# Translation as Image-Making: A Case of Mahfouz in English

A THESIS IN TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING (ARABIC/ENGLISH)

Master of Arts in Translation and Interpreting (English/Arabic/English) (MATI)

Presented to the Faculty of the American University of Sharjah
School of Arts and Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

by

DANYA MADANI
B.A. 2003

Sharjah, UAE
November 2009

AN ABSTRACT IN AN AMERICAN

UNIVERSITY OF SHARJAH THESIS:


Translation As Image-Making: A Case of Mahfouz in English

Danya Madani, Candidate for the Master of Arts Degree


American University of Sharjah, 2009


## ABSTRACT

Dialect refers to a regional or social variety of language distinguished by pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary. It is well known that in literature, particularly in novels during dialogue, writers often use different forms of colloquialisms and other dialectal variations in addition to standard dialect. However, translators do not always preserve the use of a certain dialect and, for a variety of reasons, choose to translate dialect into standard language only, paying no special attention to code switching or colloquialism. This can be the result of incompetence, or it can, more perniciously, be for more profound reasons (e.g., ideology or image-making). The purpose of this thesis is to examine and analyze how the translators of Naguib Mahfouz's novels into English handle register and dialect. This thesis will assess whether the pragmatic force of the dialect is jettisoned or preserved through translation. It will also discuss cases in which dialect is only modified, and how Mahfouz's translators systematically change the level of language used and generally upgrade the substandard nature of the dialectal use in his novels, ridding them of any popular fiction traits. To look into this further, this paper will consider examples from Naguib Mahfouz's novel *The Harafish* and its translation to see how the issue of dialectal translation is handled. The thesis concludes that, in this particular case, the translator's decision not to preserve colloquial

speech and expression is motivated, in that the source text's use of dialect when preserved in English lowers the tone and reveals the popular fiction characteristics which the translator seems determined to hide.

## Transliteration Table

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| فتحة+أ | a | about | | ن | n | nurse | |
| آ | a | cat | | و | oo | pool | |
| ع | AA | say "a" twice distinctly with an open mouth | | أ | o | on | |
| ب | b | box | | ق | q | queen ("k" sound made in back of throat) | |
| د | d | door | | ر | r | rabbit (Rolled "r" sound, similar to Spanish "r") | |
| ض | d | heavy "d" sound (Open jaw but keep lips slightly round i.e: duh) | | ش | sh | ship | |
| ي | ee | feet | | س | s | sea | |
| ف | f | fish | | ص | s | heavy "s" sound (Open jaw but keep lips slightly round) | |
| غ | gh | the sound you make when gargling (Touch very back of tongue to very back of mouth) | | ت | t | tan | |
| ه | h | hat | | ط | t | heavy "t" sound (Open jaw but keep lips slightly round) | |
| ح | h | heavy "h" sound (Drop back of tongue to open back of throat, then force air out for "h") | | ث | th | think | |
| كسرة+إ | i | ink | | ذ | th | the | |
| ج | j | jar | | ظ | th | "th" sound as in "the", but heavier (Open jaw but keep lips slightly round) | |
| إك | k | kit | | ضمة | u | put | |
| خ | kh | gravely "h" sound (Touch back of tongue to roof of mouth and force air out) | | و | w | water | |
| ل | l | look | | ؤ+ع | / | pronounce the letter before but cut it short by stopping suddenly | |
| م | m | man | | ي | y | yarn | |
| **Bold** letters are silent i.e w: write | | | | ز | z | zebra | |
| | | | | (-) is to make some words easier to read | | | |

<div align="center">Contents</div>

# Acknowledgements

together. I want you both to know that you make life easier and much more fun. Words cannot describe what you mean to me. My life is a better place because of you. I love you.

In the end, to anyone who has stood by me during all this, I say thank you very much.

# Chapter 1: Introduction

The flower girl [picking up her scattered flowers and replacing them in the basket], "Theres menners f' yer! Te-oo banches ovoylets trod into the mad…."

بائعة الزهور: (تلتقط زهورها المتناثرة و تعيدها إلى السلة) يا لهذا السلوك! تتمرغ باقتان من البنفسج في الوحل....

Considering the above translated example from Bernard Shaw's play *Pygmalion* and when faced with what is believed to be a dialect, how should the translator act?

Dialects can be difficult to define, and not just because of linguistic reasons. There can also be cultural, political, and historical reasons for why some people prefer to believe that their language is very different from another. In literature, many problems arise when one is faced with the dilemma of translating dialect and colloquial language. Sometimes there is no possible way to express dialect in the target language, or the written language may have a strict style that does not correspond to the spoken, thus does not allow for the expression of dialect. Translators are put in a position where they must make a decision about how to deal with the colloquialism presented in the literary text. Very often, as in the example presented above, and even if it is possible to do so and if the use of dialect in the source text is very functional, translators resort to the easiest choice of simply ignoring dialect and rendering it into standard or classical language, the reason behind that often being that it is difficult to find a proper equivalent dialect in the target language. Most likely, translators choose not to render colloquialism and dialect into the target language when they are not there to serve a specific function. However, even if the dialect in the source text is A functional, the translator should transfer it into the target text and in order not to lose the local color of the text which can lead to a different type of language used in the target text than that used in the source text causing an upgrade in language and, consequently, a change in genre. It is important here to point out

the difference between the terms "Colloquialism" and "Dialect" which are used interchangeably in this thesis. Colloquialism can be defined as: the use of informal expressions appropriate to everyday speech rather than to the formality of writing, and differing in pronunciation, vocabulary, or grammar. Colloquialisms or colloquial language is considered to be characteristic of or only appropriate for casual, ordinary, familiar, or informal conversation rather than formal speech or writing. Dialect on the other hand is defined as: a distinctive variety of a language, spoken by members of an identifiable regional group, nation, or social class. Dialects differ from one another in pronunciation, vocabulary, and (often) in grammar. Traditionally they have been regarded as variations from a 'standard' educated form of the language, but modern linguists point out that standard forms are themselves dialects which have come to predominate for social and political reasons. Thus we can say that the term "colloquialism" is considered to be general while "dialect" is more specific.

To look further into this issue, examples from Naguib Mahfouz's novel *The Harafish* are extracted, examined and analyzed in order to illustrate how the translators upgraded the language when translating dialectal phrases, thereby turning colloquial speech into standard language. After assessment, alternative translations are suggested in which the language used is on the same level as the language used in the source text. The English version of The Harafish here is translated by Catherine Cobham.

The main problem then is maintaining the same level of language in both the source and target text when translating literature. When reading Naguib Mahfouz's novels, one immediately identifies a certain and unique style of writing and of handling language. Mahfouz skillfully blends Standard Arabic with colloquial dialect, using the latter mostly in

dialogue where it emits a sense of a language that can be described as inferior to Standard Arabic and that is often used in association with a group of people belonging to a lower or more inferior social class. His style of writing puts his novels under the category of popular fiction. Being a fan of Naguib Mahfouz novels, this writer was curious as to how his novels are presented to Western cultures, which led to reading some of the translations of his books. What is interesting is the difference in the type of language used in the dialogue. Whereas the Arabic novels show a mixture of standard and colloquial dialects, the English dialogues present the reader with a higher and more polished type of language which does not translate the same feeling the Arabic text gives to the reader and leads to the portrayal of a different genre that is closer to serious literature than it is to popular fiction.

As will be seen in chapter two of their book *Discourse and the Translator*, Hatim and Mason (1990) distinguish among five types of dialect, one of which is social dialect (also known as class dialect or sociolect). Social dialect entails that each social class in a society has a special dialect specific to it. For example, the upper class in a society tends to use different vocabulary than that which the lower classes in a society use; educated members of a society tend to speak in a more polished manner than the uneducated. In translation, the translator should not lose the social implications portrayed through the type of language used in dialogue; that is, the dialogue should represent the same approximate social, economic and educational class. For example, an upper class dialect in the source text should be translated into an upper class dialect in the target text. In Naguib Mahfouz's novels, specifically in *The Harafish*, the language and vocabulary used in his dialogues suit the social class and educational level of the characters using the language, thus portraying a certain image and social background. When characters with a poor educational background use language, they

tend to use vocabulary that would sometimes be considered inappropriate to people with a higher social or educational ranking. Looking at the translation of *The Harafish,* one finds that the dialogue in the English version does not preserve the colloquial level of language and instead upgrades it into a more elevated form of language; thus, social dialect is not preserved in translation. For example, the Arabic phrase أنا جدع يا بنت الجدع in The Harafish is translated as "I'm a man, my beauty". The Arabic phrase is an Egyptian dialect. The word جدع as we is a colloquial Egyptian word pertaining to Egyptian culture and the vocabulary and language in this example are part of everyday conversational language and are rarely, if ever, used when speaking proper Arabic by speakers of high class society. In other words, this sentence is a clear example of language as dialect. If we look at how the translator chooses to render this sentence, we can immediately observe that the dialect is not preserved in the translation. 'I'm man, my beauty' does not preserve the tone of the Arabic sentence nor does it communicate the same feeling and effect. To preserve the tone and dialect, the translator could have translated in into a dialect of English, resorted to a systematically violated Standard English or used pure English slang.  But obviously the translator's intention is using a higher level of language different from what Mahfouz uses in the Arabic source text. On the other hand, if we look at an example such as ابن الكلب قال p.34 from Mahfouz's novel "Sugar Street" which is translated as "The son of a bitch said" p.27 we can clearly observe the difference. Here, the translation preserves the tone, color, and level of language when transferring it into English, thus conveying the feeling and effect of the source text.

In light of what is stated above, the aim of this thesis is to show that sometimes the choice of ignoring the dialect in the source text and substituting it with standard generalized language in the target text is deliberate, in other words motivated by incompetence or more

profound reasons, such as ideology and image-making. This thesis mainly sheds light on the translation of Naguib Mahfouz novels and argues that translators of Mahfouz choose to change the level of language, specifically to upgrade the language in translation in order to satisfy the target audience's taste, thus changing the genre of the novel from one with the characteristics of popular fiction to one reflecting serious literature.

The first chapter of this thesis, "The Introduction," introduces the topic and presents a brief summary about each chapter. Chapter Two sheds light on theories of translation studies from Jakobson to Venuti. It presents the notion of equivalence starting with Jakobson's theory that there is normally no one-to-one correspondence between code units of two different languages, and that languages differ in what they *must* convey and not what they *may* convey. Chapter Two then moves on to Catford, distinguishing between formal correspondence and textual equivalence in addition to defining shifts and proposing two types of shifts: level shifts and category shifts. After that comes Nida and his theory of formal and dynamic equivalence and from there it paves the way for Koller's equivalence theory and Newmark and his theory of semantic and communicative translation. It also covers language variation from the point of view of Hatim and Mason. Finally, this chapter concludes with Venuti and his theory of the translator's invisibility, in addition to his theory of domestication vs. foreignization.

Chapter Three starts by discussing the role of literary translation from different points of view and demonstrates that studies regarding this topic are of limited scope and provide evidence of how translation affects literature. It then moves on to talk briefly about translating Arabic literature and the stages it went through until it became what it is today. Furthermore, in this category, this thesis specifically talks about Naguib Mahfouz, his history and background, and the important role he played in contributing to the rise of the Arabic novel.

This part also provides a brief account of the development of the Arabic novel. Finally, this chapter discusses the fact that Mahfouz received the Nobel Prize in Literature and some of the attitudes and controversies surrounding this issue.

Chapter Four defines the concept of dialect and provides a number of definitions from a variety of sources. This section also briefly goes through the theories some of the scholars have on dialect. Furthermore, this chapter defines register according to theories of a number of different scholars in translation studies. After that, the notion of genre is explained, that is, it is defined and presented through the theories of different scholars and writers. Finally and most importantly, this chapter defines, explains, and compares between popular fiction and serious literature.

Chapter Five begins by presenting the methodology which this thesis follows in analyzing its data. After that it presents fifteen examples from Naguib Mahfouz's novel *The Harafish* along with their English translations. Those examples are assessed and analyzed after which an alternative translation is suggested and the reasons behind choosing the alternative translation are provided. Finally, this chapter concludes that the Arabic language Mahfouz uses in his novels is simple and has a tendency to veer toward colloquial language and slang while the English that the translator uses is very well composed and reveals a language that is more sophisticated, polished, and intellectual in style, grammar, and vocabulary. This chapter also reaches the conclusion that the translator's choice to upgrade the language is deliberate and highly motivated.

