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### Languages and Varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDD</td>
<td>Literary dialectal dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LID</td>
<td>Literary informal dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Modern Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Colloquial Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Abbreviations and Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Source Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Target Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Source Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Source Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Target Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract

This thesis examines the effects of translators’ stylistic choices on the function of literary dialectal dialogue (LDD) in the English translations of contemporary Saudi and Egyptian novels. The research aims to identify the procedures carried out by translators to deal with this issue. It also explores whether different translators have a particular style or preferred procedures when translating LDD.

The first stage of the study involves an analysis of random selections of LDD that have been extracted from a number of Saudi and Egyptian novels. By using quantitative and qualitative descriptive analysis, this stage focuses on mapping the procedures that have been chosen to translate LDD in Arabic diglossic novels. The analysis first examines the construction and function of LDD in its source context and then studies the extent to which these procedures have managed to reconstruct the socio-cultural and socio-ideological function of LDD in the selected novels.

This macro analysis is followed by an in-depth study of the work of two translators, Anthony Calderbank and Marilyn Booth. The micro analysis investigates the link between their translation procedures in dealing with LDD and how these procedures may have been used to reflect the translators’ own style and voice in the target texts (TTs). From a comparative quantitative and qualitative descriptive textual analysis (Toury, 1995) of the chosen novels, as well as from interviews with the two translators, the analysis of the translator’s style is carried out with two areas of focus: first, it explores the extent to which these translation procedures have been influenced by target language constraints, the idea of the translation’s implied readers, the translators’ perception of their role, and the source text authors and publishing houses; and second, it considers the extent to which the translators’ stylistic choices influence the characters’ speech in the TTs.

This study finds evidence to suggest that due to the change in language communities, LDD has changed in the translation to become literary informal dialogue (LID). Translators’ preferred patterns, which emerge from the quantitative and qualitative descriptive textual analysis, show that there are regularities in the behaviour of the translators (Toury, 1995). Based on the textual regularities, the translational norms can be considered a hypothetical explanation for the whole group’s behaviour. However, the study also finds that differences in borrowing and paratextual procedures can be attributed to the translators’ individual stylistic choices.
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Transliteration

ALA-LC Romanization System for Arabic

Vowels and Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Romanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ْ</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ً</td>
<td>aw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُ</td>
<td>ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ِ</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ّ</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َّ</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ٰ</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Romanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>omit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>(ayn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.1. Focus and the aim of the research

According to the report commissioned from Nielsen Book by the Man Booker International Prize (Anderson, 2019), there has been a 5.5 per cent increase in the sales of translated fiction in the UK market. The question therefore arises again about the translator’s agency and their position within the dialogue of the translated fiction market. In literary discussions about famous world writers who have crossed borders through translation, it is hard to ignore that the translator is apparently and usually absent or sidelined. Although it might seem obvious that a translated novel contains the translator’s interpretation of the author’s words, the presence of the former is not completely recognised. For example, in online reviews of translated works by famous authors such as Franz Kafka or Simone de Beauvoir, readers tend to talk about their reading experience of the translated text as if it is the author’s version rather than a translation. The situation is not much better in academia: for example, in a seminar I attended years ago about the philosophy and writing of Gilles Deleuze, the speakers kept referring to Deleuze’s style, writing and philosophy as if the extracts they were using were not an English translation but Deleuze’s source text itself. Whether among the general reading public or within academic literary studies, there seems to be an enduring amnesia about the translator’s creative style and voice – or even about the very existence of the translator.
The key, but largely unanswered, question is this: if we take the writer’s creative style or voice as an absolute in the source text (ST), why is it still difficult to acknowledge that, in translations, the authors, and their narrators and characters, are talking through the linguistic and metaphorical choices of the translator? Moreover, translators add their own input and literary creation to produce a text that reflects both the vision of the author and the translator’s own vision of how a text should be presented to target readers.

