition at that time called for fidelity. In Enani's search for an appropriate idiom that suits a contemporary rendering of Shakespeare's language, neither Mutran's antiquated idiom nor the prose translations of Taha Hussein's grand project seemed acceptable. Thus, later, dissatisfied with his attempts at translating *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet* in prose, he retranslated *Romeo and Juliet* in “a mixture of prose and verse” (159). Once he attained his aim at achieving an integrated approach in translating Shakespeare, Enani translated more than twenty-four Shakespearian plays, employing either verse in his translation of *The Merchant of Venice* and the sonnets or a mixture of verse and prose in most of his translations later on.

Conscious that the act of translation involves what Lefevere terms “refraction”, Enani expresses his ideology as follows, “[I]n the act of translation, words come alive, especially in verse, as each seems embedded in meanings suggested by a variety of associations in our tradition, and I have to opt for the one that seems to force itself on my consciousness as though I was *rewriting* Shakespeare's play” (160) (*italics mine*). Lefevere defines refractions, which are “part of a system” as “the adaptations of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing the way in which that audience reads the work” (2000, 234-235). In the Preface to Lefevere's book, *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, Susan Bassnett and Lefevere state that “all rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way” (1992, vii). Enani's devoted search for a contemporary idiom transpired not only in employing verse in his translations but also in his use of Modern Standard Arabic in translating Shakespeare. He writes that Shakespeare might have employed Modern Standard Arabic had he been “an Arab writing in the early Twenty-first century about the same characters and the same dramatic situation, in Arabic, for an Arabic audience...”. He adds that “the translator is in part an impersonator: I never regarded myself as undertaking a linguistic exercise; my Shakespeare is my own personal experience of the play as part of this culture” (2016, 160).

Lefevere's theory of rewriting is a development of the systems approach. Literature is one of many systems in the “(super) system known as society” (2014, 226). Such a system constitutes “constraints” on readers, writers and rewriters who either accept or reject these constraints. In particular, Lefevere identifies five constraints defining how translators manipulate texts, namely patronage, poetics, the universe of discourse, the differences between source and target languages, and the

translator's ideology. He explains that there are two control factors, one belongs in the literary system represented by interpreters, critics, reviewers, teachers of literature and translators. They are responsible for poetics. The second factor exists outside the literary system and is represented by patronage. According to Lefevere, patronage is composed of three "components: the ideological component which makes sure that literature conforms to the direction the other systems are following, the economic component which is responsible for the writer's financial support, and the status component that concerns the position the writer achieves in society (227). Lefevere defines poetic as "a kind of code." It consists of an inventory component concerned with genre, symbols, characters, and prototypical situation. The second is a "functional" component; "an idea of how literature has to, or may be allowed to function in society" (229).

In other words, a rewriting is an indication of either the translator's or the publisher's ideology and the message they want to convey to the target reader. Contrary to common practice in previous translation practice, Enani emphasizes the use of Modern Standard Arabic and verse in translating Shakespeare. In an interview with *Al-Ahram*, he asserted that Shakespeare was primarily a poet, and accordingly his verse is intrinsic to the meaning of his work (2017). This is the Shakespeare Enani felt inclined to share with his contemporary readers/audiences. According to Lefevere, "[T]ranslation ... is able to project the image of an author and/or a (series) of work(s) in another culture, lifting that author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin" (1992, 9). Thus, poetics are mainly the responsibility of the professionals of the literary system while the dominant ideology is mainly determined by the patronage outside the literary system. However, Lefevere considers ideology, whether it be the translator's ideology or an ideology that is imposed on him, to be the most important aspect in the process of rewriting. Both ideology and poetics control the strategies and procedures the translator adopts to overcome certain problems in the original. This is further illustrated in the analysis of Enani's two translations of *Romeo and Juliet*.

Enani's three translations of *Romeo and Juliet* are exemplary of the stages of his journey in search of an appropriate medium and an integrated approach to translating Shakespeare. Dissatisfied with an earlier prose translation of *Romeo and Juliet* (1965), Mohammed Enani, translates the play a second time in verse and a third time in a mixture of verse and prose to finally achieve his integrated translation approach. In spite of its adherence to the original as far as lexis, syntax and stylistic devices are concerned, Enani's prose translation does not overcome the problem of conveying the intended "tone" or "tones" of the lines. It is a close translation of the original except for the fact that the medium employed by the translator is prose. This translation belongs to the literary tradition of the sixties in Egypt, a tradition venerating accuracy and high seriousness. This literary tradition was originally adopted and then enhanced by the Arab League Project for translating the classics. Since "precision" was their main aim, the Arab League translators and other translators and scholars of the period used prose to translate literary works. Prose, they thought, was a reliable medium. However, Prose does not only detract from the

beauty and lyricism of the lines, which are intrinsic features of the play, but also sometimes interferes with the tone and, accordingly, the dramatic function.

In his introduction to his retranslation of *Romeo and Juliet*, Enani singles out tone as the main difficulty that faces any translator attempting a rendering of the play. In the Elizabethan era, romance was regarded as a subject for comedy and as such allowed playful treatment. Harry Levin explains that Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* was an innovation at the time. He reveals the effect of the play on contemporary audiences as follows:

It is hard for us to realize the full extent of its novelty though scholarship has been reminding us of how it must have struck contemporaries. They would have been surprised and possibly shocked at seeing lovers taken so seriously. Legend ... was the proper matter for serious drama; romance was the stuff of the comic stage. (1976, 108)