In the final chapter, "The Conclusion," the thesis reasserts the fact that in some cases translators choose to use a different kind of language than that employed in the original text. To sum it up, this thesis demonstrates the tendency of translators of Naguib Mahfouz to

deliberately elevate the language in their translation, thus using high Standard English instead

of simple standard or colloquial language as in the Arabic text.

**Chapter Two: Translation studies From Jakobson to Venuti**

Translation is one of the oldest linguistic activities known to man and it is impossible to trace its very beginnings. It is said that necessity is the mother of invention, and one of the most inherent needs of human beings is the need to communicate, and that makes translation a very essential part of life.

In this chapter, a theoretical background to translation studies is provided with a brief summary of the most relevant theories in the field. It starts with Roman Jakobson's equivalence and effect theory and ends with Lawrence Venuti and the cultural turn in translation.

## 2.1 Jakobson: Equivalence and Effect

In his paper "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation," Russian-Born American Structuralist Jakobson (1995) identifies three kinds of translation:

- Intralingual Translation which involves translation within the same language. It is "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language."

- Interlingual Translation which involves translation of two different languages, from one language to another. It is "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language."

- Intersemiotic Translation: It is "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems" (Jakobson 1995, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.139).

On these three types of translation, Jakobson (1995) says, "We distinguish three ways of interpreting a verbal sign: It may be translated into other signs of the same language, into

another language, or into another, nonverbal system of symbols" (Jakobson 1995, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.139).

Furthermore, Jakobson (1995) argues that on the level of interlingual translation, there is normally no full equivalence between code-units. He goes on to say that interlingual translation involves substituting messages in one language for entire messages in another language and not for separate code-units. "Thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes" (Jakobson 1995, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.139). Jakobson (1995) also contends that in order to achieve equivalence between the source text (ST) and the target text (TT), the code-units will differ since they belong to two separate languages which "partition reality differently." As an example of this, he refers to the word cheese which is not exactly equivalent to the Russian word *syr* because the Russian word does not include cottage cheese, which would be explained by the Russian word *tvarok* and not *syr* (Jakobson 1995, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.36).

Jakobson (1995) explains, "Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics" and that

> No linguistic specimen may be interpreted by the science of language without a translation of its signs into other signs of the same system or into signs of another system. Any comparison of two languages implies an examination of their mutual translatability (Jakobson, 1995, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.139).

Continuing, Jakobson (1995) states that cognitive experience and all its classification may be conveyed in any language. In the case of deficiency, terminology improved by using loan-words or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocutions. He

further contends that "languages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey" (Jakobson 1995, as cited in Venuti, 2000, pp. 140-141).

However, when it comes to poetry, Jakobson (1995) says that it is untranslatable because in poetry, "verbal equations become a constructive principle of the text" and "any constituents of the verbal code are confronted, juxtaposed, brought into contiguous relation according to the principle of similarity and contrast and carry their own autonomous signification" (Jakobson 1995, as cited in Venuti, 2000, pp. 142-143).

## 2.2 Catford: Translation Shifts

In his *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Catford (1965) coins the term Translation Shifts to which he devotes a whole chapter (Catford 1965, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.60) He (1965) distinguishes between formal correspondence and textual equivalence, which he defines below.

- Formal Correspondence: "Any category (unit, class, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the 'same' place in the 'economy' of the TL [translation language] as the given SL [source language] category occupies in the SL" (Catford 1965, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.60). With this in mind, formal correspondence can be applied to translation between English and Arabic, as in the relationship between parts of speech in the two languages that have more or less the same pattern, i.e., verb by verb, adjective by adjective, noun by noun, etc.

- Textual Equivalence: "Any TL text or portion of text which is observed on a particular occasion . . . to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text" (Catford 1965, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.60).

Based on the previous definitions, it can be said that while formal equivalence is a general system-based concept between a pair of languages, textual equivalence is tied to a particular source text (ST) – target text (TT) pair. When these two concepts part, it means that a translation shift has occurred (Munday, 2001, p.60). Furthermore, in his paper "Translation Shifts," Catford (1965) defines shifts as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL [source language] to the TL [target language] (Catford 1965, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.141). He goes on to propose two kinds of shifts: (1) Level Shifts and (2) Category Shifts.

1. Level Shift: It occurs when a SL language item at a certain linguistic level has a TL equivalent at a different linguistic level, i.e., it is expressed grammatically in the source language and lexically in the target language (Hatim, 2001, p.15).

2. Category Shift: It is divided into four kinds:

   - A-Structural Shifts: They are considered to be the most common kind of shift, and they mostly involve a shift in grammatical structure. For example, the English noun phrase "Sammy studies at 5 o'clock everyday" becomes a verb phrase in Arabic يدرس سامي في الساعة الخامسة يوميا

   - B-Class Shifts: These include shifts from one part of speech to another. An example would be "Medical Student" in English becomes طالب في الطب in Arabic.

   - C-Unit Shifts: These include shifts where the TL equivalent occupies a different rank than that of the SL. Rank refers to the hierarchical linguistic units of sentence, clause, group, word and morpheme, e.g., the English definite article is translated in Russian by a change in word order.

- D-Intra-system Shifts: These shifts occur when the SL and TL have nearly corresponding systems but where "the translation involves selection of a non-corresponding term in the TL system." For example, the word information, which has a singular form, becomes معلومات which has a plural form in Arabic (Munday, 2001, p.61).

It is important to mention that level and category shifts are not mutually exclusive. "A translation through level shift could, on a different occasion or by a different translator, be achieved through category shift" (Hatim, 2001, p.16).

Although Catford's (1965) theory has proved to be useful in many ways, Catford (1965) has been the target of a great deal of criticism. It has been said that all of his examples are contextualized, invented, that is, not taken from actual translations. In addition, he never goes beyond sentence level to look at the whole text. He believes that translation equivalence can almost always be established at sentence level because the sentence is the linguistic unit most directly related to a speech action in a situation. (Catford 1965, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.62).

In relating Catford's theory to the translation of literature, it can safely be said that preserving the effect that the source text has on its reader, transferring it onto the target reader, then transferring the source literary text's cultural values and equivalent meaning is not possible without accurately dealing with the linguistic side of translation first. Additionally, in literary translation, Catford's shifts help the translator transfer the concepts, ideas, and meanings of the source text in an accurate and defined way, thus, enabling the target reader to receive the message in the same way the source text reader had received it. Finally, Catford's

formal equivalence and translation shifts play an essential role in literary translation because they affect the style of the whole literary text and not only the grammar and lexis.

## 2.3 Nida: Formal vs. Dynamic Equivalence

Nida, one of the most prominent names in translation studies, developed his equivalence theory through his own work translating the Bible from the 1940s onwards. Nida (1964) divides meaning into linguistic, referential, and emotive meaning (Munday, 2001, p. 37-38).

In his paper, "Principles of Correspondence." Nida (1964) stresses that it is impossible for two languages to be identical; thus, there can be no full correspondence between languages and no fully exact translation (Nida 1964, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.153). He then goes on to distinguish between two types of equivalence:

- Formal Equivalence focuses on the message itself, on both its form and its context. It is concerned with the fact that the message in the target language should match the message in the source language as closely as possible. Nida (1964) says, "This means, for example, that the message in the receptor culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness." This type of translation might be called a gloss translation in which the translator tries as literally as possible to imitate the original in both form and content (Nida 1964, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.156).

On Nida's formal equivalence, Munday says, "Formal equivalence is thus keenly oriented towards the ST structure, which exerts strong influence in determining accuracy and

correctness. Most typical of this kind of translation are 'gloss translations'" (Munday, 2001, p.41).

- Dynamic Equivalence is concerned with the fact that the relationship between the target reader and the message should be the same as the original relationship which existed between the original reader and message. Nida (1964) explains that dynamic equivalence "aims at complete naturalness of expression" (Nida 1964, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.156).

Nida (1964) suggests that one way to define dynamic equivalence translation is to describe it as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message." He goes on to explain that this definition includes three important terms: (1) equivalent: meaning the source-language message; (2) natural: the target language; (3) closest: "which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation" (Nida 1964, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p.163).

Furthermore, according to Nida (1964), the success of a certain translation depends on four basic requirements:

1. Making sense.
2. Conveying the spirit and manner of the original.
3. Having a natural form of expression.
4. Producing a similar response (Munday, 2001, p.42).

Finally, Nida has taken translators away from word-for-word or literal equivalence. His formal and dynamic equivalence theories have played a big role in introducing a reader-based orientation to translation theory. However, his theory has been criticized by many, one of whom is Gentzler who is considered to be Nida's strongest critic. Gentzler degrades Nida's

work for its "theological and proselytizing standpoint" that dynamic equivalence serves the purpose of converting the target readers to the "dominant discourse and ideas of Protestant Christianity." Also, some religious groups criticize Nida for tampering with the word GOD, a word that is sacred. Therefore the changes made to it in order to achieve dynamic equivalence are considered sacrilegious (Munday, 2001, pp. 42-43).

When applying dynamic equivalence to the translation of literary texts, such as novels in our case, we find that the text becomes more target reader – friendly and easier to perceive more naturally by the target audience. In other words, dynamic equivalence brings the text closer the target audience. It also teaches the translator to deal with different cultures in order to facilitate the transfer of the intended message to the target audience and to ensure that the text has the same effect on the target reader as it had on the source text reader.

## 2.4 Koller: Equivalence

The German scholar Werner Koller (1979) has done important work on equivalence and examines this concept more closely through his paper "Research into the Science of Translation." He (1979) opposes many other scholars when he says that there is a problem of equivalence within the sphere of parole, which refers to the level of language use, and not langue, which refers to the linguistic system. He also differentiates between correspondence and equivalence. (Koller 1979, as cited in Munday, 2001, p. 46-47).

Koller (1979) describes correspondence as belonging to the field of contrastive linguistics which compares two languages and shows the differences and similarities between them in a contrastive manner. Equivalence, on the other hand, concerns equivalent items in specific source and target text pairs and contexts. A significant matter that Koller (1979)

points out is the fact that even though having knowledge of correspondence shows competence in the foreign language, it is knowledge of equivalence that shows competence in translation. "However, the question still remains as to what exactly has to be equivalent" (Koller 1979, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.47).

Furthermore, Koller (1979) describes five types of equivalence:

1. Denotative Equivalence (content invariance): it occurs when the lexis in the source language and the lexis in target language refer to the same meaning. It is related to equivalence of the extra-linguistic content of a text. For example flower in English is *warda* in Arabic.

2. Connotative Equivalence (stylistic equivalence): concerns lexical choices, especially between near-synonyms. For example, the afterlife could refer to *Al-dar al Akhira* in Arabic.

3. Text-normative Equivalence: related to text types, with different kinds of texts behaving in different ways.

4. Pragmatic Equivalence (communicative equivalence): this type of equivalence is oriented toward the receiver of the text or message. It is when the source language and target language have the same effect on the reader, and it refers to Nida's Dynamic Equivalence.

5. Formal Equivalence (expressive equivalence): related to the form of the text, including word plays and the individual stylistic features of the ST. It is usually used in translating songs and poems (Koller 1979, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.47).

Moreover, Koller (1979) points out how the above can aid the translator and what the role of translation theory is.

With every text as a whole, and also with every segment of text, the translator who consciously makes such a choice must set up a hierarchy of values to be preserved in translation; from this he can derive a hierarchy of equivalence requirements for the text or segment in question. This in turn must be preceded by a translationally relevant text analysis. It is an urgent task of translation theory – and one on which no more than some preliminary work has so far been done – to develop a methodology and conceptual apparatus for this kind of text analysis, and to bring together and systemize such analyzes in terms of translationally relevant typologies of textual features (Koller 1979, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.48).

Applying Koller's types of equivalence to literary translation helps and positively affects the stylistic side of the text. Adhering to his equivalence types also pushes a translator toward handling the literary text more systematically; that is because it makes them consider not only language features, but also the stylistic, artistic, and pragmatic features. In translating literary texts, novels in particular, it aids the translator in choosing what to preserve and what type of equivalence to apply in each situation. Koller's (1979) connotative equivalence, for example, in relation to this research, in the translation of the Arabic novels of Naguib Mahfouz into English, could be useful in translating dialects and colloquial language.

## 2.5 Newmark: Semantic vs. Communicative Translation

Newmark, a renowned British scholar, argues that equivalent effect is the result, rather than the aim of any translation, keeping in mind that it is an unlikely result in two cases: (a) if the purpose of the SL text is to affect and the TL translation is to inform (or vice versa); (b) if there is a distinct cultural gap between the SL and the TL text (Newmark, 1988, p.48).