Within the field of literary translation studies there has been a growing interest in recent years in studying translation as a creative process. A number of topics have emerged from this interest, such as studies that focus on the translator’s style. Studies of the translator’s style have traditionally been undertaken in two different ways: they either compare the work of an author with the target texts (TT) that have been translated by two or more translators (Munday, 2008a; Malmakjear, 2003); or they conduct a systematic or chronological study of the work of the translator, usually by tracking patterns in the TTs (Baker, 2000; Munday, 2008a; Saldanha, 2002). This research follows the latter approach: it is organised to analyse and investigate translator’s style by considering the work and approach of two Arabic-to-English literary translators, Marilyn Booth and Anthony Calderbank.

A starting point for framing this research is a question asked by Baker (2000, p. 261) in her paper “Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator”: “How can we best distinguish stylistic elements which are attributable only to the translator from those which simply reflect the source author’s style, general source language preferences, or the poetics and preferences of a particular subset of translators?” To find a way to answer this question in this interdisciplinary thesis, I have chosen to investigate the style of the translator by selecting challenging STs that require translators to take the texts on different translation journeys to recreate them in the target language (TL). The chosen STs
are Saudi and Egyptian novels, and the challenging feature is the use of literary dialectal dialogue (LDD) in these novels. The aim is first to consider how translators have dealt with and represented the LDD, and to examine the role of general language preferences and regularities. Secondly, I conduct an in-depth analysis of the works of two of these translators, Marilyn Booth and Anthony Calderbank. The aim is to produce comparative study of these two translators’ works to see if they have particular stylistic choices or use particular procedures when translating Saudi and Egyptian LDD.

This research does not approach the translator’s style as a complete experiment or innovative way of translation; on the contrary, my focus is on how translators navigate the text and leave their own conscious and unconscious fingerprints within the norms and regularities imposed by the TL constraints.

1.2. Research questions

As mentioned above, this thesis seeks to understand how LDD in contemporary Saudi and Egyptian novels is recreated in English, and to examine whether the translator’s style plays a role or influences the dialogue in the English translations for the novels. This primary focus can be subdivided into several interrelated questions that structure the research. The first of these research questions can be formulated as follows:

1. What are the procedures that translators have employed to translate LDD in the corpus? Are there frequent procedures that translators have applied more than others?

To answer both parts of this question, quantitative and qualitative analysis will be conducted to gain a holistic overview of the procedures and frequency of using them in the English translations. Descriptive analysis (Toury, 1995) will guide the textual analysis in Chapters Five and Six. The aim is to gain greater understanding of the dialect in the ST
and how it is reflected in the translation, and to explore procedures used in the context of translating LDD. The quantitative analysis will help to present a more visual understanding of the data and to answer the second part of the question relating to the frequency of procedures.

As a precursor to understanding the style of the translator in relation to Arabic novels and LDD, it is necessary to ask:

2. **Do different translators have a particular style or preferred procedures in translating dialect?**

Chapters Six and Seven will attempt to answer this question through comparative studies of the practices and approaches of two Arabic-to-English literary translators, Marilyn Booth and Anthony Calderbank. First, a quantitative and qualitative descriptive textual analysis will be conducted to investigate the style of each translator. In Chapter Seven, the results of interviews with both translators will be reported to discuss and analyse their own views about the translator’s position in relation to the translation.

3. **What are the effects of translators’ choice of procedures on LDD?**

I will investigate this question with the help of my proposed modification of the narratological representations initially proposed by Schiavi (1996) and modified by Munday (2008a). This will help in understanding the changes that occur to the LDD in the translation process and how the stylistic choices of the translator affect the characters’ speech in the English texts.

Finally, in light of the empirical interdisciplinary research, it is important to ask:
4. What hypotheses can be offered to explain why translators adopt particular procedures?