This, and the fact that “the sonnet is the channel through which the play flows” as Ralph Berry puts it, explain the playful tone and the light-hearted treatment of the subject (1980, 37). F. E. Halliday suggests that the play “reverberate(s) with the sonnet poetry,” expressing the same themes and employing the same imagery (1964, 76). Thus, he emphasizes the dramatic as well as the poetic aspects of the play and regards them inseparable: “a form of drama, half play, half poem...” (88). The play, as Frye affirms, is not simply an archetypal story of youth, love, and death, and hence the subtlety of the language which in turn reflects the complexity of the plot. The audience, for example, gets an unconventional opening following the prologue with the brawl and the bawdy jokes of the servants. However, Frye regards this as an appropriate way to introduce the theme that dominates this play: “the theme of love bound up with, and part of, violent death” (1988, 16). “All was not well in Verona;” confusion borders on absurdity (15). Thus Frye suggests that

love in *Romeo and Juliet* covers three different forms of a convention. First, the orthodox Petrarchan convention in Romeo's professed love for Rosaline at the beginning of the play. Second, the less sublimated love for which the only honourable resolution was marriage, represented by the main theme of the play. Third, the more cynical and ribald perspective that we get in Mercutio's comment, and perhaps those of the nurse as well. (20–21)

Accordingly, there are three main styles involving different tones which any translator would endeavour to render: the conventional, the spontaneous and finally the playful, including the bawdy. These different styles and tones are intrinsic to the play serving to further the plot and trace the development of the characters. Thus, as long as *Romeo and Juliet* conform to conventions, they are accepted. Once they

deviate from the norm using spontaneous expressions, they can no longer communicate with society. Romeo is banished and Juliet can no longer communicate with her parents or even the nurse for that matter. Moreover, the cynical and the ribald intensify the lovers' tragedy.

In 1986 Enani produced a poetic version of the play. Contrary to the prose translation, this one stressed the poetic and lyrical aspects of the original. The play was intended as a musical, especially adapted for the stage, turning the central scenes of the play into theatrical occasions for singing and dancing. This necessitated the use of light and quick moving metres suitable for songs. It also implied toning down the dramatic aspect of the play since this approach involved omission, condensation, adaptation and even interpolation. The epilogue at the end of the translation, for example, is an interpolated song sung by all the characters underlining the moral of the play. In his introduction to the play, Enani explains that this interpolated song was suggested by the director of the performance. A comparison of the two translations of Juliet's lyrical lines as she learns that Romeo is a Montague illustrates Enani's different approaches to dealing with the problem of tone:

My only love sprung from my only hate!  
Too early seen unknown, and known too late!  
Prodigious birth of love it is to me,  
That I must love a loathed enemy. (I.v.136-139)

(١) أفهذا حبي الأوحد؟

من بيت عدوي الأوحد؟  
مقدور أن أهواه  
لم أعرف من يلتقاني  
لكن أسلمت عناني  
مقدور أن أهواه  
يا ويح فؤادي يا ويحي  
هل هذا حبي وعدوي؟  
مقدور أن أهواه. (٧، ١٩٨٦)

(٢) أفهذا حبي الأوحد؟

من صلب عدوي الأوحد؟  
لم أك أعرف حين رأيت الأمل  
والآن عرفت وقد سبق السيف العذلا  
ذا مولد حب ينذر بالشر المحتوم  
اذ كتب علي غرام عدو مذموم. (١٠٥، ١٩٩٣)

The rhyme and the meter here are intrinsic to the lines which recall Romeo's oxymoronic epithets at the outset of the play: "O brawling love! O loving hate" (I.i. 169). At this stage, the lovers are still young and immature expressing their feelings

in conventional rhetorical forms. The quick moving meter, the rhyme and the interpolated refrain render the first translation lyrical. Still, however, due to modification and omission; it defies the purpose and the tone of the original. The oxymora in the first two lines culminate in “Prodigious birth of love” which sounds ominous and echoes “the death marked love” in the prologue. The omission of this line shows that the dramatic aspect of the play which cannot be divorced from its poetic is downplayed.

Though the rhythm of the second is slower than that of the first and of the original Shakespearian text, still this translation conveys an impression closer to the original than the previous one with its fusion of both the poetic and the dramatic. The first two lines of the two translations are identical except for one word “من صلب” (offspring). The word “sprung” is translated as “from the house of” in the first, but the second renders it “the offspring” which is more in tune with the word “birth” in the third line.

A comparison of the translation of Romeo's words before leaving for the Capulet's to attend the party - in the two translations – also illustrates the approach espoused by Enani in the first translation. Romeo's ominous utterance addressing his friends reads as follows:

I fear, too early, for my mind misgives  
Some consequence, yet hanging in the stars,  
Shall bitterly begin his fearful date  
With this night's revels, and expire the term  
Of a despised life closed in my breast,  
By some vile forfeit of untimely death:  
But He that hath the steerage of my course  
Direct my sail. On lusty gentlemen. (I.iv.107-114)

This is translated as follows:

إني لأوجس خيفة  
من حفلة الليل الكتوم  
قدر تداريه الغيوم  
قدر بأيدي السابحات من نجوم!  
وكانما الموعد حان  
لحكاية تنهي مرارتها الحياة  
وكانما الأحزان ترقص في الشفاه  
يا من توجه دفتي  
أصلح شراع سفينتي!  
هيا بنا قبل الأفول! (١٩٨٦، ٦٢)

In this version, the translator employs mixed metres, “Alkamel” and “alragaz”, an uncommon practice in Arabic, to stress the quick moving tempo which is further

enhanced by the use of rhyme. In the previous example, he also changes the order of the lines and adds two words: the first "الكتوم" (close or secretive) to qualify the night and the second, "الغيوم" (clouds). These, however, neither influence the meaning nor the tone of the original; even the interpolated line, "وكأنما الأحران ترقص في الشفاه" (as if misfortunes dance on the lips) emphasizes Romeo's fear. However, thematically, the first line, "I fear too early," which is dropped, is closely related to "untimely death", a significant motif that runs throughout the play. Also, "of a despised life closed in my breast," characteristic of Romeo's exaggerated rhetorical language before he matures and adopts a more spontaneous idiom is dropped. In the retranslation, though the rhythm is slower, still the lines are translated in such a way that stresses the lyrical without sacrificing the dramatic:

بل نحن بكرنا كثيرا يا صحاب!  
 فالآن أوجس خيفة  
 مما تخبئه الطوالع في غدي  
 قدر رهيب بعد هذا الحفل رهن الموعد  
 ولسوف يعثي بالمرارة قصتي  
 نهاية عمري المحبوس بين جوانحي  
 عمر يضيق بما بيه  
 فأموت قبل زمانيه  
 يا من توجه دفتي  
 أصلح شراع سفينتي  
 هيا بنا فخر الرجال. (١٩٨٦، ٩٥)

Using grammatical transposition, "أموت قبل زمانيه" "die before my time" is a dexterous rendering of "untimely death," emphasizing the significance of time lexically as well as thematically. Accordingly, the pragmatic conditions governing the translation process of the first version is an evidence of what Andre Lefevere terms the influence of "patronage." Patronage exemplified in the director of the play, on the one hand, and the audience, on the other hand, determines the choices of the translator and influences the relationship between the source and the target texts. According to Lefevere, "(A)ccptance of patronage implies that writers and rewriters work within the parameters set by their patrons" (1992, 18). Hence, the approach Enani adopts in the first version is that of a fluent translation, stressing the acceptability factor. Lawrence Venuti in *The Translator's Invisibility* defines fluent translations as those which are "written in current, widely used and standard language." They are devoid of foreign words and depend on a "syntax that... unfolds continuously and easily to ensure semantic precision with some rhythmic definition" and "a sense of closure" (2000, 4, 5).

Enani, thus, substitutes cultural elements (what Lefevere terms universe of discourse elements) for foreign ones. For example, he uses colloquial register, Arabic collocations, Arabic proverbs and Qur'anic allusions which are all avoided in the retranslation. The first translation renders Romeo's words to Juliet as follows:

Look thou but sweet!

And I am proof against their enmity. (II.i.114-115)

فإذا تعطفت بنظرة  
لم أخش أخطار الممات! (٧٥)

In the retranslation, the translator prefers "فلتبدي لي عين الرضا" (١١٩) which is as idiomatic but not as overused. "vaulty heaven" (III. v. 22) is rendered using an Arabic collocation in the first, "كبد السماء" (١٢١), but in the second version the translator employs a close translation, "قبة السماء" (١٩٨). Also, "They stumble that run fast" (II. ii. 94) is rendered using an Arabic proverb, "ففي العجلة الندامة" (٨٨). In the retranslation domestication is avoided by rephrasing the familiar proverb as follows: "من يتعجل قد يتعثر" (١٣٤). Qur'anic allusions are found in the two translations, but appear more in the first one. For example, in rendering "Alive in triumph! And Mercutio slain!" (III. i. 118), a Qur'anic allusion is used in the first translation but is avoided in the third as follows: "مزهوا بانتصاره؟ حيا يرزق ومركوشيو . The retranslation reads, "مزهوا بالنصر ومركوشيو مقتول؟" (١٦٧).

The first translation emphasizes dominant cultural values. Thus "I pray come and crush a cup of wine" (I.ii.83) is modified as follows: "فلم لا تأتي أنت أيضا" (٥١) "لنتناول العشاء؟", where to an Egyptian audience a party implies an invitation to dinner and not to "a cup of wine". Needless to say, the third translation which espouses a more faithful approach does not resort to modification: "فأرجو أن تأتي أنت" (٧٧) "أيضا وتفوز بكأس من النبيذ".

The first translation thus attempts to appease an audience that is largely conservative. Thus Juliet's "I'll to my wedding bed/ And death, not Romeo, take my maidenhead" (III.ii.136-7) is translated euphemistically avoiding the literal rendering of "take my maidenhead": "سأذهب إلى فراش عرسي ليتزوجني الموت بدلا من" (١٠٩) "روميو". The retranslation does not avoid it, but offers a tactful rendering that would still not offend the reader but is closer to the source text.

إذ سوف يأتي الموت لا روميو  
ليقطف زهرة العذراء عندي ها هنا! (١٨٠)

Capulet's language, addressing Paris when the latter asks for Juliet's hand in marriage, is an example of the Veronese conventional idiom.

My child is yet a stranger in the world;  
She hath not seen the change of fourteen years. (I. ii. 8-9)



The translation sacrifices that idiom and the emphasis on Juliet's age and innocence for the sake of a fluent translation: (Juliet is still young) "إن جوليت ما تزال صغيرة" (48) The retranslation takes account of the cultural element and is closer to the meaning and the feeling of the original:

إن طفلي ما تزال غريبة عن الدنيا  
ولم تكذ تتم الرابعة عشرة (٧٣)

Thus, the approach adopted in the first version shuns passages and lines that are "not amenable to fluent translating" (Venuti 2000, 17). Most of the oaths, mythological allusions, and cultural concepts such as, "star-crossed lovers and "humour," are ignored. "Black and portentous must this humour prove" (I.i.132) is translated avoiding the cultural concept as follows: "و حالته لا" (٤١) تبشر بخير مطلقا" The second version, however, takes account of the cultural concept transposing it intelligibly into "لا شك بأن مزاج اليافع أسود ينذر بالشر" (65) Moreover, Romeo's "My bosom's lord sits lightly in his throne" (V.i.3) is dropped in the first version but retained in the retranslation as "ورب صدري جالس في عرشه في خفة الهواء" (245) This, however, is explained in the end notes as follows: "my bosom's love" is a reference to love or the god of love, Cupid, and so the throne is the heart ( my translation). Enani's translation approach in the retranslation as illustrated in the previous examples underline his definition of accuracy in his article where he explains:

Truthfulness to the text requires more than "accuracy" in the sense we usually confine to single words: It requires the accurate rendering of what the verse says in verse, and what the verse says is determined by a perceived accurate reading of the character in a specific situation, and I am always guided in this reading by what the critics since Shakespeare's day have had to say". (2016, 160)

This explains Enani's use of detailed introductions and endnotes which are informative and illuminating.