Newmark replaces Nida's terms of formal and dynamic equivalence with the terms semantic and communicative translations. On that he says:

Communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original (Newmark 1981, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.44).

The way Newmark (1981) describes communicative translation makes it similar to Nida's dynamic equivalence in that it is concerned with the effect the TT should have on its readers. Semantic translation on the other hand is similar to Nida's formal equivalence because it adheres as much as possible to the SL's syntactic and semantic structures (Newmark 1981, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.44).

Moreover, according to Newmark (1981), literal translation is considered to be the best approach when it comes to translation. He says, "In communicative as in semantic translation, provided that equivalent effect is secured, the literal word-for-word translation is not only the best, it is the only valid method of translation" (Newmark 1981, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.44).

However, Munday points out that Newmark has been criticized for his "strong prescriptivism," and the language he uses in his evaluations is obviously affected by what he himself calls the pre-linguistic era of translation studies; that is, translations are smooth or awkward, while translation itself is an art (if semantic) or a craft (if communicative) (Munday, 2001, p.46).

In relation to this research, Newmark's theory of translation is considered to be significant since it seeks to deliver the same effect for the target reader that the source text had on its reader, and to convey the exact same feeling to the target audience as well as achieve the exact contextual meaning of the original via semantic translation, and that is what this thesis calls for.

## 2.6 Hatim and Mason: Language Variation

Discourse analysis became prominent in translation studies in the 1990s. Many theorists, including Hatim and Mason (1990), were influenced by Halliday's systemic functional model. In their book *Discourse and the Translator,* these researchers approach the problem of variation in language use from several different dimensions: the medium by which language is transmitted, formal patterning, and situational significance (Hatim and Mason 1990, p.38-39).

Hatim and Mason (1990) go on to recognize two dimensions in the framework recommended by Halliday, McIntosh, and Stevens for the description of language variation:

1. User-Related Variation has to do with the user of a language, with who or what the user is. Language varies in different ways depending on the user. "These user-related varieties are called *dialects."* Hatim and Mason identify five types of dialect: (a) Geographical Dialect: when language varies according to geographical differences. (b) Temporal Dialect: how languages change from one generation to another. (c) Social Dialect: "social dialects emerge in response to social stratification within a speech community." (d) Standard Dialect: here, "the range of intelligibility is defined in terms of the distinction between standard and non-

2. Use-Related Variation: The user-use framework, developed by Halliday and others, indicates that the term used for the kind of variety which is distinguished according to use is *register*, which means the relationship between a given situation and the language used in that situation. According to Hatim and Mason, register can be defined in terms of differences in grammar, vocabulary, etc., between two language activities. Furthermore they distinguish among three aspects of register: (a) Field of Discourse: language use which reflects the social function of the text. (b) Mode of Discourse: the manifestation of the nature of the language code being used. (c) Tenor of Discourse: the relationship between the speaker and the listener, writer and reader. These three aspects of register are interdependent (Hatim and Mason, 1990, pp. 45-51).

In relation to translating dialect, Hatim and Mason (1990) say,

Rendering ST dialect by TL standard has the disadvantage of losing the special effect intended in the ST, while rendering dialect by dialect runs the risk of creating unintended effects. At a more general level, sensitivity to the various accents and lexico-grammatical features of different geographical dialects is the hallmark of the competent interpreter at international conferences (Hatim and Mason, 1990, p.41).

However, Munday criticizes Hatim and Mason's approach saying that even though they propose basics for a model of analyzing text, they discuss a large number of concepts which makes it unclear whether their approach constitutes an applicable model. Munday goes on to say that even though Hatim and Mason analyze different spoken and written text types, their focus often remains linguistic both in terminology and in the phenomena investigated (2001, p. 101).

## 2.7 Venuti: Domestication and Foreignization

In his book, *The Translator's Invisibility*, Venuti (1995) introduces the term invisibility to portray the translator's situation and activity in current Anglo-American culture. He further explains that invisibility refers to two "mutually determining phenomena": (a) the effect of how the translator handles English; (b) the practice of reading and evaluating translations (1995, p.1).

Furthermore, Venuti (1995) explains that a translated text of any genre is considered acceptable when it is read fluently and is transparent thus reflecting the foreign writer's personality and intention. In other words, when the translation reads like the original instead of merely a translation of it. Venuti (1995) says, "The more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator and presumably, the more visible the writer or meaning of the foreign text" (1995, p.1-2).

Along with invisibility, Venuti (1995) discusses two types of translation strategies: domestication and foreignization. These two strategies deal with the choice of which text to translate along with the way to translate it (Munday, 2001, p.146). The two terms can be traced back to German theologian and philosopher Schleiermacher who argues that "there are

only two. Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him" (Venuti, 1995, p.20).

Domestication: According to Venuti (1995), domestication dominates Anglo-American translation culture. It involves "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values." This strategy of translation promotes transparency, fluency and invisibility when translating in order to reduce the foreignness of the target-text. It is also selective about the texts to translate, always choosing texts at are likely to lend themselves to such a strategy, thus, following domestic literary standards (Venuti 1995, as cited in Munday, 2001, pp.146-147).

About domestication Hatim says,

Within cultural studies, a domesticating translation is heavily criticized for the exclusionary impact it can have on source culture values. Stereotypes of national identities are invariably constructed and particular perceptions are formed as a result. Furthermore, it is through such a translation that literary canons in the target language are usually maintained and more prestigious poetic forms or narrative structures are ensured a place at the expense of weaker discourses. In the process, translation strategies which are more resistant to cultural hegemony are eliminated, closing off any thinking about cultural, literary or ideological alternatives (Hatim, 2001, p.46).

Foreignization: It involves choosing a foreign text and translating it in a way that does not adhere to the dominant cultural values of the target-language. Venuti (1995) says that the foreignizing method "sends the reader abroad" by putting pressure on the target-language's values to acknowledge the linguistic and cultural differences that the foreign text presents.

Venuti (1995) goes on to explain that foreignizing, which he also calls resistancy, has the ability to restrain the violently domesticating English-language cultural values. He describes this translation strategy as being non-fluent, making the translator's presence visible by bringing out the foreign identity of the source-text and protecting it from the dominance of the target culture (Venuti 1995, as cited in Munday, 2001, p.147).

However, even though Venuti (1995) encourages foreignizing translation, he is still perfectly aware of its inconsistencies, those mainly being that it is a subjective and relative term that still involves some domestication because it translates an ST for a target culture and depends on dominant target-culture values to become visible when it departs from them. However, Venuti (1995) defends foreignizing translations. They are "equally partial [as are domesticating translations] in their interpretation of the foreign text, but they do tend to flaunt their partiality instead of concealing it" (Venuti 1995,as cited in Munday, 2001, p.148).

Venuti's concepts of domestication and foreignization are very important to the translation of literary texts and specifically in relation to the subject matter of this thesis and the translation of Mahfouz novels. In the translation of Mahfouz novels, translators employ both domestication and foreignization in delivering the literary content to the target audience. That is, foreignization is employed through preserving cultural terms that are not familiar to the target audience: for example the word *jinn*. On the other hand, domestication is also involved in the translation of Mahfouz, and that is evident through the style of writing and the choice not to translate some colloquial and dialectal language and by that bringing the text closer to the target audience, which is the subject of this research.

# Chapter Three: On Translating Arabic Literature

This Chapter introduces us to literary translation in general and the important role it plays. It then goes on to talk, more specifically about translating Arabic literature, beginning with how Arabic literature started out and how it evolved and progressed turning into a rich and important part of the Arabic culture. After that, this chapter introduces us to Naguib Mahfouz and how his novels contributed greatly to the rise of the Arabic novel, finally leading to him winning the novel prize in literature with which this chapter concludes.

## 3.1 Literary Translation

Literary translation plays an important role in enhancing not just national literatures but entire cultures as well. However, studies in literary translations are usually of limited scope, dealing only with individual texts and rarely with an entire period of time, a body of texts, or multiple translations produced in time by different translators in different places (Mueller-Vollmer and Irmscher, 1998, p. 3-4).

According to Even-Zohar (1978), very little research has been carried out so far in this area. As a rule, histories of literatures mention translations only when it is necessary and unavoidable, for example, when dealing with the middle ages or the Renaissance. Of course, occasional references to individual literary translations in different periods of time are available, but they are rarely included coherently into the historical account of literature. As a result, it is difficult to get an idea of how a translated piece of literature affects literature as a whole or its position within that literature. Furthermore, he argues that translated works do correlate in at least two ways: (a) in the selection of source texts by the target literature and

(b) in the way the texts take on specific norms and behaviors which result from their relations with the other target co-systems. These are not only restricted to the linguistic level but are obvious on any selection level as well. Thus, translated literature may have its own norms, behaviors, policies, etc., which to a certain extent could even be exclusive to it. "These points make it not only justifiable to talk about translated literature, but rather imperative to do so" (Even-Zohar 1978, as cited in Venuti, 2000, p. 199-200).

Furthermore, through his paper "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature," Lefevere (1982) tries to show how a certain approach to translation studies can contribute significantly to literary theory as a whole and how translations or, as he puts it, refractions ("the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing the way in which that audience reads the work"), play a very important part in the development of literatures. Translations provide an ideal introduction to a system approach to literature. Lefevere (1982) says that refractions have always been a part of literature. They come in the obvious form of translation, or in the less obvious form of criticism, commentary, historiography, and teaching. These refractions are tremendously significant in establishing the reputation of a writer and his/her work, but there have not been enough studies about them. On the contrary, they have not been accepted and have been criticized because of their unfaithfulness to the original and even though they play an important part in spreading an author's work and in the development of literature, they have not been given enough attention. Lefevere (1982) argues that the reason refractions have not been studied closely enough is because there has not been a "framework that could make analysis of refractions relevant within the wider context of an alternative theory." That

framework exists if refractions belong to a system, in other words, a literary system or a system approach to literary studies (Lefevere 1982, as cited in Venuti, 2000, pp. 239-243).

In describing this literary system, Lefevere (1982) explains that it possesses a kind of code of behavior, a poetics. This poetics consists of both an inventory component and a functional component, and it is the idea of how a literature functions in a society. A final constraint operating within the system revolves around the original language in which a work of literature is written, both the formal side of that language and its pragmatic side, the way in which language reflects culture. This aspect is often immensely difficult for translators since different languages reflect different cultures; translations will nearly always contain attempts to naturalize the different culture, to make it conform more to what the reader of the translation is accustomed. Finally, a system approach to literary studies aims at making literary texts accessible to the reader through translations produced not on the basis of a temporary poetics but on the basis of that desire to know the way in which literature offers its knowledge, which is so important that it should be shared to the greatest possible extent (Lefevere 1982, as cited in Venuti, 2000, pp.239-243).

On this topic, Appiah (1993) adds in his paper "Thick Translation," that the aim of a literary translation is to produce a text which is related to the literary and to the linguistic conventions of the culture of the translation in relevantly the same way as the source text is related to its culture's conventions. He also adds that producing a translation that is identical to the original is impossible and that it might be necessary to be unfaithful to the original in order to preserve formal features that are more important (Appiah 1993, as cited in Venuti, 2000. p. 397).

On a similar note, Bush in his paper "Literary Translation" describes literary translation as "an original subjective activity at the center of a complex network of social and cultural practices," an activity in which the literary translators "challenge the authority of the canon, the nationalism of culture and the 'death' of the author." He adds that a literary translator is bilingual and bicultural in that he/she defies convention and adapts to the changes that occur in contemporary cultures. The literary translator, due to his/her creativity, creates a new pattern in a different language that goes beyond any intentions of either original author or translator. "Literary translation is a very social, culturally-bound process where the translator plays a key role in a complex series of interactions" (as cited in Baker, 1998, pp. 127-129).

Even though, as mentioned above, there have not been enough studies and research surrounding literary translation; it nonetheless plays a very influential role. Lambert in his paper "Literary Translation," explains that importing stylistic devices and sometimes entire genres through translation into the target literary system can have an enormous influence on a given literary tradition. Literary translation has reached a level of importance that made it the first thing that comes to mind when mentioning the concept of translation, and that is evident in most dictionaries and encyclopedias. Finally, most cultures will include instances of literary translation, in the narrow sense, as examples of good or well-known translations, even though the latter have been imported more systematically and with far-reaching consequences into most cultures (as cited in Baker, 1998, pp.130-131).

To conclude, it can be said that since translated literature has played an important part in shaping discourse and different cultures, it is not enough to rely on individual texts and experiences in its description. The important and influential role it plays makes it necessary to conduct serious and descriptive research in this area.