The answer to this question will make use of Brownlie’s (2003) sources of explanations. After discussing the findings of the textual descriptive analysis and the interviews, a hypothetical explanation will be presented of why LDD has been translated in a particular way, and the factors that might influence the translation process and the translator’s stylistic choices will be explored. The source of explanations will ultimately pave the way to a hypothesis that opens the door to further investigation of the matter of translating LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels.

1.3. Structure of the thesis

This thesis is divided into eight chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter Two offers a bird’s-eye view of the abstract key concepts relating to dialect across the three disciplines of sociolinguistics, literature and translation studies. The chapter begins with an explanation of language variations and their types. Particular attention in the second section of this chapter will be paid to the definition of LDD in novels and the functions that LDD plays in the writing of novels. The chapter ends with an overview of the issue of translating dialects, and how the translator’s style and the narratological representation could be linked to give a conceptual understanding of the data.

Chapter Three discusses the sociolinguistic situation in English and Arabic, with a particular focus on the concept of the formality continuum. Diglossia/multiglossia will be discussed thoroughly. The chapter then moves to a consideration of literary studies with a focus on the history of the novel in the Arab region and the chronological history of the use of dialect in the region’s novels. It discusses the debate around the use of dialect in the
English and Arabic contexts, and it presents a specific focus on LDD in Egyptian and Saudi novels.

Chapter Four outlines the data and methodology of the thesis. The chapter starts by outlining the methodological approach: it discusses the descriptive-explanatory approach as a macro-method, and textual comparison and interviews as the micro-methods. Then, the rationale for choosing Saudi and Egyptian novels is discussed; this is followed by a brief description of the novels in the research corpus.

Chapter Five maps the translation procedures used to tackle LDD in the corpus of Egyptian and Saudi novels. Since it focuses on the procedures, a quantitative and qualitative discussion of each procedure that emerges from the data analysis is presented with relevant examples from the novels. The objective is to provide an introduction to a deeper study of the style of the translators in relation to translating LDD.

Chapter Six present a comparative descriptive analysis of the style and voice of two translators, Anthony Calderbank and Marilyn Booth. This analysis goes further than Chapter Five by offering an in-depth study of their work. The chapter is structured as follows: first, background information about the translators are provided and their novels are presented. Next, comparison of the translator’s stylistic choices is analysed. This analysis begins with a general overview of the translator’s meta-style in translating the narrative, before providing a thorough descriptive analysis of her/his procedures to translate the LDD. The chapters end with a discussion section on the style and voice of Calderbank and Booth in relation to the modified narratological representations module.

Chapter Seven compares the findings of the previous descriptive analysis with the translators’ interviews to offer an explanation for the translation of LDD in the context of translating Egyptian and Saudi novels.
Chapter Eight revisits the research questions (proposed above), answering them in light of the descriptive-explanatory analysis, the interviews and the sources of explanation. Finally, limitations and an evaluation of the methodology are discussed, before suggestions are made for further research.

1.4. Terminology, transliteration, and style

Certain points relating to terminology, transliteration and writing style need to be highlighted. The first concerns the use of the terms “source text” and “target text” (abbreviated as ST and TT) to refer to the Arabic and English texts respectively. I am aware of the discussion in translation studies around these terminologies and how these two terms are considered controversial because of the authority and hierarchal relation that they create. However, I employ these two terms purely in ad hoc manner as a way of describing the categories of text in the discussion.

The second point relates to the spelling of the names of Arabic scholars and writers. For scholars whom I do not refer to often, I spell their names according to the transliteration system that I am using. As for the novelists, and to avoid confusion between different transliterations of author names, I spell novelists’ names throughout this thesis, and for both the Arabic and English versions, according to the spelling of their names in the publication of English translations.

