Enani's Translation Theory

Samar Mahmoud Shehata Tulba [*]

Introduction

This paper discusses Enani's translation theory in relation to the Functionalist perspective on translation as represented by Reiss and Vermeer. The reason for focusing on the Functionalist perspective on translation is that Enani often expressed admiration of it, declaring himself a believer in it as he explains that all pre-Functionalist approaches to translation are outdated, and collectively describes the Functional theories as "the theory of the future" (Enani 2005, 281-82). This should come as no surprise since Enani's experience as a translator informed his academic interest in translation theory, and those who knew him or read his books on translation realize that his infatuation with language was matched only by his antipathy to any attempt to separate it from its sociocultural context and reduce it to mere structures. Functional theories, specifically Vermeer's skopos theory, can be described as a theorization of a good translator's intuition, or, as Vermeer puts it: "Neither skopos nor commission are new concepts as such—both simply make explicit something which has always existed. Yet they do specify something that has hitherto either been implicitly put into practice more unconsciously than consciously" (2000, 230).

Hence, this paper focuses on Enani's affinities with Functionalists as expressed in his statements about literary translation in such books as *Fann al-Tarjama* [The Art of Translation] (2000) and *Murshid al-Mutarjim* [The Translator's Guide] (2005), but most of the paper is dedicated to literary translation, notably verse translation, Enani's favourite topic. The paper also discusses departures from the Functionalists' views. Translation is too dynamic an activity for any theory, no matter how practical, to fully describe. This calls to mind Jeri Levy's 'Minimax strategy' which Enani always admired. It states that the translator "resolves for that one of the possible solutions which promises a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort" (2000, 156).

Functional Theories of Translation: An Overview

In the preface to one of his most popular books on translation, Enani describes translation as a 'science' (2000a, para. 2). Paradoxically, the book is called *Fann al-Tarjama* [The Art of Translation] and in it Enani defines translation as a "craft which can only be mastered through training and practice, based on talent"[1] (2). Despite the

highly practical nature of the book (and of most of his books on translation), Enani expresses an awareness of the growing theoretical interest in the then-relatively-new discipline known as Translation Studies. Keen to take a stance towards this new discipline in his preface, he describes the insights he provides in the book as "opinions pertaining to translation practice rather than theory" (para. 2). He explains that he chooses to leave theory to "linguists" as he believes that "the subject matter and content of research (in translation) must be the text (itself), be it written or spoken" (para. 2).

However, Enani does not simply leave translation theory to linguists. In his *Murshid al-Mutarjim* [The Translator's Guide], he expresses great enthusiasm for the Functional theories of translation and introduces their main terms and concepts to the Arab reader in an appendix of twelve pages (298-310). He expresses the same enthusiasm for these theories in his book *Nazaryyat al-Tarjama al-Haditha: Madkhal li-Dirasāt al-Tarjama* [Modern Theory of Translation: An Introduction to Translation Studies] (2003) which Enani explains is a critical history of translation theory modeled after Jeremy Munday's *Introducing Translation Studies* (2008), and even defends Vermeer's skopos theory against those who question its applicability to all kinds of texts, including literature (2003b, 2).

It would be difficult to decide whether the Functionalist ideas, which first appeared in the late 1970s, caused a sea of change in Enani's view of translation as Enani's first literary translation, published as early as 1961, is out of print. However, the fact that Functional theories of translation, particularly Vermeer's skopos theory, are closer in nature to what translators know and practice by intuition gives us reason to believe that the theories simply spoke what was already believed and practiced by Enani who, like many—if not most—practitioners of translation, was skeptical about the use of theory. In this connection, it may be useful to mention that in the aforementioned *Nazaryyat al-Tarjama al-Haditha* [Modern Theory of Translation], Enani particularly praises Jeri Levy's practical insights on translation expressed in an article Levy wrote in 1967. Enani laments the little critical attention Levy's article received and that none but Venuti did it justice. In his later article, Levy states that "translation theory tends to be normative, to instruct translators on the 'optimal' solution; actual translation work, however, is pragmatic" (2000, 156). In addition, Enani—often lightheartedly—comments on the 'dryness' of purely linguistic approaches to translation. For instance, in *Fann al-Tarjama* [The Art of Translation], he defends Eugene Nida's *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964) which, though usefully simple, is "no longer respected by linguists" (2000a, 65- 66). He also describes linguists as "priests—the mention of whose names alone can make you quake with fear" and who have "their own language which none, except for themselves, can understand" (2000a, 65). This explains his attitude to the Functional theories of translation which have managed to "bypass linguistics altogether" (2000b, 11).