Stressing the lyrical aspect of the first translation requires toning down the dramatic aspect by omission, condensation, or modification which in turn influences the "tone" in the original. Following are illustrative examples. Two significant motifs, poison, and death are closely associated with love. Benvolio playfully introduces the first in his advice to Romeo at the outset of the play using paradox which is a significant feature in the Renaissance, in general, and in Shakespeare's plays in particular:

Take thou some new infection to thy eye  
And the rank poison of the old will die (I.ii.48-49)

While this is ignored in the first translation, the metaphor is cleverly rendered in the retranslation as follows:

فانشد لعيونك عدوى حب آخر  
تهلك ما خلفه الحب السالف من سم نافع! (٧٥)

The motif is stressed again in Friar Lawrence's speech at the outset of Act II, scene ii; it is also deleted in the first version but is accounted for in the retranslation:

Within the infant rind of this weak flower  
Poison hath residence and medicine power:  
.....  
Two such opposed kings encamp them still  
In man as well as herbs, grace and rude will;  
And where the worser is predominant,  
Full soon the canker death eats up that plant. (23-24, 27-30)

في داخل قشرة هذه البرعمة الهشة سم نافع  
ودواء ناجع

.....  
هذان الملكان إذن ما انفكا يصطرعان  
ويرابط جيشهما في الأعشاب وفي الإنسان  
الأول ملك الشهوات الدنيا  
فإذا انتصر الملك السيء  
نخر السوس البرعم والتهمة! (١٢٩-١٣٠)

The dramatic purpose of this highly poetic speech is to shed light on the speaker and the crucial role he plays in furthering the plot. The speech also comments on the two kinds of love referred to in the play, sensuous love and true love. Friar Lawrence's highly rhetorical language is beautifully rendered in the second translation emphasizing the imagery of light and darkness that runs throughout the play. This imagery, as many critics have commented, intensifies "the imaginative unity" and gives the play its peculiar atmosphere, an atmosphere of "prevailing darkness pierced by brilliant light" (Halliday 1964, 88). Also, Friar Lawrence's use of key words such as "tomb" in line 9, "grave" in line 10 and "death" dramatizes the theme of death closely "bound up with love and part of, violent death" in the play (Frye 1986, 20).

This also appears in the dialogue between Friar Lawrence and Romeo when the latter says, "And bad'st me bury love", Friar Lawrence says, "To lay one in, another out to have" (II.iii.83-84), meaning that he did not advise Romeo to bury one love in order to give birth to another. This is also ignored in the second translation, but accurately translated in the retranslation:

روميو: وطلبت كذا دفن غرامي!  
القس: لم أطلب أن تدخل في القبر غراما وتعوضه بغرام آخر (١٣٣)

This theme is stated explicitly in Paris's cry. Thinking Juliet is dead, he addresses death saying:

Most detestable Death, by thee beguiled;  
By cruel, cruel thee quite overthrown!  
O love! O life! Not life, but love in death! (IV.v.55-57)

The theme of love in death does not appear in the first translation ... "أيها الموت الكريه... However, the retranslation accounts for it poetically as follows:

يا أبغض شيء نعرفه يا موت خدعت النفس  
وأطحت بقلبي وكياني يا عاتى البأس  
يا حبي وحياتي لا بل يا حبي الباقي في الموت (٢٣٧)

The comic and the cynical tones are also functional in the original. These are almost dispensed with since the first translation drops most puns and ignores most of the comic lines and episodes. An example is the episode at the beginning of Act II, scene i, where Benvolio and Mercutio go looking for Romeo. Mercutio mocks Romeo and expresses his cynical view of love. This conversation is dramatically significant since Mercutio's bawdy language contrasts with Romeo's lofty lyricism as he encounters Juliet following his friends' departure. The translation also drops Act II, scene iv, with its witty repartee. Benvolio informs Mercutio of the letter sent by Tybalt challenging Romeo to a fight. Mercutio in turn ridicules Tybalt's affected manners. When Romeo enters, Mercutio, in an attempt to make him forget his love for Rosaline, engages him in a battle of wits.

Mercutio's "cause" of being is to serve Romeo's foil in a multiplicity of ways: his frank bawdry is a contrast, his quick wit a messmate, and his violent, pitiful unnecessary death a foreshadowing of the hero's death (Bradbrook 1979, 118). The rest of the scene where Romeo instructs the Nurse to tell Juliet to come that afternoon to Friar Lawrence's cell is also omitted. In addition, many of the nurse's lines and the musician's episode following the discovery of Juliet's assumed death are omitted.

The conventional tone parodying courtly love tradition in exaggerated Petrarchan idiom and hackneyed rhymes is toned down due to omission. Earlier in the play, Mercutio's words referring to Romeo, emphasize that the conventional idiom of love was associated with Petrarchan poetry: "Now is he for the numbers that Petrarch flowed in!" (II.iv.34) This is accounted for in the retranslation, but not in the second. Also, Romeo's address to Juliet as "dear saint" (II.i.97) is also omitted in the first. Most importantly, Romeo's significant speech expressing his love for Rosaline is also dropped. Benvolio tries to persuade Romeo that at the Capulet's ball, the latter will discover that compared to other young ladies, Rosaline is a "crow". Romeo's belief in the supremacy of Rosaline's beauty is like a firmly held religious faith:

When the devout religion of mine eye

Maintains such falsehood, then turn tears to fire:  
And these, who, often drowned, could never die,  
Transparent heretics, be burnt for liars,  
One fairer than my love? The all-seeing sun  
Never saw her match since first the world begun. (I.ii.90-95)

The religious idiom is ignored in the first translation: Conversely, almost the same idiom and tone are transposed in the retranslation as follows:

إن حل الباطل في عيني محل الإيمان الصادق  
فلتحول عيراتي لجحيم حارق  
ثُرمي فيه العينان الكاذبتان  
الصافيتان الصابنتان وتحترقان  
وهما من أغرقتنا  
لكن مامانت أيهما \_ بالدمع الدافق  
أفتاة أجمل من فاتنتي؟  
قد رأيت الشمس جميع الخلق ولم تر أجمل منه  
من أول يوم خلق الناس الخالق! (٧٨)

The parallelism of this speech and Romeo's words when he first sees Juliet intensifies the effect of dramatic irony, which in turn enhances the tragedy of Romeo and Juliet. Moreover, the contrast between Romeo's artificial language at the beginning of the play and his spontaneous idiom after he matures is intrinsic to the play. Hence omission modifies the dramatic design intended by Shakespeare. Venuti suggests that "[b]y producing the illusion of transparency, a fluent translation masquerades as true semantic equivalence when it in fact inscribes the foreign text with a partial interpretation..." (1995, 21).