Finally, with regard to the representation of the examples in the data analysis chapters, I have decided for conciseness and clarity to reference the extracted examples by following a system that was inspired by Read (2013). The examples in the chapter will be preceded by a reference in the following form: Example 4.1 (ST, p. 4; TT, p. 6).
Chapter Two

Conceptual Understanding: Dialect across Sociolinguistic, Literary and Translation Studies, and How It Could Be Studied through the Lens of Translators’ Style

2.0. Introduction

As background research for the study, it is important to cover key concepts related to dialect across the three disciplines of sociolinguistics, literature and translation studies. This chapter outlines an interdisciplinary conceptual understanding for the concepts of language varieties and dialect in order to help understand the data analysis in the discussion chapters. It is divided into three sections. The first section covers the linguistic aspects of dialect. It begins with a description of what is meant by language variations and what the different types of language variation are. As the focus of this research is predominantly on novels, the second section discusses the definition and functions of literary dialect in novels. The final section focuses mainly on dialects from the perspective of translation: it begins by outlining general approaches to dialect translation, and then it presents the discussion about the style of the translator and how it is investigated in this thesis through the translation of LDD.

2.1. A sociolinguistic approach to dialect

In general, dialect is surrounded by various stigmatised ideas that sometimes result in it being mistakenly considered as a low-status non-prestige form of language, or that associate it with remote and uncivilised areas (Chambers & Trudgill, 1998). Dialect is looked at as a form at
the periphery of the norm and as open to correction through its comparison to the so-called standard version of a certain language. Chambers and Trudgill (1998), in their introduction to *Dialectology*, have stressed that none of the stigmatised criteria is valid from a sociolinguistic and dialectologist perspective, and that there is a misconception of the hierarchical relationship between dialects and the promoted standard forms of any language. In their view, every language is made up of numerous dialects and subdivisions, not one of which can be considered superior to the others. In the following section I consider how language and dialect are defined, and, in particular, I ask where the line can be drawn between these concepts.

2.1.1. What are language and dialect?

2.1.1.1. Language and dialect

It is important to consider the debate about the definitions of and distinctions between ‘language’ and ‘dialect’. Key questions concern why a certain variety can be defined as a language, when there may be a number of dialects, and how it can be said that a dialect belongs to a certain language.

It is easy for a general reader to distinguish between the two terms, as the assumption is that dialect is equivalent to non-standard and non-prestigious language; however, for scholars these terms have presented some ambiguity (Wardhaugh, 2006, p. 28). Haugen (1966, p. 922) claims that it is sometimes difficult to decide which term to use in certain situations and that the terms sometimes “represent a simple dichotomy in a situation that is almost infinitely complex”. Haugen (1966, p. 923) comments that ‘language’ can be referred to as “either a single linguistic norm or [as] a group of related norms”, whereas ‘dialect’ refers to “any of the related norms comprised under the general name language”. In light of this, the clear difference between the two terms is that ‘language’ is superordinate, whereas ‘dialect’ is subordinate (Haugen, 1966, p. 923; Sánchez, 1999a, p. 188). The term ‘language’
could be used independently without referring to a certain type of dialect, whereas the term ‘dialect’ is dependent and is implied to belong to a certain language (Haugen, 1966, p. 923).

According to Haugen (1966, p. 926), two different dimensions are used when making the distinction between ‘language’ and ‘dialect’: the ‘structural dimension’, which describes the language itself, and a ‘functional dimension’, which relates to the social usage of the language. The structural dimension is based on ‘genetic relationships’; more specifically, Haugen maintains that when linguists claim that a certain language has a number of dialects, this means that they have recognised that this different form of speech has a number of cognates that are derived and have developed from a previous form of speech (Haugen, 1966, p. 926). These related dialects share certain linguistic features and are understandable to the users of other dialects; if not, then they can be considered different languages. The functional dimension is determined by the usage of language, and particularly the way speakers of the language use it. The sociolinguist could claim that for a certain nation there is no language, only dialects, and that, therefore, none of those dialects could serve as a language beyond the local speech community; or the sociolinguist could claim that a language operates as a common interaction medium for people who speak the different dialects (p. 926). For some sociolinguists, ‘language’ enjoys more prestigious functions and is used as a medium of communication between different dialects, whereas the ‘dialect’ is more limited in its usage (p. 927).