Both Reiss and Vermeer subordinate the linguistic aspects of translation to the circumstances of the target culture. Reiss believes that the translation process should be informed by an understanding of the text type and the role language is supposed

to play in it (2000, 163). In typical translation situations, the target text is supposed to perform within its cultural context the same function performed by the source text in its original cultural context, which means that both should belong to the same text type and text variety (i.e. poem, advertisement, news story, etc.) no matter how huge the linguistic differences among them are. According to Reiss, text types are more or less constant across cultures (2000, 163). He also explains that the same is true for text varieties (165-66).

Reiss identifies three basic text types, each of which focuses on a certain aspect of language to achieve the function associated with it, which, in turn, determines the optimal method of translation (2000, 165). Informative texts are meant to communicate information, opinions, etc. through employing the referential aspect of language. Plain prose should be used in translating them, with special focus, of course, on their 'meaning,' by which Reiss means the informative content rather than ways of organizing this informative content. Expressive texts make use of the aesthetic aspect of language in communicating "artistically organized content" (163). Thus, form is an intrinsic part of the identity of this text type, which is represented by the different genres of literature. Since this type of text expresses the unique experience of an individual author, the translator needs to identify "with the artistic and creative intention of the SL author in order to maintain the artistic quality of the text" (167). Operative texts communicate "content with a persuasive character" through dialogic language with the aim of inducing the reader to take a certain course of action (163). Translating operative texts requires adaptations in ways that the target text's effect on its readers should be the same as the source text's effect on its readers. To these three text types Reiss adds a fourth type—namely, "the multi-medial text type" which she describes as "a hyper-type … a super-structure for the three basic types," which combines the function represented by any of the three basic text types with "additional information … supplied by a sign system other than that of language (picture-text, music and text, gestures, facial expressions, built-up scenery on the stage, slides and text, etc.)" (163).

While "the text type determines the *general* method of translating," the text variety "demands consideration for language and text structure conventions" (166). A process of analysis, states Reiss, should highlight the linguistic and pragmatic features of the source text that needs to be translated, so as to enable the translator to decide how different the target text is to be (166). Then comes the actual translation process, which Reiss calls 'reverbalization' (166). In it, the translator has to decide whether "the linguistic signs and sequences of linguistic signs selected in the TL in coordination with a sign form and sign function can guarantee the functional equivalence for which a translator should strive, by due consideration of text variety and text type" (166). Reiss also discusses hybrid texts which have more than one function, to which she refers as "problematic cases" of translation (169), indicating that the method of translation associated with the dominant function should be followed when dealing with such texts. Reiss also discusses the effect of temporal factors on functional equivalence, stressing the importance of re-translating source

texts if the "TL has changed to such an extent, that the TL version reflecting previous language conditions does not guarantee functional equivalence anymore" (2000, 162). Thus, functional equivalence is not a static relationship between texts, but is decided in light of the sociocultural context, which is, by nature, subject to change.

On the other hand, Vermeer's skopos theory simply makes the skopos, or the purpose for which the source text is translated and is supposed to serve, the factor that determines the nature of the translation strategy. Though he defines translation as a type of translational action "based on a source text" (2000, 221). Vermeer explains that the translator—being an 'expert'—has the authority to decide "what role a source text plays in his translational action" in light of the skopos of translation as determined by the target culture (221). The theory, thus, is based on "a new concept of the status of the source text for a translation" (221). Literal translation that restricts itself to the linguistic surface of the source text ignoring the circumstances of the target culture fails to achieve the skopos of translating in typical translation situations:

> A source text is usually composed originally in the source culture; hence its status as "source text," and hence the role of the translator in the process of intercultural communication…Transcoding, as a procedure which is retrospectively oriented towards the source text…is diametrically opposed to the theory of translational action. (223)

Vermeer is, expectedly, less specific about methods of translation than Reiss; if the skopos is the most important element in the translation process, then any translation method is acceptable as long as it leads to the achievement of the skopos specified in a certain translation situation.

A source-oriented translation is the ideal translation if this is what the target reader needs in situation X; a target-oriented translation, perhaps of the same source text as that translated in situation X, is the ideal translation if it is what the target reader needs in situation Z. Translation methods that are half way between a source-language/culture orientation and a target-language/culture orientation are equally acceptable in other translation situations:

> The skopos theory thus in no way claims that a translated text should ipso facto conform to the target language behaviour or expectations, that a translation must always "adapt" to the target culture. This is just one possibility: the theory equally well accommodates the opposite type of translation, deliberately marked, with the intention of expressing source-culture features by target-culture means. Everything between these two extremes is likewise possible, including hybrid cases.To know what the point of a translation is, to be conscious of the action—that is the goal of the skopos theory. (2000, 231)

Reiss and Vermeer later joined efforts with the aim of producing a general theory of translation based on five tenets listed in Reiss and Vermeer (2014), in descending order of importance.