Thus, although the "poetic version" conveys the lyricism of the original, it does not adequately represent the intended tone or tones of the source text since the dramatic as well as the cultural aspects of the play cannot be divorced from the lyrical. Venuti, in *The Translator's Invisibility*, explains that a fluent strategy acculturates the ST by opting for "a domesticating method" which involves "an *ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values* (1995, 20; italics mine).

In the second version, Enani resists the constraints of pragmatic conditions and reproduces the Shakespearean text in all its formal, stylistic and semantic components. This, however, does not imply that the translation creates an impression of alienation or minimizes the involvement of the Arabic reader. The target text is rendered linguistically and artistically in a framework true to the Arabic language and the Arabic reader. Thus, the translator manages to strike a compromise between source text rhetorical meaning and target text rhetorical conventions. The following famous lines are illustrations. Romeo addresses Juliet:

Arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon,  
 Who is already sick and pale with grief  
 That thou her maid art far more fair than she.  
 Be not her maid, since she is envious;  
 Her vestal livery is but sick and green,  
 And none but fools do wear it; cast it off. (II.i.49-51)

The translation dexterously resolves many difficulties. Among these, the moon which is masculine in Arabic, is feminine in English. Also, the lines are loaded with cultural allusions. “Maid” refers the reader to unmarried maidens, the servants of Diana, the virgin goddess of the moon. This is explained by the translator in the endnotes. The lines also refer to the dress (livery) worn by Diana’s servants (vestals) which is sickly green in colour. Envious people were said to be “green with envy” (green sickness or lack of blood). Finally, the jester or fool usually wore green. The translation reads:

هيا اسطعي شمسي الجميلة وامحقي البدر الحسود  
 لقد بدا الشحوب في محياه العليل أسفا  
 إذ إن إحدى راهباته فاقتنه حسنا  
 فلتتركه إذن لأنه يغار منك  
 بل إن أثواب العذارى ذات لون أصفر سقيم  
 فلتخلعي ذاك الرداء لأنه ثوب الغباء! (١١٣-١١٤)

The translator dexterously overcomes the problem of gender since in Arabic fair girls are compared to the moon even though it is masculine. “Maid” is translated as “one of his nuns”, but to account for the fact that Diana’s maids were unmarried maidens, vestal livery is translated as virgins’ dress. A slight modification is made by the translator, altering green into yellow. Due to the difficulty in accounting for the cultural allusion associating green to envy, this has no effect on the source text. However, this compromise is made because in the Egyptian culture yellow may describe an ill person who looks pale, and sometimes it indicates jealousy. Green, on the other hand, is a pleasing colour. To emphasize its unpleasant significance, the translator uses the word "سقيم" (sickly) to qualify yellow. Finally, the syntax of the last line is changed, fronting the independent clause and thereby emphasizing “cast it (that dress) off”. This does not influence the rhetorical meaning of the original; it still conveys Romeo’s suggestion that anyone who decides never to marry is a fool.

Without sacrificing lexical and syntactic cohesion or alienating the Arabic reader, the translation registers linguistic and cultural differences by accounting for the foreign components, concepts and styles. This is illustrated by the translator’s dexterity in rendering the different verse forms that informs the drama of *Romeo and Juliet*, “a play in which the related lyric utterance of the sonnet, aubade, epithalamium and elegy are the interwoven music of a symphony” (Halliday 1964, 88). The prologue is written in the form of an English sonnet of fourteen lines: three quatrains and a concluding couplet, presenting an outline of the play. The

retranslation adheres, to a great extent, to the same verse form as far as the stanzaic units and the total number of the lines are concerned. It is a close translation of the original with three stanzas, each handling one idea, and ending in a couplet addressing the audience. Most importantly, the translation conveys an impression very similar to the one conveyed in the original with the emphasis on the tragedy of the star-crossed lovers. A comparison of the retranslation and the source text is illustrative:

Two households, both alike in dignity,  
In fair Verona where we lay our scene,  
From ancient grudge break to new mutiny,  
Where civil blood makes civil hands unclean. (I. prologue. 1-4)

The first quatrain is translated as follows:

فى بلدة فيرونا الحسناء (حيث المشهد)  
عائلتان يزينهما كرم المحتد،  
تصحو عندهما أحقاد الماضي الهوجاء  
فيلوث دم أهل البلدة أيدي الشرفاء! (٥٣)

The translation changes the order of the first and the second lines and adds "الهوجاء"(reckless) to qualify grudge. The translator explains in the endnotes that the pun on civil cannot be transposed.

From forth the fatal loins of these two foes  
A pair of star-crossed lovers take their life:  
Whose misadventured piteous overthrows  
Doth with their death bury their parents' strife. (I. prologue. 5-8)

This is translated in five lines as follows:

لكن من أصلاب الخصمين الرعناء  
يخرج للنور حبيبان  
تعبس لهما الأفلاك  
وتذيقهما أسواط هلاك  
فتوارى في الأرض بموتهما حقد الآباء! (٥٣)

The translator ingeniously transposes the compound adjective star-crossed using a verbal clause. A precise rendering is crucial as this is not merely an adjective but a motif that runs throughout the play. Closely associated with the previous motif is "misadventured piteous overthrows" (unfortunate and pitiful downfall) which again is translated as doomed to scourges of perdition, producing the same horrifying expectation. The only word that is added is "الرعناء" (thoughtless), a synonym of

"الهوجاء", used appropriately to qualify foes "الخصمين". Also, the fact that the two synonyms rhyme together enhances the meaning and creates unity and cohesion.