However, Chambers and Trudgill (1998) criticise this approach, which assumes that a language is understood by mutual intelligibility of its dialects, arguing that it is difficult to make this distinction based purely on linguistic criteria. Trudgill (2000, p. 3) argues that the distinction is not only made on linguistic grounds, but is also based on social and political grounds. This ‘mutual intelligibility’ criterion of distinction has failed when looking at Scandinavian languages (Norwegian, Swedish and Danish), for although these languages are
mutually intelligible, they are nevertheless recognised and registered as independent European languages. Moreover, within certain languages (for example, German) there are types of spoken dialect that are not intelligible to other speakers of the same language. Chambers and Trudgill (1998) also consider to what extent this mutual intelligibility is applicable and if both speakers can understand each other equally. Other aspects play a role in the fluctuation of mutual intelligibility, such as education, exposure to other languages, and, most importantly, the conscious willingness to understand.

The language–dialect dilemma is an ongoing debate, and to examine this issue there should be some consideration of political, geographical, historical, sociological and cultural aspects when centralising and identifying what language is and what dialect is, as well as analysis of which dialects are considered the standard form of a certain language and why.

For the purpose of this research and to avoid any complexity in the relation between those notions, I am going to use the following terms in an ad hoc manner. The application of the term variety will be used here in a general sense as a neutral term to include languages, dialects, registers, styles, or other forms of language when there is a need to talk about them in general. Language will be used for the specific purpose of describing a variety as a single entity for the languages I am discussing in the thesis, such as Arabic or English. The term dialect will be used primarily to refer to “varieties which are grammatically (and perhaps lexically) as well as phonologically different from other varieties” (Chambers & Trudgill, 1998, p. 5). In general, the latter term is the focus of this research and will be used in the analysis specifically to refer dialects that are spoken in a certain region or associated with a certain social and ethnic group. Other terminology that will be occasionally used in the research are accent to refer mainly to differences in pronunciation; and colloquial to refer to a way of speaking or writing that is characteristic of informal conversation, is not usually used in formal settings.
2.1.2. Horizontal continuum and vertical hierarchy: The study of language development

As mentioned above, language varies between places, communities and situations. Sociolinguists have analysed the development of language variations along horizontal and vertical dimensions. The horizontal dimension of a language concerns the geographical dialect continuum and its expansion, which is the spread of language within a geographical area. The vertical dimension is more concerned with sociolect which refers to a linguistic variety defined on social grounds such as those that related to a social class (Federici, 2011). Within each dimension, there are geographical, cultural and political factors that should also be considered.

2.1.2.1. Horizontal continuum (geographical dialect continuum)

A geographical or regional variety is different in some linguistic items from neighbouring regional varieties of the same language. Across wide geographical regions, where the people have spoken the language for hundreds of years, the differences can be noticed at the level of pronunciation, words, and syntax (Wardhaugh, 2006, p. 44). A language with many speakers is highly likely to develop several regional varieties, especially if the different groups are separated by geographical barriers (Federici, 2011, p. 9).

There are, however, no start or end points to the variety of language. The idea of the border fluidity of variety has been discussed among sociolinguists, but it was also mentioned prior to the formation of modern linguistic and sociolinguistic studies. Ibn Ḥazm (994–1064), an Andalusian historian, wrote in his book Al-iḥkām fī ʿusūl al-ḥakam (Judgment on the Principles of Ahkam) about the relationship between language and the spatial dimension. In a discussion of the roots of Arabic, Hebrew and the Syriac languages, Ibn Ḥazm criticises the claim that place forces people to speak a particular language, arguing instead that language formation is an optional act emerging for many reasons over and beyond the nature of a place.
(Shākir, 1983, pp. 31–32). He comments that observation of geographical places reveals that many languages have entered these places due to the mixing of people from different communities or the neighbouring geographical areas. Ibn Ḥazm argues, therefore, that language is not formed by or limited to a certain place; rather, language continues to travel as long as there is communication and interaction between different communities.