The first tenet expectedly designates the skopos of translation as the factor determining the nature of the target text (2014, 94). The second and third tenets are variations on the idea that the function of the target text can sometimes be different from the function of the source text since each belongs in—and is a product of—its own sociocultural context (94). According to the fourth tenet, the target text must be characterized by internal coherence (98). The fifth tenet, dubbed as "the fidelity rule" makes it necessary that the target text be coherent with the source text (102). The last, and least important, tenet should not be understood as a reference to faithfulness to the form of the source text, but rather to consistency between the source text content, the translator's understanding of it, and the content communicated by the translator in the target text. Nevertheless, it must be noted that Vermeer, in the context of discussing the effect of the skopos on translation method, cites "maximally faithful imitation of the original" as a long-standing method of translating literature (228).

Enani's Translation Theory

Enani's translation theory is generally in line with his Functionalist beliefs. For informative texts, he advocates the communicative method of translation focused on delivering the informative message of the source text through a form recognizable by the target reader as representative of the text variety of the target text. For example, translating Arabic news into English should conform to the conventions of writing English news (2003b, 152). Referential meanings of source-text words and expressions should be reproduced in the target language so that their renderings would be relevant to the target reader's sociocultural context. This entails, for example, dealing with fixed expressions as referential units rather than separate words, translating 'birth control,' for instance, as تنظيم الأسرة not as السيطرة على المواليد because the meaning of 'control' is decided in the light of its relationship with 'birth' as understood by the source reader, and consequently the translator should seek equivalence on phrase level, not on word level, by opting for تحديد النسل since this expression means to the target reader what 'birth control' means to the source reader (11-12).

Thus, functional equivalence takes precedence over semantic accuracy. Enani explains that standardized renderings of source-language expressions should always be used by translators even if more semantically accurate renderings can be devised given that the aim of communicative translation is immediate intelligibility based on what is familiar and accepted as far as the target language is concerned (2000a, 35-36). The target culture here should not necessarily be understood as the culture of the target language in its broad sense, as it can also mean the culture of a specific group within the TL linguistic and cultural community. The criteria such specific groups follow in evaluating the target text may differ significantly from—or even

clash with—standards of linguistic correctness as defined and understood by the target culture. Enani cites English-to-Arabic UN translation as an example where translators have to translate according to the expectations of the target readers (who are UN delegates) about the target text, which are not necessarily the same as what is correct from the target language's perspective (2003b, 130- 31). Moreover, the target reader's viewpoint should also be taken into consideration in communicative translation, through the use of target-language words and expressions which the target reader would deem politically correct and in accordance with his/her worldview. For instance, the choice of either مناضلين or متمردين as a translational equivalent of 'militants' should depend on the target reader's stance to the cause in question (2003a, 12).

Delivering the informative message communicatively also entails ironing out syntactic irregularities, be they characteristic of the source language's modes of expression or simply stylistic errors. Hence, Enani explains that patterns of emphasis are only important in literary texts (2000a, 87). Discussing English-to-Arabic translation of informative texts, he proposes numerous syntactic transformations meant to ease the burden of processing the informative content in syntactically complicated texts (his examples are mainly news stories) by referring the target reader back to genuine Arabic structures. These transformations include moving long modifiers which separate the subject from the verb to the end of the sentence when translating it (70), and changing fake passive—where the agent is mentioned after the preposition 'by'—into the Arabic active voice (67-68).

It is Enani's literary translations that yield more interesting results when investigated in the light of his identification with the Functionalists. In his introductions to his translations of Shakespeare's plays, Enani often stated the 'skopos' of his translations as being faithful to the original texts. As early as 1988, when he translated *The Merchant of Venice*, producing a translation that represents the original more faithfully than older Arabic translations was the main purpose that informed his translation strategy (2004b, 20). This can be regarded as the basis of Enani's perspective on literary translation. However, faithfulness to the original does not mean close imitation of the original which is described by Vermeer as the traditional skopos of literary translation (Vermeer 2000, 228). Perhaps a useful starting point would be the following passage from Enani's introduction to Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, where Enani sums up his views on literary translation as follows:

> In my opinion, literary translation is an artistic effort in a cultural framework, an effort involving a considerable degree of secondary innovation, or innovation within innovation.…What I mean by 'artistic effort' is: employing the artistic means and methods specific to the target language, and using its genuine idiom, that is, the modes of expression of the living language which people use when they read, write or speak.…I believe that literary translation is more than conveying the meanings of the words in

order for the foreign reader (the Arab reader in our case) to know what the characters say. (2004b, 9)

Enani proceeds to define 'the cultural framework' as the spirit of the age in which the characters of the play are supposed to have lived, which is far bigger than the linguistic habits of the characters expressed in words or expressions, and even than mythological references (2004b, 9-10). To Enani, the cultural framework is the character's worldview, which can only be captured in translation through the extensive study of the culture of Shakespeare's time as represented in the original play (10). In this respect, Enani warns against confusing faithfulness to the cultural content of the play with faithfulness to an archaic linguistic medium, maintaining that his translation is a text depicting a past culture using the means of the target reader's contemporary culture (10).