The fearful passage of their death-marked love,  
And the continuance of their parents' rage,  
Which, but their children's end, nought could remove,  
Is now the two hours' traffic of our stage; (I. prologue. 9-12)

The translation reads as follows:

ولسوف نصور هذي الساعة فوق المسرح  
قصة حب ذي أهوال يترصده الموت  
ونزاع شيوخ لم تدفنه سوى مأساة الأبناء (٥٣)

In the endnotes, Enani points to the change he made translating two hours into this hour, where, in both cases, the reference is to a certain period of time not a definitive one. This reveals the translator's extreme honesty. The translation also changes the order of the lines, but since the unit is the quatrain, this does not influence the meaning or the tone of the source text. Again the compound adjective, "death-marked", which is another motif closely associated with star-crossed in the previous stanza, is cleverly rendered using a clause, "يترصده الموت" (death lies in wait for their love). Finally, both the prologue and the translation end the sonnet in a couplet addressing the audience.:

The which, if you with patient ears attend,  
What here shall miss, our toil shall strive to mend.

فإذا أصغيتم وصبرتم يا سادتنا  
فلسوف نعوض ما فاتكمو من قصتنا (٥٣)

Form, sound and sense are transposed adequately in the retranslation.

The first version is a free translation that maintains the content but not the form. The unit of translation is not the quatrain, as in the retranslation. Although examples of modification, omission and addition are not many, still the translation creates an impression different from that conveyed in the original and successfully captured in the retranslation. For example, the emphasis on "star-crossed" as ill-fated disappears and so does death-marked love. According to the translation, "bad luck" ended their love story which is described as bloody. "Death" as an important motif is avoided. Mahood explains, "A leitmotiv of the play is Death as Juliet's bridegroom..." (1979, 57). Also "where civil blood makes civil hands unclean" which is dramatically crucial to the plot and the theme is omitted. Finally, the last two lines are an interpolation which sounds epigrammatic but is not functional. The translation employs a quick tempo and a rhyme scheme that appeals to the taste of the Arabic audience. Following is the lyrical prologue of the first translation:

فى بلدة فيرونا الفيحاء  
يقع المشهد  
وهنا في المسرح كل مساء  
نروي ما يحدث في بيتين  
يزينهما كرم المحتد!  
إذ أن قديم الأحقاد  
هبت عاصفة رعناء  
فى أبناء العائلتين  
لتودي بحياة الأحياء!  
لكن من نسل الآباء  
يخرج للنور حبيبان  
ما كادا يلتقيان  
حتى كان الحظ العاثر  
يطوي حبهما الطاهر  
ويواري معه حقد الآباء  
ولسوف تصور في مسرحنا كل مساء  
قصة هذا الحب الدامى  
وصراعا لم تدفنه سوى مأساة الأبناء!  
الصبر إذن يا سادتنا  
حتى تنساب حكايتنا  
وإذا كنا قد أسرنا  
فنسينا أو أخطأنا  
فالواقع أن النسيان  
من شيم الإنسان! (٣٣)

The second version carefully renders other verse forms such as Mercutio's rhapsody on Queen Mab, Juliet's epithalamium in Act III, scene ii, the aubade in Act III, scene v and Paris's elegy in Act V. Some of the best poetry is found in both translations of Mercutio's rhapsody. The first translation, however, is written in the form of a lyrical poem with its quick rhythm and rhyming pattern. It also drops some lines due to their indecent or offensive allusions. Following is an example:

O'er ladies lips, who straight on kisses dream,  
Which oft the angry Mab with blisters plagues,  
Because their breaths with sweetmeats tainted are. (I.iv.74-76)

The second and third lines are deleted: "وبالشفاه حين تحلم البنات بالقبل" (٦١). Moreover, lines 93-95 are dropped for their bawdry. These, however, are accounted for in the second translation as tactfully as possible:

This is the hag, when maids lie on their backs,  
That presses them and learns them first to bear. (I.v.92-93)



هذي هي الشمطاء تأتي للبنات إذا رقدن  
حتى تعلمهن فن الحمل أول مرة. (٩٣)

Domestication in the first version also appears in condensing some lines for the sake of fluency and using a Qur'anic idiom whereas the retranslation captures the same tone.

In Act III, scene ii, Juliet's epithalamium is an invocation to the night to come quickly so that Romeo may join her unseen. This is translated very skillfully and closely in the same number of lines in the retranslation. However, slight changes are made to strike a balance between the rhetorical meaning of the original and the cultural idiom of the target text. The translation, for example, shuns the mythological allusion in the first two lines. "Fiery-footed" steeds refers to the horses which draw the chariot of Phoebus, the Greek sun-god, from the east to his resting place (lodging) in the west. This is translated as the steeds of time and Phoebus is rendered as the sun. Also, the reference to Phaeton, Phoebus' son, is avoided. This, however, does not detract from the rhetorical excellence of the original.

The skillful rendering of the sound, sense and tone of the aubade of Act III, scene v is another example of the translator's linguistic and artistic ability. The aubade is a dawn song after a night of love. In the courtly love poem, the lover leaves at dawn because secrecy is part of the code, but Romeo leaves because his life is at risk. The third translation conveys to the Arabic reader the beauty of the verse in almost the same tone and form except for few modifications.

A final example of a verse form which is cleverly rendered especially in the retranslation is Paris' elegy. It is translated in the same number of lines. Each line comprises the same idea expressed in the original except for the last two lines where the couplet is regarded as a unit.

Sweet flower, with flowers thy bridal bed I strew -  
O woe, thy canopy is dust and stones -  
Which with sweet water nightly I will dew,  
Or, wanting that, with tears distilled by moans.  
The obsequies that I for thee will keep,  
Nightly shall be to strew thy grave and weep. (V.iii.11-17)

يا زهرتي على فراش عرسك الجميل أنثر الزهر  
ويحي لقد صار الغطاء من تراب والفراش من حجر  
فسأنثر الأنداء كل ليلة عليه من مائي العطر

The translation with its rhythm and rhyme scheme uses Arabic poetic conventions skillfully to render the elegy as closely as possible. Necessary modifications do not seem to interfere with the tone and effect conveyed. For example, canopy is rendered using two words, bed (الفراش) and bed-cover(الغطاء) and tears distilled by moans is rendered as distilled tears in the blaze of moans adding an appropriate word, blaze.