## 3.2 Translating Arabic Literature

Even though the West has shown a lot of interest in Third World people, cultures, and texts in the 1980s and 1990s, Arabic literature remains generally marginalized and not of great importance to them. In addition, Arabic fiction had a limited audience before the year 1988 when Naguib Mahfouz was awarded the Nobel Prize. After that, however, Western publishers and readers have shown a developing interest in contemporary Arabic fiction. Still, the choice of what to translate from Arabic, even with a Nobel Prize in Literature, remains under the power of domestication of a familiar yet foreign culture (Faiq, 2004, p. 5).

As for the stages that Arabic fiction went through over the years, it can be divided into three phases. The first starts in the year 1947 and goes to the year 1967, the second from 1968 to the year 1988, and finally the third period starts from 1988 and goes to the year 2003 and up (Altoma, 2005, pp. 54-57).

In the first period, due to the fact that the novel and short story did not begin to take their place as genres in Arabic until up to the mid-nineteenth century and the fact that Orientalists did not approve of the value of Arab fiction up until the 1970s, Western readers did not show much interest in Arabic fiction, whether as translations or as literary studies. All in all, between 1947 and 1967 due to the difficulty of finding publishers for Arabic works, only a small number of Arabic works of fiction were translated into English; more importantly, this was also due to the fact that Arabic fiction did not occupy much significance in Oriental and Middle Eastern studies. This phase was also marked by the first appearance in English of a novel by Naguib Mahfouz.

The second period (1968-1988) witnessed a great deal of effort in translating contemporary Arabic fiction; that is, many works were translated into English, and

consequently, Arabic fiction was appreciated and understood more than ever before. In addition, the number of literary translators into English increased widely.

The post-Nobel phase (1988-2003) is different from the earlier phases in that Arabic fiction has come to be in demand; therefore, it has been translated frequently and regularly into English and other languages. It also witnessed the availability of an extensive corpus of Arabic fiction for an audience that is widely increasing (Altoma, 2005, p.54-57)

In conclusion, it is safe to say that even though there is no evidence of the existence of the novel in Arabic literature before the nineteenth century, the main achievement of Arab authors from the second half of the nineteenth century up until today is the creation of the Arabic novel, which comes from European models and European definitions of the genre. It is "the result of a protracted and broad social crisis and of the awareness that the world had radically changed" (Faiq, 2004).

## 3.3 Naguib Mahfouz and His Role in the Rise of the Arabic Novel

Naguib Mahfouz was born on December 11, 1911, to a Muslim lower-middle class family in Cairo in al-Jamaliyya quarter, and even though he only lived there until he reached 12 years of age, it always lived within him and as a result, had its effect on his writings. Most of his early novels are set in Jamaliyya including *The Harafish*. The *hara* (street/alley) "with its warring *futuwwas* [thugs] and their gangs, its mystery-enveloped *takiyya* [dervish-house], its *qabw* [dark vault or arch which once housed a city gate], its ancient *sabil* [drinking fountain], its shops, its café and the adjacent *qarafa* [cemetery]" – all of these elements which characterize Mahfouz's work throughout the years originate in Jamaliyya and constitute

images that are permanently imprinted in Mahfouz's memory and mind (El-Enany, 1993, p.1, 2; Le Gassik, 1991, p.1).

Mahfouz was a widely read, popular novelist not only in Egypt but in the Arab world as a whole, and his popularity and fame in the Arab world preceded his international recognition. Since receiving the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1988, Mahfouz attracted a lot of interest and gained a lot more popularity, "the kind that enshrines a writer in translations and critical anthologies" (Beard and Haydar, 1993, p.1).

As for his style of writing, Mahfouz writes in modern standard Arabic. His characters think and speak in a dialect that differs from the narrative voice lexically as well as in pronunciation and syntax. Egyptian readers have observed that his use of modern standard Arabic, while formal on the surface, still brings to mind in its rhythms the colloquial language of Cairo. His writings present the reader with a mixture of colloquial language and traditional Arabic; in his dialogues the reader gets a feel of the spoken language underlying the words on the page while in his narrative style one feels a very traditional rhythm (Beard and Haydar, 1993, p. 2-3).

As for the role of Mahfouz in the rise of the Arabic novel, the award of the Nobel Prize came to confirm a truth that had been overlooked by both Arabs and non-Arabs: modern Arabic literature stands out not only when it comes to poetry but also in the rise and quick development of fiction. For a long time, the idea that Arabs only excelled in poetry was dominant. The novel then came to put into words the experiences of the modern Arab man, proving its capacity for "a closer affinity with the rhythms, temper, vision, moods, and realities of contemporary Arab life." (Beard and Haydar, 1993, p. 2-3).

In its modern form, the novel is the product of the twentieth century but during the first few decades of the century, the Arabic novel was unsure of itself and imitative of the style of Western novels, that is, while it was growing and developing, it depended on Western examples and on countable attempts at the genre by some Arab writers, such as Al-Aqqad and Taha Hussain.

This uncertain beginning led to the novel taking more than half a century to turn into a "serious genre." However, during the last two or three decades the popularity and growth of the genre has occurred and rapidly increased, giving birth to many Arab novelists, some of whom are very talented from different Arab countries.

Finally, after depending completely on Western methods and styles, the Arabic novel was able to find its own identity in expressing the lives and experiences of Arabs whose rich literary tradition was the source of inspiration for a genre of fiction that was initially dependent on Western models. Naguib Mahfouz played a crucial role in this change in the Arabic Novel's situation and contributed greatly to its rise. Through his dedication and creativity, Mahfouz was able to establish the novel as a key genre in Arabic literature. "He established the novel's inception in the Arab world; in the course of three decades, he transformed a hesitant, rather naïve art into the preeminent literary form of our time" (Beard and Haydar, 1993, p.10-13).

Naguib Mahfouz takes credit for the major role he plays in developing the novel in Arabic as a new genre in quite a short period of time. Having dedicated himself to the art of fiction since the 1930s, Mahfouz has managed to follow Western fictional techniques and styles and to create in the process a "distinctly Arabic narrative art." As a noted Egyptian

novelist said, "You cannot picture Egypt without the Pyramids, nor can you conceive of Arabic literature without Naguib Mahfouz" (Altoma, 2005, p.21).

Mahfouz had published eight novels by the year 1951, but the publication of *The Trilogy* in its three volumes (*Bayn al-Qasrayn, Qasr al-Shawq, al-Sukkariyya*) in 1956 and 1957 was considered to be the turning point in modern Arabic literature, and through this successful publication, Naguib Mahfouz was named the finest novelist in Egypt and the Arab world. *The Trilogy* caused a radical change in Arabic literature and displayed the genre of the novel in a completely new light, which caused other writers a sense of uncertainty toward the new genre that they were unable to resolve. After *The Trilogy* a lot of Arab writers began writing novels turning this genre into the most widely read genre of modern times. "Very rarely in the history of literature does a single writer herald the advent of a whole literary era and, at the same time, introduce a hitherto alienated medium as the preeminent literary genre of the future" (Altoma, 2005, p.21).

Now having written over fifty works and having won with the Nobel Prize for Literature, Naguib Mahfouz has clearly outshone the late Egyptian writers Taha Husayn and Tawfiq al-Hakim. His works are significant for the variety of their subjects and issues he handles. Even though his works are specifically Egyptian in close context, they have an inter-cultural appeal and relevance and are therefore worthy of an international readership (Le Gassik, 1991, p. 7).

Allen, who is recognized for his significant role in presenting Mahfouz as a great novelist says,

> He [Mahfouz] is recognized as the Arab world's leading writer of fiction because he
> has not only produced a whole stream of excellent novels over a period of four

decades, but also turned the novel, as a means of societal comment and criticism, into an accessible and accomplished medium. His is a nomination which, the normalities of Arab politics aside, would be welcomed throughout the Arab world (as cited in Altoma, 2005, p.22).

## 3.4 Mahfouz and the Nobel Prize

The Nobel Prize awarded to Mahfouz in 1988 is considered an important milestone in the history of Western reception of contemporary Arabic literature and a symbolic act of global recognition, generating more awareness of Mahfouz as a gifted representative of Arabic literature. It supports what many scholars had been saying for decades about the high level of literary achievement attained by modern Arab writers, including Mahfouz (Altoma, 2005).

However, many discussions and controversies accompanied the award of the Nobel Prize for Literature to Naguib Mahfouz in 1988. Some saw it as a proof of the West's appreciation of Arabic literature, which could end the Arabs' feelings of minority and inferiority. Others, however, perceived the prize as a political scheme, a reward to Mahfouz for his positive attitude toward the Egyptian-Israeli peace initiatives. Mahfouz was condemned for his political conservatism rather than for the quality of his work. In addition, the approval of his work by Western cultural patrons changed Mahfouz's position in Arabic literature and made him part of Western literature. It meant that, through translation, he would be present in the core of Western culture. This changed the meaning of his work, and it was reinterpreted according to the new Western context. This was started by European intellectuals who awarded Mahfouz the prize, thus opening the way for reinterpretation. The

result was that his work was condemned by some Islamic groups. Muslim radicals rejected the award as a "Western provocation of Islam, celebrating an author who was supposed to have written against religion, particularly against Islam, and presented a distorted image of Egypt's recent history. The prize was seen as a symbol of Western aggression against Islam, supporting atheists, materialists and secularists in the Arab world" (Faiq, 2004, p. 22).

Despite all that, the prize never created any real serious interest in modern Arabic literature or the social, economic, political, etc., mayhem that the Arab world is going through. Edward Said writes,

> Now that the act has worn thin, Mahfouz has more or less been dropped from discussion – without having provoked even the more venture – some literari into finding out which other writers in Arabic might be worth looking into. Where, after all, did Mahfouz come from? It is impossible not to believe that one reason for this odd state of affairs is the longstanding prejudice against Arabs and Islam that remains entrenched in Western, and especially American, culture (Faiq, 2004, p. 8).

## Chapter Four: Dialect, Register, and Genre

## 4.1 Defining Dialect

According to *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms,* dialect is "a distinctive variety of language, spoken by members of an identifiable regional group, nation or social class. Dialects differ from one another in pronunciation, vocabulary, and (often) in grammar." Dialects have been traditionally regarded as a branch that stems from standard language, today however, linguists point out that standard forms themselves constitute dialects (Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms)

Similarly, in *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* dialect is defined as "a language or manner of speaking peculiar to an individual or class or region. Usually it belongs to a region, like the West Riding or East Anglia." However, in this dictionary, unlike the previous one, dialect is said to highly differ from the standard language of a country. It adds that ever since Standard English has been developed in the sixteenth century, the use of dialect has been declining.

On the contrary, Newmark (1988) describes dialect as a "self-contained variety of language" and not a "deviation from the standard language." On the translation of dialect he mentions that it is sometimes referred to as impossible to translate, which is not true. He argues that a translator's job is to decide whether it is necessary to translate dialect or not, depending on its function in the source text. Newmark (1988) explains that the functions of dialect are usually (a) to show a slang use of language, (b) to stress contrast in social class, and/or (c) to show local cultural features (Newmark, 1988, p. 194-195).

Baker (1992), in her book *In Other Words: A Course book in Translation*, defines dialect as "a variety of language which has currency within a specific community or group of speakers." She explains that dialect may be classified according to the following conditions:

1. Geographical: For example, Scottish dialect as opposed to British dialect.

2. Temporal: Words and structures used by members of different age groups within a community or words used at different periods in the history of a language.

3. Social: Words and structures used by members of different social classes (Baker, 1992, p. 15).

In the book *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*, Biber and Finnegan (1994) state, "a group that operates regularly in a society as a functional element will tend to develop identifying markers of language structure and language use different from the language of other social groups," in short, a dialect. They explain that speakers will be affected by the speech of those who they are surrounded by and with whom they frequently interact, "those they see as belonging to a social group that they see themselves as belonging to, and those whom they see for one reason or another as appropriate models behaviors" (Biber & Finegan, 1994, p. 18-19).

On a different note, Hudson (1980) in his book *Sociolinguistics* distinguishes between dialect and language explaining that the word dialect is borrowed from the Greek. He says that the distinction between language and dialect is a result of Greek influence and that it was developed in Greek; however, the meaning of the Greek terms for language and dialect are different from the meaning these words have in English now (Hudson, 1980, p. 31).