Thus, faithfulness to the original must not be understood as resulting in what is known as an exoticizing (or foreignizing) translation; it rather refers to the faithful depiction of what the 'foreign' characters say and do through a linguistic medium and an artistic form that the target reader can relate to. Hence, the Arabic version of the play should linguistically and artistically mean to the target reader (or audience) what the original meant to its reader or viewer. Faithful reproduction of the content of the play is only part of faithful reproduction of the play's original effect, a purpose which cannot be achieved unless the content is reproduced in a form functionally equivalent to that of the original. As a matter of fact, the artistic form was particularly important to Enani, be it the form of a poem or the form of a play. Most of what he wrote on translation theory pertains to the translation of verse, his main premise being that verse can only be translated as verse (44; Enani 2003b, 124). He asserts that the verse form is an intrinsic part of poetic meaning (2003b, 9). He even goes so far as to say that "the translator has to translate verse as verse, no matter how lacking in poeticality the source text may be" (124). Consequently, the translator should seek to create an equivalent effect when dealing with the meter of verse by striving to produce target-language rhythms whose effect on the target reader would be similar to the effect of the original rhythms on the source reader (2003a, 40). In order for this goal to be achieved, the translator, who – needless to say- must be a poet, should identify with the original poet, "attempting to produce a target-language poem that, from a prosodic point of view, is an equivalent to the source-language poem" (2000a, 147). This seems to put much emphasis on the translator's subjectivity, but the fact is that deciding what is artistically equivalent to the music of the original poem is a task that the translator accomplishes as a representative of the target culture, not as an individual; the meter s/he opts for should faithfully represent the tastes of poetry lovers in the target culture (2003a, 40).

Enani expounds the aforementioned general theoretical guidelines in most of what he wrote about literary translation, discussing specifics of translating poetic genres and the nature of Arabic meters in relation to the requirements of these genres. In his introduction to Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, he explains that the Arabic

composite meters of traditional poetry are best suited for the translation of English lyrical poems that are characterized by a high degree of musicality (resultant from prosodic regularity), as well as the songs in Shakespeare's plays, which are also highly musical for the same reason; compared to Arabic pure meters (2004b, 44). The composite meters are far more musical, and consequently more capable of producing an equivalent effect in such cases as these, where musicality is particularly essential (44). The Arabic pure meters, or rather their versions on which the so-called free verse is based[2], are the medium Enani recommends when he discusses translating verse plays, like Shakespeare's. Once again, equivalence of effect or function is the rationale. The blank verse of Shakespeare's plays makes great use of the various possibilities of the iambic meter to express changes in the characters' feelings as well as to echo differences between their styles. Thus, the translator's perfect choice would be free-verse meters, where the absence of the restrictions of poetic form makes it easy for the translator to reproduce most, if not all, aspects of poetic meaning (47).

The same strategy is proposed for translating English lyrical poetry which is not characterized by a high degree of prosodic regularity (i.e. that makes considerable use of modulations) (2000a, 164). According to Enani, the free-verse meters which most efficiently serve the purposes of writing for the theatre and translating verse drama are Khabab and Rajaz (2003a, 117-18). However, Enani does not advocate using the two meters indiscriminately when translating English verse, be it dramatic or lyrical; the composition of the Khabab foot makes it sound more vivid than Rajaz, and consequently better suited for expressing such emotions as happiness or anger, whereas Rajaz is slower by nature, and, thus, more suitable when expressing sadness and solemn states of mind (117). Enani particularly praises the flexibility of free-verse Rajaz, which not only accepts all kinds of modulations but can also be 'seamlessly' transformed into free-verse Hajaz or Ramal (2003a, 118, 123)[3].

In fact, it is Enani's experimentation with free-verse meters in translating poetry (both dramatic and lyrical) that made it possible for him to reduce inevitable translation losses to a minimum, by allowing him to strike a balance between the need to break free from the shackles of poetic form in order to preserve the original meanings and ideas on the one hand, and the need to translate verse as verse on the other hand. It may be interesting to investigate translation situations in which Enani deviated from the aforementioned theoretical principles, which he followed most of the time as his readers have surely noticed. The first exception would be his second translation of *Romeo and Juliet* (1986) where he did apply the rule of translating songs as songs, but translated the dialogue as prose[4]. In the introduction to his translation of *Julius Caesar*, Enani explains that this deviation from the rule of translating verse as verse was motivated by lack of experience in the areas of writing for the theatre and translating literature (1991, 5). However, this explanation does not seem accurate enough for more than one reason. By 1986, the year the translation in question was published, Enani had already published six translations over the period from 1961 to 1986. In addition, Enani had always been a poet, as readers of his autobiography surely know[5]. More importantly, Enani's first 'all-verse'

translation of a Shakespearean play, which is his translation of *The Merchant of Venice*, was published only two years after the publication of the translation in question.