The translator also uses “explication” where he resorts to interpolation to render “to strew thy grave”: with roses and sweet-smelling flowers.

The first translation, however, is a lyrical domestication of the original rendering it in quick rhythm and short lines ending in a rhyming couplet as follows:

يا زهرتي الرقيقة  
هذي زهور عرسنا  
أنثرها على فراشنا  
قد أصبح الغطاء من تراب  
والفراش من حجر  
لكنني أرويه  
بالندى العطر  
وبالدموع  
كل مساء  
شعائر العزاء. (١٥٨-١٥٩)

Finally, conscious of the dramatic function of wordplay in *Romeo and Juliet*, in the retranslation, the translator takes great pains to reproduce it whenever possible. M.M. Mahood emphasizes the importance of wordplay in this play in particular showing that it is “one of Shakespeare’s most punning plays.” She underlines the dramatic function of wordplay suggesting that it “holds together the play’s imagery in a rich pattern and gives an outlet to the tumultuous feelings of the central characters.” She adds that it “sharpens the play’s dramatic irony”; most importantly, it “clarifies the conflict of incompatible truths and helps to establish their final equipoise” (56).

Following are some illustrative examples which appear in the retranslation. The translation adds a pun which is appropriately employed to translate Mercutio’s idiolect:

And but one word with one of us? Couple it with something:  
Make it a word and a blow. (III.i.37-38)

تتكلم فقط مع أحدها؟  
ولماذا لا يصاحب الكلام شيء آخر؟  
كلمة ولكمة! (١٦٣)

The lovelorn Romeo objects to Benvolio’s use of the words “sadly” and “sadness” because they remind him of his sorrow. By “in sadness” and “sadly”, Benvolio means seriously, but Romeo pretends to misunderstand the word and uses it to mean sadness.

Benvolio: Tell me in sadness, who is that you love?

.....  
 But sadly tell me who.  
 Romeo: A sick man in sadness makes his will –  
 A word ill urged to one so ill.  
 In sadness, cousin, I do love a woman. (I.i.192, 194-97)

دع الهزل واذكر لنا من تحب  
 ...  
 ألا بحت لي باسمها دون هزل؟  
 أتطلب منى الهزيل العليل بأن أترك الهزل وقت الوصية؟  
 ألا ساء ما تتبغيه لمن ساء حاله!  
 سألتزم الجد يابن العمومة إني أحب امرأة. (٦٩)

The translator accounts for the pun using "هزل" and "هزيل". The play on sick and ill, however, is difficult to render. Still the translation manages to convey the intended tone accounting also for ill-urged and ill employing a play on the word "ساء". Another interesting example of the translator's ingenuity in rendering puns is the translation of Romeo's and Mercutio's witty repartee:

Mercutio: Nay, I am the very pink of courtesy.  
 Romeo: Pink for flower.  
 Mercutio: Right.  
 Romeo: Why, then is my pump well-favoured. (II.iv.55-58)

Romeo and Mercutio play on the word pink which means perfection, but it is also the name of a flower. To pink is to cut holes in cloth or leather as an ornament. When Romeo says his "pump" (his single-soled shoe) is "well favoured", he means that it has been pinked in this way. The translation reads:

: ولم لا ... وأنا أكثر المؤدبين تفتحا  
 : إن التفتح للزهور.  
 : هذا صحيح .  
 : ولكن حذائي قد تفتح أيضا... بالثقوب! (ص ١٤٠)

The translator uses paronomasia. The first "تفتح" means broad- minded, the second means to bloom and the third to be full of holes.

The idea of harmony disrupted by the family feud is emphasized by references to music. Trying to anger Tybalt, Mercutio purposely misunderstands him, taking "consort" in its other meaning, "combine in musical harmony". He pretends that Tybalt has insulted him by calling him a hired musician. The third translation conveys the tone and the sense:

Consort? What, dost thou make us minstrels?  
 And thou make minstrels of us, look to here

Nothing but discords. Here's my fiddlestick;  
Here's that shall make you dance. Zounds, consort! (III.i.43-46)

بمصاحبته؟ هل جعلت منا منشدين يعزف أحدنا بمصاحبة  
الأخر؟ إذا كنا منشدين فلن نسمع إلا النشاز! ها هي قوس  
الكمان .. (يخرج سيفه) هذه هي التي ستجعلك ترقص..  
هيا.. لمصاحبتي! (١٦٣)

Another example is the musicians' humour in Act IV., scene v, "I'll re you, I'll fa you/Do you note me?" (113-115) Note here means to take note and also a musical note. Though difficult to render as a pun, this is accounted for by adding "understand": Did you understand this note? The translation also adds and I'll beat you with the key of sol. Interpolation here serves to convey the intended tone.

سأحاربكم ب"ري"  
"وفا" وأضربكم بمفتاح "صول"!  
هل فهمتم هذه "النوتة"؟ (٢٤٠)

Juliet's witty and light-hearted speech addressing the nurse, which is deleted in the second translation, is functional as it dramatizes the theme of harmony as opposed to discord through the metaphor employed:

O Lord, why lookest thou sad?  
Though news be sad, yet tell them merrily:  
If good, thou shamest the music of sweet news  
By playing it to me with so sour a face. (II.v.21-24)

The third translation conveys not only Juliet's idiosyncratic tone, but it also transmits the distinctive themes and characterization of the play:

لاداعي للحزن أبدا – فاذا كانت الأخبار سيئة،  
فخففي من وقعها ببعض المرح! وإذا كانت حسنة  
فأنت تفسدين أنغامها حين تعزفينها. (١٥٠)

Finally, the rapid repartee between Juliet and Paris also sheds light on both their characters. Her formal manner contrasts sharply with the language she uses in the previous example. The translator accounts for the varieties of dialogue and tones of utterance which serve a dramatic as well as a poetic purpose. The dialogue presents the audience with a self-assured Paris and a serious but witty Juliet:

Paris: Come you to make confession to this father?  
Juliet: To answer that, I should confess to you.  
Paris: Do not deny to him that you love me.