Chambers and Trudgill (1998) have recently coined a name for this concept: the ‘geographical dialect continuum’. They argue that, if the linguistic differences are examined in a linear direction among the same linguistic community, the further one moves from the starting point, the bigger the differences that will be discovered; links will nevertheless exist. They comment that “dialects on the outer edges of the geographical area may not be mutually intelligible, but they will be linked by a chain of mutual intelligibility” (Chambers & Trudgill, 1998, p. 5). This geographical dialect continuum explains why the German dialect near the border with Denmark is comprehended by Danish speakers in nearby villages, whereas it is less well comprehended in the centre of Germany. Drawing boundaries at the geographical level and spotting where the gradual transition starts are difficult tasks.

The idea that one variety represents one place has been proved wrong by scholars and sociolinguists, as well as by everyday encounters with the community. Within the same place there can be different dialects, sociolects and idiolects.

2.1.2.2. Vertical social variations (variationist sociolinguistics)

Social variation is defined by sociolinguists as a variation “used to describe differences in speech associated with various social groups or classes” (Wardhaugh, 2006, p. 49). Just as language varies geographically, so it also varies socially, and the distance between regions can also be mirrored by that between social classes in a certain society. This social differentiation between groups is portrayed not only through language but also through extra-
linguistic elements such as occupation, place of residence, education, racial or ethnic origin, religion, and cultural background (Milroy, 1987; Wardhaugh, 2006).

In relation to social variation, it is important to discuss the situational and contextual factors that trigger the use of the variation. As a point of departure, the work of William Labov on language variation and change is especially relevant. Labov approaches language as a dynamic force that always changes, moves and develops as it interacts with different parts of a dynamic society. Labov’s (1966) social approach to language involves studying the social class dialect, or the sociolect. Labov’s work reveals that the variation in a community is not random but can be identified by extra-linguistic factors. He argues that speech can differ from one person to another in the same community; however, knowing the speaker’s social class, age, and gender can identify a few variables that help to predict the speech community (Labov, 1966). An important concept in Labov’s research is the idea of prestige and the dichotomy of what he terms overt and covert prestige. Prestige is the level of regard and preference given to a certain variety over other varieties in the same community. According to Labov (1966), both ‘overt prestige’ and ‘covert prestige’ are used to gain prestige within a community. Overt prestige is the idea of using a dialect that is recognised as the dialect of the culturally dominant group in the community and is regarded as the more representative pronunciation variety; it usually describes the chosen standard dialect that is officially codified and developed in a writing system. Covert prestige, on the other hand, is the use of a dialect to stress local identity in small community communication in order to gain the respect of that small community.

Milroy (1987) has questioned why people insist on continuing to use lower-status dialects (according to that society’s classification), especially given the advantage of using the standard variety. That questioning has paved the way to a different approach to language variation based on studying social networks and local groupings. Milroy and Gordon (2003,
identify the individual’s social network as “the aggregate of relationships contracted with others, a boundless web of ties which reaches out through social and geographical space linking many individuals, sometimes remotely”. A network is determined by two contact factors between its members: first, density, which concerns the number of social ties linking members and how many ties are held in common through family, friendship, or occupation; and, second, multiplexity, which concerns the quality of ties between the members and how well they know each other. These two factors play an important role in leading an individual to adapt to the linguistic norms of the community: the more social contact and involvement in the community, the more the adaptation to linguistic norms.