Perhaps a more plausible explanation has to do with a change in the way Enani viewed his role as a translator, as well as the way he viewed those he was translating for. In the list of his works usually included with his Shakespearean translations, Enani describes his 1986 translation of *Romeo and Juliet* as 'a musical version, prepared for theatrical production'[6]. In 1986, Enani was, therefore, a dramatist-translator whose 'skopos' is to entertain the potential viewers with a play that speaks to them in prose rather than verse. It is true that the play was in Modern Standard Arabic, which is not the 'real' language of everyday life, but, according to Enani, Modern Standard Arabic (or MSA) is the linguistic medium closer in nature to Egyptian Arabic[7], and so is less 'elitist' than verse. In fact, in most of his early translations of Shakespeare's plays Enani had the theatre in mind[8]. By contrast, in later translations, notably those published in the 2000s, he rarely, if ever, mentions theatrical production. We often encounter Enani the 'academic' addressing his target readers—mostly fellow scholars or researchers—using verse, a medium none but a particularly well-educated reader could appreciate. The fact that Enani's early translations did not include endnotes bears witness to the plausibility of this explanation. It goes without saying that endnotes are more associated with books meant to be read by a target reader with scholarly interest. Moreover, in the endnotes, Enani often discusses his renderings in the light of the original, explaining how close they are, and stating his rationale for choosing a certain translation strategy. This strongly suggests that the reader he addresses is not the average reader who may read a play to while away time, but, rather, the reader who would compare the original text to the target text, most probably because s/he studies translation or comparative literature.

Another explanation, which is more or less related to the aforementioned explanation, could have to do with Enani's search for the linguistic medium best suited for theatre. Enani explains that the amalgam of free-verse meters—which he designated as a medium for his translations of Shakespeare starting from *The Merchant of Venice*—aroused the anger of classicists accustomed to traditional prosody where meters are never combined (2003a, 122). Apprehension about reactions from traditionalists may have delayed Enani's decision to adopt combined free-verse meters. In this connection, it may be useful to mention that the shift from prose to verse occurred gradually. In the 1960s, Enani translated *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet* into prose (1964 and 1965 respectively), then attempted his hand at verse without completely doing away with prose in his second translation of *Romeo and Juliet* (1986), then came his all-verse translation of *The Merchant of Venice* (1988), which established Enani's mixture of free-verse meters (mainly Rajaz and Khabab) as his linguistic medium in Shakespeare translations[9].

The year 1991 saw another deviation from the translating verse-as-verse principle, but unlike the aforementioned example, this one was vindicated by Enani

in a way that provides us with insights into the dynamics of the decision making process in which the translator is always involved. When translating *Julius Caesar* (1991), Enani set out with the intention of preserving the poetic meaning of the play by translating it into verse. However, a deeper understanding of the specific nature of the play led him to refrain from using verse. In its introduction (1991, 20-25), he explains how the effect of the play mainly depends on the way Shakespeare himself structures his ideas, and, therefore, subjecting the syntax of the play to the transformations inevitable when translating verse as verse. This would result in a loss which the preservation of the verse form cannot compensate for, hence his decision to produce a prose Arabic version of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. To this argument he adds another that has to do with his personal interpretation of the play, which differs from the common interpretation that contrasts Mark Anthony's demagogic use of verse, in his famous speech after Caesar's assassination, to Brutus's prose appeal to the plebeians' minds. According to Enani's interpretation, Anthony is an honorable man expressing his genuine feelings of sorrow over the demise of a dear friend, not a politician with a populist agenda, and, therefore, should use prose (1991, 27)[10]. Thus, Enani had to re-order his translation priorities in the light of a change in his concept about the best way to achieve the skopos. According to him, the poetic meaning of the play primarily lies in the syntactic, not the artistic, organization of the content. Insisting on verse would impair the effect of such an important speech as Anthony's. Therefore, Enani concluded that prose was better suited for capturing the 'dramatic essence' of the play so that the function of the translation should be equivalent to the function of the original (1991, 21).