On the other hand, Fawcett (1997) distinguishes between dialect and what he calls sociolect, which he believes to be two overlapping terms. He defines dialect as "a way of

speaking typical of a group of people living in a certain region" while sociolects "characterize groupings by social class, status, profession, and so on." Fawcett (1997) elaborates by explaining that dialects are usually used by the lower classes while sociolects are used by the middle classes within the same geographical space (Fawcett, 1997, p. 116-117).

Dickens, Hervey, and Higgins (2002) in their book *Thinking Arabic Translation* also distinguish between sociolect and dialect. They explain that sociolect is defined according to the notion of class. "It is a language variety typical of one of the broad groupings that together constitute the 'class structure' of a society." Furthermore, Dickens, Hervey, and Higgins (2002) say that when translating, the translator must first and foremost consider the function of the sociolect in the source text and the purpose of the target text when deciding on a strategy for translating the text. Finally, they mention Standard Arabic and how its formality prevents it from having different sociolects. Colloquial Arabic on the other hand does have sociolects and that is why in translation, one should worry about sociolects only if the source text is written in colloquial Arabic and not Standard Arabic. As for dialect, they define it as "a language variety with features of accent, lexis, syntax and sentence formation characteristic of a given region." Again, they stress that a translator must decide whether dialect has an important function in the source text in order to decide whether to render it into the target text or not (Dickens, Hervey and Higgins, 2002, pp.165-167).

## 4.2 The Notion of Register

Register is defined in the *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* as "a term used in stylistics to refer to a variety of language used in specified kinds of social situation: thus a

formal register differs from an informal one, usually in vocabulary, pronunciation and punctuation" (Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms).

Baker (1992) defines register as "a variety of language that a language user considers appropriate to a specific situation." She explains that people belonging to different source cultures often have different expectations about what language is appropriate for each situation, that is why a translator must make sure that the translation matches these register expectations (Baker, 1992, pp. 15-17).

In his book *Translating Literature*, Lefevere (1992) explains the notion of register by saying that language is never used in a vacuum; in other words, it is always used in a way that suits a certain situation. In different cultures, a certain way in which language is used is considered either appropriate or inappropriate depending on the situation. Lefevere (1992) concludes by stressing the translator's part in all this in that he/she must ensure that the register of the source and target text are similar or equivalent in different cultures; otherwise the illocutionary power of the source text will be lost in the target text (Lefevere, 1992, p. 58).

Moreover, Hatim and Mason (1997) define register as "a configuration of features which reflect the ways in which a given language user puts his or her language to use in a purposeful manner." They add that "register consequently carries all kinds of intended meanings and thus functions as the repository of signs, whose range of semantics as well as rhetorical values is intuitively recognized by all textually competent speakers of a language." Furthermore, regarding the use of register in literary works, Hatim and Mason (1997) say that the use of register is sometimes motivated in literary works and the translator must be aware of language variations and the motivations behind them in literary contexts where they sometimes occupy a crucial position and serve as an important clue in portraying a certain

scene or character. Finally, Hatim and Mason (1997) explain that it is not always a neutral category and that language must be more dynamic according to the creativity of the text (Hatim and Mason, 1997, pp.100-102).

Hatim (1997) defines register as "the set of features which distinguishes one stretch of language from another in terms of variation in context concerning the language user (geographic dialect, idiolect, etc.) and/or with language use (field or subject matter, tenor or level of formality and more of speaking vs. writing)." That is, while field, tenor, and mode are part of the context of the language use, dialect is part of the context of the language user (Hatim, 1997, p. 231).

Fawcett (1997) has more to say on language use and language user. First of all, he explains the definition of register by explaining that language is always variable, meaning that people do not always speak the same way all the time. On the contrary, language "varies in different contexts and situations of use." The two factors that cause this language variation are language users and language use. Starting with language users, Fawcett (1997) says that they can be described by the place they occupy in time, space, and society. As for time, he describes it as uncontroversial; it is about the way that language writers and translators use of register becomes the language that reflects and represents the time they live in. Over time, this language changes; words become obsolete or change meaning, spelling, and grammar change. Usually, a text that is written in an earlier language is translated into the modern language of today because "the larger the temporal gap to be bridged the more alien such a translation becomes to its readers." The other two factors that define language user are region and society. If a source text or even part of it is written in a regional language (dialect) then the translator will choose whether or not to render this dialect into the target text depending on its

significance. As for society, or social register, it can be summed up in that certain classes of society tend to use different registers and levels of language..

Moving on to language use, Fawcett (1997) explains that it is described in terms of three factors as well: tenor, mode and domain. Tenor describes the relationship between speaker and listener, reader or writer: the level of intimacy, formality, politeness and distance. As for mode, Fawcett (1997) simply defines it as "the choice between speaking and writing." Finally, he moves on to domain, which he describes as being an unclear term to explain, but sums it up by describing it as a "combination of subject matter, in so far as it influences choice of lexis, and genre or format of delivery in so far as it influences such parameters as formality, complexity and presentational mode" (Fawcett, 1997, pp. 75-80).

Finally, and on a different note, Dickens, Hervey and Higgins (2002) distinguish between two types of register:

a. Tonal Register:  A linguistic expression that carries affective meaning. It is expressed in the tone that the speaker uses whether it is formal, polite, cold, etc. "The affective meaning of a feature of tonal register is conveyed by a more or less deliberate choice of one out of a range of expressions capable of conveying a given literal message."

b.  Social Register: A particular style from which the listener confidently infers what social stereotype the speaker belongs to. Through social register, translators can find out things such as the speaker's education, social class, occupation, etc. (Dickens, Hervey and Higgins, 2002, p. 163-164).

In relation to the topic of this thesis, the case of Standard Arabic can serve as an example. It is easier to identify tonal register in Standard Arabic than to identify social

register. The formality of Standard Arabic makes it difficult to identify clear links between the kind of language used and social stereotypes. However, when translating it into English, social register should not be ignored; on the contrary, a social register should be imposed on the translation even if there is no obvious social register in the source text (Dickens, Hervey & Higgins, 2002, p. 165).

## 4.3 Genre

"Genres are structurally organized components of our view of the world and also the vehicle by which this view is reproduced and transferred from one generation to the next" Bakhtin (as cited in Faiq, 2004).

According to different encyclopedia entries, literary genre is defined as "A category of literary composition. Genres may be determined by literary technique, tone, content and even length." Examples of genres are epic, tragedy, comedy, novel, short story and creative non-fiction.

In his book *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*, Lefevere (1992) explains that genre is "part of an inventory of literary devices shared by authors and readers alike." For example, if a poem is said to be a sonnet, the reader would then have certain expectations. He adds that many foreign genres are very difficult to accept in the West because they have no equivalence in the target culture; an example would be the Arabic *qasidah*, for instance, or Chinese rhyme-prose. It is a translator's job to try to make the target genre match the original as much as possible, and if not, he/she could instead use a genre that is familiar to the audience of the target culture ( Lefevere, 1992, p.31-33).

Additionally, in his book *Reading Popular Fiction,* McCracken (1998) defines genre as "particular formal characteristics that define a work of literature as belonging to a particular group that shares those characteristics." He explains that while traditional genres include, for example epic, tragedy and comedy, genre criticism is a provisional art, because genres are always changing, never absolutely fixed. Each classification of a genre is endlessly being modified and enriched with new examples; therefore, it is difficult to produce a definitive version of what each genre is. He goes on to say that genres are understood as historical and relational. What is meant by historical is that they provide a definition for a certain form according to how it has been defined in the past and how it might be defined later. They are relational in that they define a form in a way that shows the difference between it and other literary forms. In his book, McCracken (1998) defines popular fiction and distinguishes between it and what he calls literary fiction, which is the topic of the following section (McCracken, 1998).

Finally, Hatim (2001) distinguishes between two levels of abstraction when dealing with the notion of genre.

1. "A translation might be seen in terms of the minutia of the source genre or genres and the translation shifts affected. Thus, genre as a macro-sign provides translators with a framework within which appropriateness is judged and the various syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and semiotic structures are handled."

2. "A translation might be seen in terms of how closely it represents what all translated material should look or sound like" (Hatim, 2001, p.141).

Hatim (2001) concludes that these two senses can be derived from one another; however, each one of them has a different focus of investigation. The first case involves the translation of genre and the second involves the translation as genre.

In this study, the focus is on how translation, in this case translation of dialect and colloquial language, can affect the genre of the source text, turning it into a different genre in the target translation. This is what has been seen in the translation of Mahfouz's novel in this study, the case here being a shift in genre from Popular Fiction to Serious Literature.

## 4.4 Popular Fiction Vs Serious Literature

"Popular fiction at the end of the twentieth century is a quintessential product of the modern world" (Mccracken, 1998,).

The meaning of the word popular has kept changing over the last three hundred years, and in the nineteenth century, its original definition as "of the people," began to be used to describe an easy, comprehensible style until the beginning of the twentieth century when it was used to describe newspapers and fiction. Today, the bestseller, a product of the industrial age, is the most common type of popular fiction. In the past, popular fiction was known to have a more direct relationship with its audience, for example, folk tales, ballads and even epic poems usually receive a direct response from the audience. The nineteenth century novels of Dickens and Gaskell were published in popular periodicals, yet they were consciously aimed at a family audience. Such novels managed to play the role of both high literature and popular culture. However, at the end of the nineteenth century, an obvious split occurred between elitist high culture and the mass culture it defined itself against, in other words, between serious literature and popular fiction. It is difficult to compare the popular fiction of

today with earlier forms of popular culture; that is, while it is true that Shakespeare's theatre was popular in its day and that the novels of Dickens were popular as well as accepted as part of Victorian high culture, the meaning and nature of what it is to be popular has changed over time.

McCracken (1998) says,

I define popular fiction simply as fiction that is read by large numbers of people; but in the context of the late twentieth century that definition needs some refinement. Contemporary popular fiction is the product of a huge entertainment industry. Written fiction is only a part of that industry, which markets and sells popular narratives for film, radio, television and periodicals as well as in book form. To study popular fiction, then, is to study only a small part of popular culture. Nonetheless, written popular narratives can tell us much about who we are and about the society in which we live (McCracken,1998).

According to Meinhardt (2004), there are two kinds of fiction: popular and literary (serious fiction). The latter revolves around ideas, and it works on evoking the reader's thought; the main purpose behind it is for the writer to express his/her ideas and personal opinions without giving much importance or much thought to the reader. Popular fiction on the other hand revolves around emotions and evoking the reader's feelings, it does not give importance to self-expression or what the author thinks, and the main goal behind it is to entertain the reader. Literary fiction is a term that is used to distinguish between serious fiction and popular fiction. To put it more generally, literary fiction focuses more on style, psychological depth, and character, whereas popular fiction focuses more on narrative and

plot. Literary fiction is generally characterized as distinctive based on its content and style (Meinhardt,2004).

However, adopting a slightly different view, Burton (2006) in her article "The Great Divide: Commercial Vs Literary Fiction," distinguishes between popular fiction, which she calls commercial fiction, and serious fiction (literary fiction). She says that popular fiction is an old and classic form which has been around for a very long time. She describes popular fiction, as a form of storytelling that goes back thousands of years, as having certain characters, themes and characteristics. In addition, most mysteries, horrors, romances, thrillers and science fiction novels fall under the genre of popular fiction in which the hero, usually perfect and larger than life, is faced with a conflict that he/she struggles to resolve reaching a final conclusion and a well earned happy ending, and even if the ending was not a happy one, it is typically satisfying. Finally, she concludes the description of popular fiction by saying that the main focus of popular fiction is on the character, and its success depends on the characters, how the reader identifies with them and relates to them, not on the plot (Burton, 2006).

On the other hand, Burton (2006) moves on to literary fiction, saying that the term has only been around for the past three or four decades, making it a much younger genre than popular fiction. She explains that literary fiction focuses on the technique, theme and style rather than on the content, story and characters. Language is used eloquently in this genre, usually of high standard and flawless fluency. As opposed to popular fiction, Burton (2006) explains that the leading character in literary fiction is usually very human and usually the conflict is not resolved at the end of the novel. That is, literary fiction rarely has a positive or happy ending. (Burton, 2006)

Furthermore, Burton (2006) argues that entertainment is the main purpose of all literature and what makes popular fiction popular is that most people read seeking entertainment and relief, all of which popular fiction provides unlike literary fiction which does not usually offer that relief and in which the hero's struggles are frequently in vain. Another disadvantage of literary fiction is that the author often overemphasizes the message he is trying to deliver and the language and stylistics he uses to deliver it to the point where the reader's feelings are rarely provoked and "it is impossible to feel anything but irritation." Burton further argues that there has always been prejudice against the genre of popular fiction, not because it is different, but because literary fiction is considered higher and classier. Popular fiction is just considered escapist pulp. She concludes that recently, popular fiction has been appreciated more and it that it has been pointed out that "'literary' needn't necessarily equal 'quality' and 'popular' doesn't automatically mean 'pulp'. Good fiction is good fiction. Bad fiction is bad fiction" (Burton, 2006).