Juliet: I will confess to you that I love him.  
 Paris: So will ye, I am sure, that you love me.  
 Juliet: If I do so, it will be of more price,  
 Being spoke behind your back, than to your face. (II.v.21-24)

فهل أنيت للأب القدسي كي تعترفي؟  
 إجابتي هذا السؤال تعني الاعتراف لك!  
 لا تنكري أمامه حبك لي!  
 بل أعترف أمامك بالحب له  
 وبحبك لي دون جدال!  
 إن أفعل ذلك زادت قيمة أقوالي وارتفعت  
 إذ تصدر في غيبتك وليس أمامك (٢١٤)

By identifying some historical and pragmatic factors such as the poetics of a certain period, the dominant current definition of translation or the influence of patronage, and how these may influence and govern the choices made by the translator the above discussion highlights Enani's attainment of an integrated approach to translating Shakespeare and establishing the medium he adopted as the language of Shakespeare in contemporary Arabic translations, One of the factors influencing the discourse which has dominated Arabic literary translation in different periods is the theory of translation in the west. Venuti, in the introduction to *The Translation Studies Reader* underlines concepts influencing the translator's choices:

The history of translation theory can in fact be imagined as a set of changing relationships between the relative autonomy of the translated text, or the translator's actions, and two other concepts: equivalence and function. (2000, 5)

He then adds two other concepts: the instrumental and the hermeneutic. Theories that opt for the instrumental concept "privilege the communication of objective information..., minimizing and sometimes excluding altogether any question of function beyond communication." On the other hand, theories which espouse the hermeneutic concept "privilege the interpretation of creative values and therefore describe the target-language inscription in the foreign text, often explaining it on the social functions and effects" (2000, 6).

Venuti writes that in the 1960s and 1970s, the concept of equivalence was more dominant, whereas in the 1980 and 1990s, the "autonomy" of translation "is limited by the dominance of functionalisms, and equivalence is rethought to embrace what were previously treated as shifts or deviations from the foreign text." The choices made by the translator in the prose version were thus influenced by translation theories stressing equivalence-- regarded as accuracy and precision-- rather than function which is more concerned with effect. Its literary discourse belongs to the category of the instrumental with emphasis on communication. On the contrary, the

influence of translation theories embracing function with its emphasis on “the potentiality of the translated text to release diverse effects, beginning with the communication of information and the production of a response comparable to the one produced by the foreign text in its culture” is evident in Enani’s two translations (Venuti 2000, 5). Their literary discourse falls into the category of the hermeneutic with its emphasis on interpretation taking the social and cultural components into consideration.

However, the two verse translations present two different interpretations of the original. The discourse of each is coloured by the tradition, tastes of the time and pragmatic conditions. The discourse of the first translation conveys an accommodation to target language linguistic, aesthetic and cultural models accounting for the poetic effect but sacrificing some elements of the dramatic in the original. The retranslation attempts a compromise between ST rhetorical meaning and themes and TT rhetorical conventions.

Venuti believes that a translation can “communicate to its readers the understanding of the foreign text that the foreign readers have.” He maintains that “any communication through translating, will involve the release of a domestic remainder.” The translator attempts “to invent domestic analogues for foreign forms and themes” (1995, 471). Enani’s retranslation of *Romeo and Juliet* is an example of such a translation which “includes an inscription of the foreign context in which the text first emerged.” It does not only communicate “dictionary meanings” or “the basic elements” of the dramatic form, “but an interpretation,” of the play “that is shared by the foreign-language readers for whom the text was written.” This kind of translation fosters “a common understanding with and of the foreign culture, an understanding that in part restores the historical context of the foreign text- although for domestic readers” (1995, 473). Translations such as the second verse translation of *Romeo and Juliet* and all Enani’s translations written in the third stage of his journey promote what Venuti terms “the utopian dream of common understanding between foreign and domestic cultures” (1995, 487).

## References

- Berry, Ralph. 1980. *The Shakespearean Metaphor: Studies in Language and Form*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.,
- Bradbrook, M.C. 1979. *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enani, Mohamed. 2016. “On Translating Shakespeare into Arabic: A Translator’s Testimonial.” In *Rewriting Narratives in Egyptian Theatre*, edited by Sirku Aaltonen and Areeg Ibrahim, 157-161. New York: Routledge.
- . 2017. “An Interview With Muhammad Enani.” Conducted by Nadia Abdel Halim. *Al-Ahram Newspaper*, January 6.
- Frye, Northrop. 1986. *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare*. Edited by Robert Sandler. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Halliday, F.E. 1964. *The Poetry of Shakespeare's Plays*. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc.
- Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translating, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
- , 2000. "Mother Courage's Cucumber." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti, 233-249. London: Routledge.
- , 2014. "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and The Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm." *The Manipulation of Literature*, edited by Theo, Hermans, 215-243. London: Routledge.
- Levin, Harry. 1976. *Shakespeare and the Revolution of the Times: Perspectives and Commentaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mahood, M.M. 1979. *Shakespeare's Wordplay*. Methuen: Methuen and Company.
- Shakespeare, William. 1965. *Romeo and Juliet*. Translated by Mohamed Enani. Cairo: *Majallat al-Masra*.
- , 1984. *Romeo and Juliet*. The New Cambridge Shakespeare Series. Edited by G. Blakemore Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 1986. *Romeo and Juliet*. Translated by Mohamed Enani. Cairo: Dar Ghareeb.
- , 1993. *Romeo and Juliet*. Translated by Mohamed Enani. Cairo: : al-Hay'a al-'Āmma lil-Kitāb.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence ed. 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.