Enani also deviates from his theoretical principle of preserving composite Arabic meters for the translation of particularly regular lyrical poems and songs in Shakespeare's plays. Perhaps the most famous example is his rendering of Portia's lines spoken after her lover's triumph in *The Merchant of Venice* (Act III, scene ii), in which Khafif, an Arabic composite meter, is used:

<div dir="rtl">

ما عدا الحب من مشاعرَ ولَّى

ومضى في الهواءِ مثْلَ الهباءِ

من ظنونٍ وبعضِ يأسٍ شَرودٍ

أو كخوفٍ وغيرةٍ حمقاءِ

أيها الحبُّ رحمةً بي ترفَّقْ

لا تُذبْني بسكرةٍ وانتشاءِ

أمطِرْ الفرحَ بين جنبيَّ لكنْ

اقتصد وابتعد عن الغُلَواءِ

يغمرُ النفسَ منكَ فيضُ هناءٍ

وأنا أخشى تخمةَ الامتلاءِ. (١٦٨ ,b٢٠٠٤)

</div>

The speech is 'visually' similar to free verse. However, line lengths do not vary greatly as they do in free verse simply because this is not free verse, but traditional verse in the guise of free verse. Each two lines are in fact hemstitches of one line:

<div dir="rtl">

ما عدا الحب من مشاعر ولى   ومضى في الهواء مثل الهباءِ

</div>

<div dir="rtl">

من ظنونٍ وبعض يأسٍ شرودٍ   أو كخوفٍ وغيرةٍ حمقـــــاءِ

</div>

Though his decision can be justified in the light of the fact that Portia's original speech is more musical than typical Shakespearean dramatic dialogue and—therefore—closer in nature to songs[11], Enani apologetically explains that this deviation from his overall strategy occurred "unwittingly" (2004b, 47). By contrast, Enani's translations of highly regular English lyrical poems are sometimes prosodically freer than the original poems. A case in point is the following translation of a sixteenth-century sonnet by Samuel Daniel[12]:

<div dir="rtl">

أيها النوم الذي يقهر كالسحر الهموم
يا ابن ليل أسود اللون بهيم
يا أخا الموت الذي يولد في صمت الظلام
خفف الأحزان عني وانشر الضوء العميم
عد فأنسى كل كربٍ في دجى الليل الحميم!
وليكن طول النهار كافيا كي أندب الخراب
إذ تحطمت سفينة الشباب في وسط العباب
وليكن في الصحو ما يكفي لتبكي يا عيوني
محنة الصد الذي أذكى شجوني
دون تعذيب الليالي بالظنون!
ولتكفّي يا رؤى الأحلام يا صورة أشواق النهار الغارب
لا تصوغي أي أشواق الغد المأمول صوغ الكاذب
لا تضيفي أي أحزانٍ إلى همّي بزيفك
وليكن في مشرق الشمس غدا تكذيب حيفك
ليت أن النوم يطويني دواما حاضنا سحب الهباء
دون أن أصحو فألقى ما ألاقي من عذاب الازدراء! (٢٠٠٣b, ٨٢)

</div>

Enani's translation captures the regularity of the original sonnet in certain lines, but, generally speaking, it involves much experimentation with the Arabic meter called Ramal. For instance, lines 1, 3, 4 and 5 are traditional Ramal in the guise of free verse (like Khafif in the aforementioned translation of Portia's speech). Line 1, for instance, would be written as follows if it occurred in a traditional Arabic poem:

<div dir="rtl">

أيها النوم الذي يقـ   هرُ كالسحر الهمومَ [13]

</div>

Line 2—as well as the last two lines—consists of three Ramal feet, which makes it a hemstitch of a traditional Ramal line. Line 6 conclusively represents free-verse Ramal since it consists of five Ramal feet, which is not a possibility in traditional Ramal. Line 7 is, similarly, made of five feet, but the fourth foot is actually a modulated Rajaz foot. Combining Rajaz, Ramal, and Hajaz is, as already mentioned, a characteristic feature of Enani's prosodic experimentation.

Conclusion

This paper investigated Enani's translation theory, or rather his theoretical translation principles, as expressed in his books on translation and applied in actual translations. It focused on similarities between Enani's translational approach and Reiss and Vermeer's Functional theories of translation, in which Enani strongly believed. Non-literary translation was discussed, but the main focus of the paper was literary translation, especially the translation of verse—Enani's favourite subject—whether as a translator or a theorist.

The discussion, hopefully, showed that Enani's theoretical principles were generally in line with his belief in Reiss and Vermeer's theories. The strategies Enani suggests in his discussion of non-literary translation, for example, are in line with Reiss's text type theory in that they are meant to guarantee rendering the informative text in forms that conform to the target reader's expectation about the text type and the text variety. Reiss recommends translating informative texts "according to the sense and meaning in order to maintain the invariability of the content" (2000, 167). Enani describes situations where the optimal non-literary translation is not necessarily the most accurate in relation to the source text. This calls to mind the main assumption of Reiss and Vermeer's collaborative theory: "a translational action is a function of its skopos" and not necessarily 'accuracy' (2014, 94). Hence, an inevitable corollary of this assumption is that the internal coherence of a target text often takes precedence over fidelity to the source text (2014, 101-02). The belief that the skopos of the target text defines its nature and relation to the source text in typical translation situations also informs Enani's approach to literary translation. Enani agrees with Reiss that the translator of a literary text needs to identify with the original author in order for him/her to reproduce the expressive function of the text in translation. This entails that the translator be an expert that knows all about his/her field, an idea stressed by Vermeer (2000, 222) and by Enani, who believes that a translator of poetry must be a poet (2000a, 147).