Adopting a wider view, in her article "Genre, Mainstream or Literary," Parker (2007) also distinguishes between three kinds of novels, which she calls genre fiction (popular fiction), literary fiction (serious literature), and mainstream fiction (or commercial fiction) (Parker, 2007).

Parker (2007) starts with genre fiction and defines it as having certain characteristics, such as a fast paced plot, straightforward sentences, and characters that are not complex, in other words, easy to understand and relate to. Examples of genre fiction include mystery, suspense, romance, thriller, etc. (Parker, 2007).

Moving on to mainstream fiction, Parker (2007) says that it is defined by others as "fiction that appeals to a wide swath of a particular reading audience." For example,

"women's mainstream" means fiction that appeals to women readers – young and old, professional and housewife, educated and less educated. However, Parker (2007) says that she defines it differently, "those novels that not only appeal to men and women and cut across all social lines, but those novels that fall midway between genres and literary." Finally, she states the fact that there are not many books in this category. She gives the example of Gruen's *Water for Elephants*. Gruen's book does not fall neatly into any genre category, is well written, but not as complex in terms of plot or character as is a literary novel, and also does not employ as many figures of speech (Parker, 2007). Another example is Sebold's *The Lovely Bones* which fits into neither category – not really genre and not fully literary. Both Gruen and Sebold were big sellers and hit nearly every best-seller list. Their books appealed to men and women, young and old, and cut through social-class divides.

Parker (2007) concludes with literary fiction. Of the three writing styles, she describes it as the most complex and sophisticated. She differentiates between it and genre fictions in that literary fiction tends to be character driven, while genre fiction is said to be plot driven. Furthermore, in literary fiction the central character or characters are explored in depth and their lives change in major ways from the beginning to the end of the novel. Also, the interior life of characters is explored in great depth. The plot is frequently more subtle than in genre fiction and ethical principles or themes are well thought-out. The pace of the plot is also often a little slower than in genre fiction. In literary fiction style is also more complex. Figures of speech – metaphors, for example – are used to a much greater extent than in commercial or genre fiction. Good literary fiction might live well beyond the life of the writer and will be debated in academic and social settings. Finally, Parker (2007) gives examples of literary fiction authors. These include Faulkner, Hemmingway, Welty, Steinbeck, etc. The works of

many contemporary writers who fall into the literary category include Russo, Naslund, Lahiri, Roth, Gaines, and Garcia-Marquez (Parker, 2007).

As the definition of popular fiction and the presentation of its characteristics by different authors have shown, the original Naguib Mahfouz novels have the characteristics of popular fiction. That is evident in the simple language and style Mahfouz uses in writing in addition to the characters and their life struggles. Mahfouz's novels address issues that were troublesome for Arabs at that time, for example, poverty which is an issue that concerned a wide range of Egyptians and Arabs in general. Mahfouz conveys these important issues by using a simple standard level of language which is the reason why his novels fall under the category of popular fiction. He tends to mix simple modern Standard Arabic with colloquial Egyptian dialect in his dialogues, which contributes to the simplicity of language, described as everyday language. However, his novels are not labeled under popular fiction only for the language used in them; in addition to that, Naguib Mahfouz's novels present the reader with a simple plot and simple characters with no complexities to which the reader can easily relate. The novels also address issues that touch the readers and reflect their lives at that time. All of those elements combined, in addition to the language used, constitute the characteristics of popular fiction.

Even though the content was transferred beautifully through translation, and the translators were able to skillfully convey the life, struggles, and social values of the Egyptian Culture to the English audience, they did that by using a higher standard of language which caused the translated novels to veer toward serious literature. That is, looking at how the language changes in the translated version of Mahfouz's novels, which no longer show evidence of simple everyday language and instead employing a higher level of Standard

English, it is more likely that the English version will be classified under the genre of literary

or serious fiction rather than that of popular fiction.

# Chapter 5: Data Analysis

In this chapter, examples from Naguib Mahfouz's novel *The Harafish* are examined in order to illustrate how the translators upgraded the language when translating dialectal phrases and turned colloquial speech into high standard language. The analysis will focus on the dialogue of characters in which colloquial speech is used in the source text.

## 5.1 Methodology:

In *The Harafish*, Naguib Mahfouz tells the story of the history of the Al-Nagi family in Cairo through ten generations. The story begins with Ashur, the clan chief and leader of the neighborhood, who returns after years to find it deserted. He distributes all of his wealth and property to the impoverished (the harafish), creating the Covenant of Ashur. However, succeeding generations do not live up to his legend and instead fall under the family curse. They all pursue status and money, killing each other for it. This novel follows their tale throughout the generations.

While translating Arabic dialect into English, there is always a tendency to upgrade the language for the purpose of attracting the target audience and making the text more appreciated by them. This novel is written in standard Arabic, but in the dialogue some of the characters use a form of dialect in some instances throughout the novel. The dialect the characters use differs from standard language mainly in pronunciation and in the type of vocabulary used.

The type of dialect the characters sometimes use in this novel contributes to the novel's genre, which is popular fiction. In the English text, the translator does not always preserve the dialect and in many instances chooses to translate dialect into Standard English

which changes the overall effect, thus changing the genre of the novel from popular fiction to serious literature.

For the purpose of this study, twenty examples in which the translator choses to upgrade the language and vocabulary and translate it into Standard English have been extracted. Those examples are analyzed and assessed; then an alternative translation is suggested.


## Example One

لا فائدة من قوتك ان لم تغسل مخك من الغباء (الحرافيش، ص.17) (La fa'eda min qowatak in lam taghsil mukhuk min al ghaba'a)

If you don't get rid of your stupid notions it will do you no good at all (*The Harafish*, p.8)

**Commentary**

This example demonstrates how the translator elevates the vocabulary used. The Arabic dialogue extract is a mixture of standard Arabic and colloquial speech; still, even the Standard Arabic Mahfouz uses is not highly elevated, meaning that it suits the situation and the class of the speakers. It can be seen through words such as مخك (Mukhuk) which is used in a colloquial way in this example. Reading the Arabic sentence gives one a sense of the speaker's class and of the level of the Arabic which Mahfouz chooses to use, all of which contributes to the genre of popular fiction. However, when the translated version of the sentence is considered, it is obvious that the translator has chosen to upgrade the language. His choice of vocabulary, grammar, and his way of rephrasing the Arabic sentence are all indications of a higher level of speech that is not common among the class of the speaker in Mahfouz's novel. Using vocabulary such as "stupid notions," gives a clear sense of proper, very good English, which

is not the same effect delivered by the Arabic version of this sentence. Moreover, "It will do you no good at all" could have been said in a way that represents colloquial speech more accurately instead of proper Standard English. Thus, it can be said that the English version of this example delivers a more sophisticated and intellectual tone than the Arabic version does.

**Alternative Translation:**

Your strength is useless unless you stop being such a bone-head.

This suggested translation does not indicate proper and high Standard English thus is considered fit for an average middle class speaker of English. The use of a word like "bone-head" gives a sense of slang which brings the reader closer to the effect that emanates from the Arabic version of the sentence.

## Example Two

اخفض صوتك يا بغل (Ikhfid sawtak ya baghl) (الحرافيش ص.19)

Lower your voice, you fool (*The Harafish*, p.9).

**Commentary:**

In this second example, it is evident that the translator chooses to translate colloquial vocabulary into proper and good English. In the Arabic source text, the use of a phrase like يا بغل (Ya baghl) is considered derogatory speech and is never used when speaking proper Standard Arabic. When the English translation is read, one can immediately feel the properness of the language and how different it is from the Arabic version in the effect it produces. The word fool does not have the same degrading effect that the word بغل does. In addition, the word بغل gives a sense of street language or inappropriate language, whereas the phrase "Lower your voice you fool" only portrays proper, respectable English. The difference

in the type of language used also says something about the class from which the speaker comes. For example, in the Arabic version, this phrase is not likely to be spoken by a person from a high class society or in a proper setting and is closer to street language. In the English version on the other hand, the phrase could easily be spoken by a someone from a higher class in society and not from a middle class uneducated person.

**Alternative Translation:**

Keep it down, dumb-ass.

In this translation, the word "dumb-ass" corresponds to the word بغل more clearly, and it certainly brings the reader closer to the sense of street language that the Arabic sentence portrays. In addition, "keep it down" is more "slangy" than "lower your voice." Translating the sentence this way acts in preserving the same effect of the source text sentence.

## Example Three

(الحرافيش ص.20) أيها البغل الخسيس المخلوق للتسول (Ayoha al baghl al khasees al makhlooq lel tasawol)

You miserable idiot! Begging's all you are fit for (*The Harafish*, p.10).

**Commentary:**

In this third example, there is clear evidence of language upgrade into English. If the Arabic text is examined, one can again notice the use of non-standard, uneducated class vocabulary (البغل الخسيس) (Al-baghl al-khasees), which the translator renders into a higher more polished form of language ("miserable idiot"). Describing a person as البغل الخسيس is clearly not equivalent to describing them as "miserable idiot" in that the former is not on the same level of the latter, not as classy.

A look at the grammar in both sentences also reveals a distinction. That is, in the Arabic text, there is no real focus on the grammatical outcome of the sentence. For instance, the lack of any punctuation or division in the sentence gives a clear understanding of how the sentence would sound when spoken out loud; there is a sense of low-class yelling. On the other hand, if one looks at the English target text, the difference can be clearly noted through the fact that the English sentence, although slightly informal when choosing to say "begging's" instead of "begging is," is still more elevated grammatically than its Arabic counterpart. That is notable through the choice of words in "all you are fit for." The expression "fit for" is not likely to be spoken by an uneducated person in an informal situation, such as the given one. This leads to the observation that the language used in the English translation is both lexically and syntactically good Standard English. Consequently, one can say that in this example, the source text and the target text are non-correspondent, neither in the level of vocabulary, grammar, nor the type of language.

**Alternative Translation:**

You good-for-nothing begging lowlife dumbass!

In this alternative translation, the phrase "miserable idiot" is substituted with "lowlife dumbass" because it corresponds more closely to the Arabic البغل الخسيس in the level and type of language. Moreover, instead of saying "begging's all you are fit for," something more suitable to the situation and to the speaker's background should be chosen, and that would achieve equivalence more accurately. "You're no good for nothing but begging." In this translation the reader can immediately sense the weakness in the grammar "no good for nothing"; the violation of grammatical rules here is deliberate in order to create a certain

## Example Four

خطوة عزيزة (الحرافيش ص.46) (Khutwa Aziza)

Nice to see you (*The Harafish*, p.27).

**Commentary:**

In this example, one can witness the use of a purely colloquial Arabic phrase: خطوة عزيزة (Khutwa Aziza). This expression is not restricted to speakers of a certain class in society, but it belongs to colloquial language, meaning it is not considered part of Standard or classical Arabic. It is used as a form of greeting to welcome a person to one's house or personal space. Looking at the way the translator chooses to render this expression into English, a slight alienation from the feeling and effect the Arabic version can be seen. "Nice to see you" would more accurately correspond to a Standard Arabic phrase such as سررت بلقائك (Surertu bi leqa'ek) whereas خطوة عزيزة is less formal and radiates more warmth. The translator's decision to translate this Arabic source text into "Nice to see you" gently takes the reader away from the colloquialism of the expression and gives a hint of an upgrade in language.

**Alternative Translation:**

It's great to have you.

OR

Welcome! It's great to have you.

In these suggested translations, the effect of the original phrase is captured and transferred to the reader more than the previous translation. They convey the same meaning and try to give the same feeling of warmth and welcoming to a home or personal space that comes from the Arabic version. In addition, these translations are less formal and closer to colloquial speech than is "nice to see you."


## Example Five

(47.الحرافيش ص) ابعدي عنه يا بنت (Ib'edy aanuh ya bint)

I'd keep out of his way (*The Harafish*, p.28).

**Commentary:**

Once again, evidence of upgrading the language is clear through this example. If the Arabic source text is examined, the use of informal colloquial dialect can easily be seen: ابعدي (Ib'edy) instead of ابتعدي (Ibta'edy) and يا بنت (ya bint) instead of يا فتاة (ya fatah). Usually, addressing someone as يا بنت in colloquial language is considered somewhat inappropriate especially when used with strangers or people with whom one shares a formal relationship. It could also be said that it veers a bit towards street language.