Thus, Enani believes that functional equivalence is not a static relationship between the source text and the target text, but a relationship that can be affected by the passage of time. Reiss (2000, 162) discusses cases where the target language changes to the extent that a certain target text no longer represents the target readers' expectations of what makes a functionally equivalent translation of the source text, which gives rise to the need to retranslate the source text. Enani shares the same opinion; hence, the main motive behind his decision to retranslate Shakespeare was to produce translations which correspond to the idiom of Modern Standard Arabic, and which the contemporary Arab reader can understand and relate to. Enani even goes as far as to say that the change of linguistic—as well as translational—norms makes translators who abided by these norms in the past unfaithful in the eyes of today's target readers (2000a, 181).

As translators are human beings, it is expected that they will occasionally depart from the translation principles which represent their views about translation. The reasons may vary. One reason may have to do with a change in the way the translator

views himself/ herself and his/her target readers (e.g. Enani's theatrical adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet* vs. his verse translation of the same play). Another may be a change in the way a translator sees a certain source text, or even the way he interprets parts (or all of) the source text (e.g. Enani's prose translation of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, originally a verse play). It is worth mentioning here that Reiss' text type theory was criticized for the oversimplification characterizing the assumption that it is the text type that defines the translation method. Munday, for instance, explains that "the translation method employed depends on far more than just text type. The translator's own role and purpose, as well as sociocultural pressures, also affect the kind of translation strategy that is adopted" (2008, 75). In addition to these, an important factor that defines translation approaches and, at the same time, accounts for deviations from them is a principle which Enani admired (Enani, 2003b, 102), namely Jeri Levy's Minimax principle which explains how "the translator resolves for that one of the possible solutions which promises a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort" (2000, 156).

Notes

[1] This translation from *Fann al-Tarjama*, as well as all translations from Arabic, are mine, unless otherwise stated.

[2] Following Enani's introduction to his translation of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, I use the term 'free verse' in a non-technical sense here as the term is actually a misnomer (2004b, 47). Free verse is not really free, but is freer than traditional Arabic verse as far as meters are concerned. It employs the types of feet on which the pure meters of traditional Arabic poetry are based, but, unlike traditional poetry, does not put restrictions on the number of times a foot can be repeated in a poetry line, hence the varying lengths of the lines of a 'free-verse' poem. A pure meter, whether traditional or free-verse, is pure because it uses just one type of foot. The Ramal foot, for instance, is فاعلاتن; the Rajaz foot is مستفعلن, etc. Composite meters are combinations of two (or more) types of feet. Taweel, for instance, is a composite meter that depends on two types of feet فعولن and مفاعيلن. A typical (i.e. unmodulated) Taweel line repeats the pattern فعولن مفاعيلن four times as follows:

فعولن مفاعيلن فعولن مفاعيلن   فعولن مفاعيلن فعولن مفاعيلن

[3] An example from Enani's translation of *King Lear* (Act II, scene ii) would hopefully help clarify this point:

إني لأعرف هذه الأوغادَ حقَّ المعرفةْ

فهم يخفون في القولِ الصريح من مكر الطوية أو فسادِ القصدِ

ما يربو على عشرين تابعا ذَليلا ساذجا (Enani 1997)

The first line (consisting of four feet) basically depends on the Rajaz foot (with only one insignificant modulation in the second foot that changes it into a Kamil foot). The second line (a run-on line consisting of six feet) starts with two Hajaz feet, followed by a modulated Rajaz foot, then three 'intact' Rajaz feet, the third of which ends with the first word of the third line. This move from Rajaz and back to it is barely noticed by the reader (or the hearer) unless trained in Arabic prosody, as the three meters are harmonious by nature.

[4] Enani translated Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* three times. His first translation was a prose translation which he published in 1965. The second translation, discussed here, was published in 1986. The third was a verse translation (1996).

[5] See Enani's autobiography, *Wahat al-'omr* [Oases of my Life] (1998), where he describes his first encounter with poetry as a child.

[6] See, for instance, the list of Enani's published works at the end of his translation of *Hamlet* (2004a, 496).

[7] See, for example, his introduction to *The Merchant of Venice* (2004b, 23-31) where he explains that he chose Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) as a linguistic medium for his translation because it is the linguistic level most influenced by Egyptian Arabic (his term for Egypt's local vernacular), and therefore more suited for dramatic dialogue than classical Arabic, which would alienate the audiences from the characters on the stage (and in the book). According to Enani, a dramatist writing a dialogue in MSA "often discovers that s/he is actually 'translating' Egyptian-Arabic dialogue into MSA" (25).