Moving to the English translation, the reader can immediately sense the difference in the level of language. "I'd keep out of his way" is a somewhat classy and proper way of rendering the Arabic source text into English. Furthermore, the Arabic sentence conveys a strict order whereas the English translation fails to deliver the same order; instead it only conveys a suggestion or a piece of advice expressing the meaning of: "If I were you, I would keep out of his way." In addition to that, the translator chooses to omit يا بنت from the

translated text, and by doing that he reduces the colloquial and street quality which is obvious in the Arabic text. As a conclusion, the English translation misrepresents the original text.

**Alternative Translation:**

Stay away from him, girl!

This translation is suggested because first of all, it preserves the order that the source text conveys. Also, this translation expresses the meaning of the original sentence more accurately and brings the reader closer to the sense of colloquial language seen in the Arabic source text. Overall, "Stay away from him, girl!' is far less polished and less proper than "I'd keep out of his way" which is more suitable in this situation and more likely to be spoken by an uneducated speaker.

## Example Six

هتف حسب الله: سلام الجدعان (الحرافيش ص.47) (Hataf Hasballa: Salam el ged'aan)

Hasballa shouted a greeting (*The Harafish*, p.28).

**Commentary:**

In this example, the translator chooses not to translate the actual greeting Hasballa says and instead just translate it as "Hasballa shouted a greeting." سلام الجدعان (Salam el ged'aan) is a purely colloquial phrase; specifically, it is a purely Egyptian dialect which the translator chooses not to render into English; This could be considered a form of upgrading language by choosing not to translate dialect. If the translator had chosen to translate the greeting and render the dialect into an English equivalent, it would have brought the reader closer to the Arabic text, and it would have represented it better. However, choosing to just say "Hasballa shouted a greeting" causes the English text to lose the effect that the Arabic text

**Alternative Translation:**

Hasballa called out, "What's up, lads?" OR "What's up, guys?"

This translation brings the language closer to the Arabic text and gives the same colloquial feeling.


## Example Seven:

(Ana fi aard el Nabi) أنا في عرض النبي (الحرافيش ص.51)

. . . until he shouted for mercy (*The Harafish*, p.31).

**Commentary:**

This example is similar to the previous one in that the translator once again chooses not to translate the words of the speaker and instead simply incorporates them into the sentence by using the third person point of view. The Arabic expression in this example is also purely Egyptian dialect; it is considered part of colloquial speech, which is not used in Standard Arabic. Now, if the original Arabic text above is compared with the English translation the obvious difference in the effect each one produces is clear. In the case of the Arabic, the language is non-standard colloquial Arabic, the feeling that develops when the passage is read is that of simple Egyptian dialect, more appropriate for a popular fiction novel.

The English, on the other hand, gets rid of the dialect, thus killing this feeling of colloquialism received from the Arabic text. Hearing a phrase such as "*Ana fi ard el Nabi*," transfers the reader to the heart of the novel and gives a taste of the Egyptian culture and language, which is an essential part of the novel and should have been preserved in the translation. Finally, it is true that the vocabulary and language used in the English translation are not highly elevated, still as presented in the previous example, the choice of getting rid of the dialect and not translating it into English is considered a form of upgrading the text.

**Alternative Translation:**

'Have mercy, I'm beggin' you!'

This suggested translation renders the Arabic expression as a part of dialogue instead of just explaining it from a third person point of view. The word "begging" is deliberately spelled as "beggin'" as a way of manipulating the speech and violating Standard English in order to create a dialect for the uneducated class.

## Example Eight

(sa takoon warta ay warta) ستكون ورطة أي ورطة! (الحرافيش ص.82)

That would be extremely awkward (*The Harafish*, p.52).

**Commentary:**

Starting with the Arabic text, and specifically if the word ورطة (warta) is examined, it can be seen that even though it is sometimes spoken in Standard Arabic, it is not considered to be very eloquent Standard Arabic and leans more toward colloquial or everyday language. A more eloquent word that would be used to speak a higher level of Standard Arabic would be

Moving on to the English translation, the difference is clear. To start with, the sense of excitement and the effect that occurs from the Arabic text is lost in the English version and instead leaves the reader with a sense of contemplation and a completely different effect. In addition, and more importantly, the vocabulary the translator uses shows a slight upgrade in language.  For instance, the words "extremely" and "awkward" are not likely to be used by someone with the social and educational background of the speaker. Instead, the translator could have used the words "very" or "so" and "embarrassing" or "weird."

**Alternative translation:**

That would be such a mess!

In the first suggestion, the effect of the original text is restored by making sure that this remark is in the form of an exclamation. As for the vocabulary, the word "mess," which has a colloquial feel to it, is chosen to describe ورطة and "such a mess" to give the same effect as ورطة أي ورطة.

In the second suggestion, the translation is kept with a change of vocabulary: "extremely" is substituted by "so" which is much less eloquent and more frequently used, while "awkward" is substituted by "weird" which might not have the same meaning but is used for the same purpose in colloquial English in the given situation.

**Example Nine**

ماجدوى الكذب يا وليه؟ (الحرافيش ص.135) (Ma jadwa al katheb ya wleya)

What is the point of trying to hide it, my lady? (*The Harafish*, p.89).

**Commentary:**

This example carries strong evidence of an upgrade in language by the translator. If the Arabic source text is considered, it is clear that the language Mahfouz uses is suitable with the situation and the speaker's background. The word الكذب (alkatheb) is a strong word in the Arabic language, and it is somewhat insulting to call a person a liar to his/her face. As for يا وليه (Ya wleya), it is a phrase that is restricted to the Egyptian culture, purely Egyptian dialect. In most cases, it is considered insulting and degrading to address a woman as يا وليه especially if it is done by a man; also, it is not used to address a lady in a formal context or a formal situation. Further, this expression is purely Egyptian slang and is never used in Standard Arabic.

When the English translation is examined, the difference is immediately obvious. To start with, describing "lying" as "trying to hide it" is considered sugar-coating it or putting it nicely. To call a person a liar has many negative connotations behind it and carries a note of insult which is lost here in the English translation. When the translator says "trying to hide it" instead of "lying," this shows much more respect and displays respectable language all which does not adequately translate the word الكذب as is it supposed to be translated in this situation. Secondly, if the focus is shifted to the phrase يا وليه and how the translator rendered it into "my lady," the elevation in language becomes very clear for on no level are يا وليه and "my lady" equivalent words. Further, يا وليه is entirely colloquial and is not used in formal contexts or in Standard Arabic while "my lady" can be used in Standard English and in formal language. Additionally, يا وليه does not show any form of respect to the addressee while "my lady" depicts quite a bit of respect and has an air of "class" to it. Finally, if one compares the overall effect of both the source text and the target text it is clear that they leave the reader with a

**Alternative Translation:**

What's the point of lying, woman?

Or

Fibber for lying between your teeth!

In this translation, "lying" is used instead of "trying to hide it," and "woman" instead of "my lady." By doing so, the sentence has an effect that is more similar to the effect of the Arabic sentence, and the language is less elevated, more suitable to the situation and to the speaker's social and educational background.

## Example Ten

أيها العجوز المخرف الذي يبول على نفسه! (الحرافيش ص.148) (Ayoha al aajooz al mukharif al-lathi yabool aala nafseh)

Incontinent old fool (*The Harafish*, p.98).

**Commentary:**

Once more, here is an example that presents the reader with another case of language upgrading performed by the translator. Looking at the vocabulary Mahfouz uses in the Arabic source text, it is obvious that very simple Standard Arabic is veering toward colloquial language. The word المخرف (Mukharif) is originally standard Arabic; it comes from the word خرف and the verb تخريف. But the form in which it is used in this sentence (مخرف) is not

The English translation shows a more dignified language and terminology. That is obvious in the word "incontinent" which is used by the translator in the place of الذي يبول على نفسه. "Incontinent" is a high standard term which reveals a good educational background and is used widely in medical environments by doctors. Even though it gives the same meaning as الذي يبول على نفسه this word is not likely to be spoken by someone with the poor educational and social background as that of the speaker in this situation. A term like that is only expected to be used by an educated, more sophisticated kind of person. Incontinent would have been a good translation if the Arabic text had used a term such asالمصاب بالسلس which is also a medically used term and the exact equivalent for it. Shifting to the word "fool," it is not considered a sufficient equivalent for المخرف because, again, it has an air of dignity about it which the Arabic word does not. Additionally, it does not convey the same meaning or deliver the same effect. This is the description of an old man who is said to have lost his senses and gone crazy due to old age and who has also lost bladder control. Describing him as a "fool" does not accurately contribute to that image, and it would have been more accurate to have used a word such as "insane" or "crazy" because fool means "stupid" or "idiot." It can be conclusively stated that this example presents the reader with the translator's clear attempt to elevate the level language.

**Alternative Translation:**

You senile old man who wets his pants!

OR

You senile old man pissing his life away

In these suggestions, the word "senile" is used in the place of "fool" to convey the same meaning, fulfill the same description, and deliver the same effect the Arabic text does. Moreover, "Wet his pants" or "pisses his pants" is used in the place of "incontinent," thereby downgrading the level of language and equalizing it with the Arabic version.


## Example Eleven

لقد قتلتها وسأقتلك يا تيس (الحرافيش ص.198) (laqad qataltaha was a aqtolok ya tais)

I've killed her, and now it's your turn (*The Harafish*, p.131).

**Commentary:**

There are different ways and methods through which the language can be upgraded. In this example, the difference in effect and the reason behind the elevation in the level of language in the English example are due to the elimination of a single word: يا تيس (ya tais). The presence of this word in the Arabic text adds a sense of street language to the dialogue, contributing to the image of the speakers, their background, and the kind of language they use. Such a word would never be used by a speaker choosing to speak correct Standard Arabic. However, the English translation fails to deliver the same image; on the contrary, by eliminating the word يا تيس and by using "now it's your turn" instead of repeating the use of the word "kill," the English version contains nothing which comes close to street or alley language. What occurs is proper English leading the reader to the conclusion that once again

the translator chooses to use a higher level of language that is not equivalent to the Arabic version.

**Alternative Translation:**

I killed her, and now I'm gonna kill you, bustard!

Here, the first modification is done through saying "and now I'm gonna kill you" instead of "and now it's your turn." This shows more simplicity in the language, and using repetition is more likely how a speaker with a poor social and educational background would say it. In addition to that, the word "bustard" is added at the end of the sentence as a translation for يا تيس.

## Example Twelve

إنت خرع (الحرافيش ص.358) (Enta Khere'e)

You've got no guts (*The Harafish*, p.239).

**Commentary:**

Once again, this example demonstrates how the translator elevates the level of language and chooses to translate into a higher level of English. The Arabic text presents a phrase which is specific to the Egyptian dialect, and that is evident through the word خرع(Khere'e) which is used among Egyptians as part of their slang. The phrase إنت خرع would never be heard if speaking Standard or proper Arabic and is only heard when speaking a casual, everyday colloquial Egyptian dialect. Additionally, it reflects the image of a certain class of speakers, not those who come from a higher society in Egypt.

Shifting attention to the English translation, it can immediately be noticed that the language used is no longer colloquial or slang; on the contrary, it is more of a proper kind of

English. Taking into consideration the speaker's educational and social background, the environment to which he belongs, and the nature of the Arabic phrase, it becomes clear that the English translation is not exactly suitable in this situation and the translator could have used more "slangy" vocabulary in order to capture the same sense and produce the same effect. However, since the translator has his mind set on the purpose of upgrading the language to create a certain effect, it becomes clear where his choice is coming from.

**Alternative Translation:**

You're a wimp.

OR

You're a wuss.

In these suggested translations, the words "wimp" and "wuss" is proposed instead of "you've got no guts." The Arabic خرع means a person who is a weakling, who is timid and unmanly. "Wimp" and "wuss" are English slang words that convey the exact same meaning and deliver the same imagine, preserving the same level, effect and tone of the Arabic sentence.


## Example Thirteen

(دسها بقدمك حتى تصير خرقة بالية (الحرافيش ص.358) (Dos-ha bi qadamek hatta taseer kherqa baliya)

Trample her underfoot until she's like a worn out rug (*The Harafish*, p.240).