[8] This also applies to *The Merchant of Venice*, his first verse translation 'proper' of Shakespeare. In the introduction to this translation, he takes great pains to justify his use of verse as a medium for a translation written for the theatre, explaining that the two meters he uses are "the closest in nature to the rhythms of prose" so that the dramatic dialogue should not sound too musical. (2004b, 47).

[9] Enani actually did not use verse indiscriminately in his translations of Shakespeare, but sought functional equivalence by translating verse as verse, and translating the prose parts of the original plays as MSA prose.

[10] It is amusingly interesting that in the introduction of *Julius Caesar* Enani translates Anthony's speech into verse, lest, he says, the reader should think "that I was too lazy to translate the play in verse" (1991, 26).

[11] Here is the Portia's original speech, which is obviously closer in form to songs, yet functions as part of the dramatic dialogue (though, of course, it is less musical than Enani's translation):

> How all the other passions fleet to air,
> As doubtful thoughts and rash embraced despair,
> And shudd'ring fear, and green-eyed jealousy!
> O love, be moderate, allay thy ecstasy,
> In measure rain thy joy, scant this excess!
> I feel too much thy blessing. Make it less
> For fear I surfeit.

[12] Here is Samuel Daniel's sonnet:

> Care-charmer Sleep, son of the sable Night,
> Brother to Death, in silent darkness born:
> Relieve my languish, and restore the light,
> With dark forgetting of my cares, return;
> And let the day be time enough to mourn
> The shipwreck of my ill-adventur'd youth:
> Let waking eyes suffice to wail their scorn,
> Without the torment of the night's untruth.
> Cease dreams, th' imagery of our day-desires,
> To model forth the passions of the morrow;
> Never let rising sun approve you liars,
> To add more grief to aggravate my sorrow.
> Still let me sleep, embracing clouds in vain;
> And never wake to feel the day's disdain. (qtd. in 2003b, 80)

[13] Traditional Ramal results from the repetition of فاعلاتن, the Ramal foot, for six times, so that each hemstitch of a line should consist of three feet , as follows:

فاعلاتن فاعلاتن فاعلاتن   فاعلاتن فاعلاتن فاعلاتن

The six feet are reduced to four in Majzou' al-Ramal, as follows:

فاعلاتن فاعلاتن   فاعلاتن فاعلاتن

In the lines in question, Enani uses Majzou' al-Ramal, but visually represents it as if it were free-verse Ramal, as follows:

فاعلاتن فاعلاتن فاعلاتن فاعلاتن

References

Enani, Mohammed. 1998. *Wahat al-'omr* [Oases of my Life]. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization.

---. 2000a. *Fan al-Tarjamah* [The Art of Translation]. 5th edition. Gizah: Longman.

---. 2000b. *On Translating Arabic: A Cultural Approach*. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization.

---. 2003a. *Al-Tarjama al-Adabya bayn al-Nazaryya wal-Tatbiq* [Literary Translation between Theory and Practice]. 2nd edition. Gizah: Longman.

---. 2003b. *Nazaryyat al-Tarjama al-Haditha: Madhkal li- Dirasāt al-Tarjama.* [Modern Theory of Translation: An Introduction to Translation Studies]. Gizah: Longman.

---. 2005. *Murshid al-Mutarjim* [The Translator's Guide]. 3rd edition. Gizah: Longman.

Levy, Jeri. 2000. "Translation as a Decision Process." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, 148- 59. London and New York: Routledge.

Nida, Eugene. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translating.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Munday, Jeremy. 2008. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. New York: Routledge.

Reiss, Katharina. 2000. "Type, Kind and Individuality of Text." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, 160-171. London and New York: Routledge.

Reiss, Katharina, and Hans Vermeer. 2014. *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained.* Translated by Christiane Nord. London and New York: Routledge.

Shakespeare, William. 1925. *Shakespeare's Comedy of A Midsummer-Night's Dream.* Edited by Evelyn Smith. London, Edinburgh, and New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd.

-----. 1964. *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* Translated by Mohammed Enani. n.p.

-----. 1986. *Romeo and Juliet*. Translated by Mohammed Enani. Cairo: Dar Ghareeb.

-----. 1991. *Julius Caesar.* Translated by Mohammed Enani. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization.

-----. 1997. *King Lear*. Translated by Mohammed Enani. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization.

-----. 2004a. *Hamlet*. Translated by Mohammed Enani. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization.

-----. 2004b. *The Merchant of Venice*. Translated by Mohammed Enani. 2nd edition. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization.

Vermeer, Hans. 2000. "Skopos and Commission in Translation Action." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, 221-232 . London and New York: Routledge.