**Commentary:**

Examining the words in the source text, Mahfouz again uses language and vocabulary that is not elevated Standard Arabic but simpler language that veers toward the colloquial. For example, the Arabic word خرقة (kherqa) is a colloquial word not found in proper Arabic. In

the English translation, on the other hand, the difference is glaringly obvious. The translator uses vocabulary that is scarcely used in dialogue and mostly in written language let alone used by an uneducated character from the social class of the speaker. The word "trample" is not a word heard in everyday dialogue, especially among an uneducated class of society. It is considered high Standard English; that can be said about the whole phrase (trample her underfoot) which has a "classy" ring to it, pulling it further away from resembling the original text. Lexically and syntactically speaking, the English translation is very well composed, and instead of using the English language so eloquently, the translator could have said, for example, "walk all over her" or "step on her" instead of "trample her underfoot," both of which convey the same meaning but are less eloquent and more frequently used.

**Alternative translation:**

Walk all over her till she's like a useless piece of cloth

As mentioned above, "walk all over her" is a more suitable way of rendering the Arabic phrase into English and because it brings the reader closer the nature of the Arabic text and delivers the same effect. In addition, saying "useless piece of cloth" instead of "worn out rug" acts better in preserving the colloquialism of the phrase because it uses simpler more commonly used vocabulary. Also, the word cloth is a more accurate way of translating خرقة . Further, it is more degrading and less fancy than a rug.

## Examples Fourteen and Fifteen

أنا جدع يا بنت الجدع (ana gadaa ya bent el gadaa) (الحرافيش ص.479)

I'm a man, my beauty (*The Harafish*, p.324).

هذه الوضيعة الخسيسة (hatheh al wadee'aa al khaseesa) (الحرافيش ص.400)

That low-class creature (*The Harafish*, p.267).

**Commentary:**

In these two final examples, the language upgrade performed by the translator is once again apparent. Beginning with the Arabic text in the first example, the dialogue is an Egyptian dialect. The word جدع (gadaa) as previously mentioned is a colloquial Egyptian word pertaining to Egyptian culture, thereby making the whole sentence colloquial in every aspect without any connection to standard language. The vocabulary and language in this example are part of everyday conversational language and are rarely, if ever, used when speaking Standard Arabic by upper-crust speakers. In other words, this sentence is a clear example of language as dialect. The translator chooses to render this sentence in a manner that is not consistent with the Arabic text. "I'm man, my beauty" does not preserve the tone of the Arabic sentence nor does it communicate the same feeling and effect. To preserve the tone and dialect, the translator could have translated in into a dialect of English, resorted to a systematically violated Standard English or used pure English slang. But obviously the translator's intention is using a higher level of language different from what Mahfouz uses in the Arabic source text.

The same goes for the second example; once again the tone and effect of the Arabic text are not preserved in English. When reading the Arabic sentence it is obvious how insulting and degrading the vocabulary is; however, the English translation does not put

across that same effect and instead uses vocabulary that is less degrading, and more formal and sophisticated. Tthat proves the same point that the translator aims to elevate the English language to fulfill a certain purpose.

**Alternative Translation:**

I'm a man, pretty thing

That trashy lowest piece of scum!

The suggested translation for the first example uses "pretty thing" instead of "my beauty" as a way of turning to slang to come closer to preserving the tone and effect of the Arabic sentence. "My beauty" sounds better, while "pretty thing" is purely slang conversational language which is not likely to be spoken by someone from a higher social stratum.

In the suggested translation for the second example, the goal is to use vocabulary that is as insulting and degrading as that used in the Arabic version in order to succeed in delivering the same effect instead of elevating the language into more proper sophisticated English.

## 5.2 Conclusion

Through the specified examples presented in this chapter, it can be concluded that the Arabic used by Mahfouz in his writings is a mixture of Standard Arabic and colloquial speech. The Standard Arabic he uses is simple, veering toward colloquial, not highly elevated; it suits the situations and reflects the class of the speakers in his novels. That is, the level of Arabic Mahfouz uses, his choice of vocabulary, and his frequent use of slang all suit the informal context of his novels and contribute to the elements of the genre of popular fiction.

Looking at the translated version of the previous examples, one can notice how the translator's choice of vocabulary, grammar, and language all point toward a language upgrade, thus leaving the reader with a higher level of language and revealing a more sophisticated and intellectual style than that of the Arabic text. If both translations are compared, it is clear that the English text does not preserve the same tone of the Arabic, and thus, fails to convey the same effect. The colloquial language used in the Arabic is substituted with very formal and polished English, or to put it in other words, very eloquent and classy. In addition, while the Standard Arabic used by Mahfouz is simple and has some colloquial feel to it, the Standard English used by the translator is lexically and syntactically good Standard English. Furthermore, in addition to choosing not to preserve dialect and substituting colloquial language and dialect with proper Standard English, there are instances where the Arabic text includes forms of Egyptian dialect which the translator chooses to delete in the English sentence. This is also considered a form of upgrading the language.

In conclusion, the source text and the target text are non-correspondent in the level of vocabulary and grammar, and thus are not the type of language used. While the Arabic text uses common every day conversational language, the English text employs eloquent language and is lexically and syntactically very well composed. The suggested alternative translations aim at preserving the tone, effect, and language level of the source text. To do that, the translator could have translated into an equivalent English dialect, resorted to a systematically violated form of Standard English or used pure English slang. However, the translator's choice to upgrade the language is clearly a deliberate and motivated one, and the aim behind that is to rid the English text of any popular fiction traits in order to satisfy a specific audience.

# Chapter 6: Conclusion

No language exists as a whole; on the contrary, linguists often talk about sub-languages, varieties and vernaculars; dialect comprises one of those language varieties. Any language variety can be used inappropriately. For example, speaking Standard English to customers in a lower class joint would be as inappropriate as using slang to deliver a lecture. This thesis, through the translation of Naguib Mahfouz's novels, has investigated the reasons some translators choose to use a different kind of language than that employed in the original text. To be more specific, translators of Naguib Mahfouz deliberately elevate the language in their translation, using elevated Standard English instead of simple standard or colloquial English that mirrors the language in the Arabic text. In the instances where dialect is used in the Arabic dialogue, the English translation renders it into Standard English instead of an equivalent dialect in the English language. These findings suggest that the aim behind this elevation in language is creating a certain image that suits the target audience at that time. In this case, it is presenting the target audience with a work of serious literature instead of a work of popular fiction.

This thesis further examined examples from Mahfouz's Novel *The Harafish*, the story of ten generations of the Al-Nagi family in Cairo. The story is set in the alley of Jamaliyya and the characters are mid-lower class people with a modest if not poor educational background. The language and dialect Mahfouz employs in his dialogues suits this situation and fits the context in that it reflects the social class, educational background and surroundings of the speakers. Further, aside from the dialogue, the language used throughout the novel is simple Standard Arabic with a colloquial air and not formal high level classical Arabic, simple language that constitutes a characteristic of popular fiction.

The aim of this study is to show how translators sometimes upgrade dialect and language in order to create a certain image; in this case, to produce a novel that is labeled literary fiction instead of popular fiction. Chapter Five, through analyzing fifteen examples from *The Harafish*, proves this point in the case of Mahfouz. The examples are taken from parts of the dialogue in the novel presenting the grammar, language, and vocabulary that is very simple and tends towards colloquialism. Some of the examples depict pure Egyptian dialect and slang, others a mixture of a very simple form of Standard Arabic along with Egyptian slang. In some instances the vocabulary used is low standard and reflects the class of the speaker in that it would not be spoken in a high society. However, through examining the translation of these examples, this study found that there is an obvious difference between the Arabic source text and the English translation. In the English version, the translator uses language and vocabulary that are much more sophisticated, polished, and intellectual than that in the Arabic text. In addition, in the instances where the author uses Egyptian dialect, the translator chooses not to transfer this dialect into the English translation. Moreover, the study found that in some examples the translator chooses to get rid of some of the "slangy" vocabulary, something that contributes to the translator's language upgrade. Finally, this study shows that the tone of both texts differ, thus creating a different effect. Taken together, these findings show that the different use of language has presents the reader with different types of novels: an Arabic version that uses the language of popular fiction and an English translation that employs the language of serious literature.

The alternative translations suggested in this study try to preserve the tone, effect and language level of the source text in order to convey the same image. To do that, the translator could have translated into an equivalent English dialect, resorted to a systematically violated

form of Standard English, used very simple Standard English vocabulary and language or used pure English slang. However, the results of this study indicate that the translator's choice to upgrade the language is deliberate. The aim of the translator is to rid the English text of any popular fiction traits in order to satisfy the target audience and create a certain image for Mahfouz's novels, giving *The Trilogy* the characteristics of serious literature or literary fiction.

This study enhances the understanding of translating dialect, and its findings show that rendering the dialect and colloquial language in the source text is preferable due to the fact that it plays an important role in preserving the image of the original text, thus conveying the same effect and delivering the same feeling of the original work.

Additionally, a number of important limitations need to be considered. The most important limitations of this study are the constraints of time, space, and source availability. More time and space would have made it possible to include a larger number of Mahfouz's novels in this study and provide a larger number of examples for the analysis. In addition, more time and space would have allowed further and wider research on the issues of language upgrade and dialect translation. The availability of needed sources would have allowed more research on the matter of image-making through language upgrade. Unfortunately, no valuable sources were found on that topic.

Finally, further research needs to be conducted to explore and investigate the issue of image-making through translation to determine whether the transfer of dialect is necessary in translation and how translating or ignoring dialect affect the source text and the target audience's perception of it.

# REFERENCES

Altoma, J. (2005). *Modern Arabic literature in translation: A companion*. London: British Library.

Baker, M. (Ed). (1998). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. London: T.J. International Ltd.

Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Florence: Routledge.

Beard, M., & Haydar, A. (Ed). (1993). *Naguib Mahfouz: From regional fame to global recognition*. New York: Syracuse University Press.

Biber, D., Finegan E (eds.). 1994. *Sociolinguistic perspectives on register*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burton, L. (2006*). Erotic fiction*. Retrieved March 5, 2009.

http://www.louisaburton.com/fictioncraft/literaryvscommercial.html

Catford, J. (2000). Translation shifts. In L. Venuti (Ed). *The translation studies reader*. (pp.141-147). London: Routledge.

Dickins, J., Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (2002). *Thinking Arabic translation*. New York: Routledge.

*A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (1976), UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

El-Enany, R. (1993). *Naguib Mahfouz: The pursuit of meaning.* London: Routledge.

Faiq, S. (2004). *Cultural encounters in translation from Arabic*. London: Multilingual Matters.

Fawcett, P. (2003). *Translation and language: Linguistic theories explained.* London: St. Jerome Publishing.

Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and language linguistic theories explained*, Manchester: St Jerome.

Gentzler, E. (2001). *Contemporary translation theories: A resource book*. London: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Hatim, B. (1997). *English-Arabic/ Arabic-English translation: A practical guide*. London: Saqi Books.

Hatim, B. (2001). *Teaching and researching translation*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Hatim, B and Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hatim, B and Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. UK: Longman Group.


Hatim, B and Mason, I. (2001). *Discourse and the translator*. UK: Longman Group.

Hudson, R.A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics.* London: Cambridge University Press

Jahsonic. (2005) *Literary fiction*. Retrieved April 7, 2009.

http://www.jahsonic.com/LiteraryFiction.html

Jakobson, R. (2000). On linguistic aspects of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.). *The translation studies reader*. (pp.113-118). London: Routledge.

Le Gassik, T. (Ed). (1991). Critical perspective on Naguib Mahfouz. Washington D.C: Three Continent Press.

Lefevere, A. (2000). Mother Courage's cucumbers; Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature. In L. Venuti (Ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader*. (pp.233-249). London: Routledge.

Lefereve, A. (1992). *Translating literature: Practice and theory in a comparative literature context*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Mahfouz, N. (1977). *The Harafish*. United States of America: Anchor Books. Translated by: Catherine Cobham.

McCracken, S. (1998). *Pulp: Reading popular fiction*. New York: Manchester University Press.

Meinhardt, S. (2004) *Popular fiction vs. literary fiction*. Retrieved September 29, 2009.

http://www.shellythacker.com/marketsavvy.htm

Mueller-Vollmer, K., & Irmscher, M. (Eds). (1998). *Translating literatures, translating cultures: New vistas and approaches in literature studies*. California: Stanford University Press.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and application*. New York: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A text book of translation*. Longman: Malaysia.

Nida, E. (2000). Principles of Correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.). *The translation studies reader.* (pp.126-140). London: Routledge.

*Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (1990). New York: Oxford University Press.

Parker, B. (2007) *The writer's loft*. Retrieved April 12, 2009.

http://www.mtsu.edu/theloft/genre.shtml

Venuti, L. (Ed.). (2000). *the Translation studies reader*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.