Although the two types of variationist sociolinguistics set out by Labov (1966) and Milroy (1987) differ in focus, they are both quantitative approaches that use linguistic variables to categorise the social group (Drummond & Schleef, 2016, p. 52). A new approach to dialect in relation to language variation and change that focuses on identity and communities of practice was introduced by Eckert (2000). This qualitative approach goes beyond an investigation into social groups and networks to shed light on the use and ideologies of individuals. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992, p. 464) define a community of practice as “an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavour. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations – in short practices – emerge in the course of this mutual endeavour”. In this third wave, language is looked at as one of many social practices that constitute identity rather than as a reflection of social categories.

Eckert (2000) and Moore (2011) argue that the focus on individual linguistic features will not help in understanding identity; instead, the focus should shift to something larger, such as the study of style. The analysis of the social meaning of linguistic variants can lead to an understanding of how language constructs identity. The experimental method in this third
wave, contrary to the views of Labov and Milroy, has helped to prove “how social meaning may depend on our perceptions of speakers, listener background and listener language use, context and topic” (Drummond & Schleef, 2016, p. 54).

Dialect and variations can also be analysed from a different angle that involves thinking about the sociology of power in relation to language and about the symbolic power of language use. Bourdieu (1991) criticises the traditional approach, arguing that language should be viewed as a medium of power which individuals use to negotiate their position and competence in relation to others in their wider society. Those individuals unconsciously change their linguistic resource and adapt to the linguistic habitus of the social field in which they live. The way individuals use and modify language reflects the social structure in that social field. Backed by state power and social positions, institutions impose a certain linguistic order on society to form social classification. Bourdieu (1991, p. 46) argues:

In order for one mode of expression among others (a particular language in the case of bilingualism, a particular use of language in the case of society divided into classes) to impose itself as the only legitimate one, the linguistic market has to be unified and the different dialects (of class, region or ethnic group) have to be measured practically against the legitimate language or usage. Integration into a single ‘linguistic community’, which is a product of political domination that is endlessly reproduced by institutions capable of imposing universal recognition of the dominant language is the condition for the establishment of relation of linguistic domination.

This distinction of the correct way of talking, such as in the form of Standard English or Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), might be an institutionalising attempt to centralise knowledge production within educated elite groups and to eliminate other social groups in the community from that. Setting these criteria and backing them up with academic and political institutions can create an unconscious barrier in the minds of those from social backgrounds where the prestigious variety is not spoken; therefore, they are unable to contribute to or voice their opinion on knowledge production. More examples of how institutions affect
language and writing systems will be elaborated in relation to English and Arabic in the following chapter.

2.2. Definition and functions of literary dialect

The discussion of literary dialect in this section focuses on the dialouge of novels. Writers’ reasons to use literary dialect vary: for some, it is used to represent the characters, while for others it compensates for the semiotic signals of characters that are usually obvious in oral speech through sound and tone.

It is helpful in the beginning to shed some light on fictional dialogue and its function in the context of literary studies. Writers use a certain structure to tell their stories by employing certain means: narration and dialogue. The dialogue is the fictional speech between characters where it functions as a revealing indicator to convey the behaviour and thought of characters in the story (Leech & Short, 2007). Its multifunctional role can extend to serve as plot advancement, character development, description of the setting and atmosphere, or a combination of these functions (Page, 1973, p. 51). Novels in general and speech in particular are not necessarily reflections of reality; rather, they are a reflection of the author’s vision projected onto the novel in order to create a certain world within it. Page (1973) comments that a novel’s words, whether as description or speech, have a deliberate and selective nature contrary to the unorganised and unpredictable nature of reality. He argues that the language in a novel has undergone careful scrutiny by the author and is designed to carry meaningful significance that is not necessarily found in everyday, real-life discourse (p. 2). Leech and Short (2007, p. 129) maintain that “fictional speech may aspire to a special kind of realism, a special kind of authenticity, in representing the kind of language which a reader can recognise, by observation, as being characteristic of a particular
situation”. The writer’s own version of realism depends on his or her adoption of certain conventions to create “the illusion of contact with life” (Page, 1973, p. 2).

Novelists incorporate the voices of ordinary people. These voices may derive from many different regional and social dialects, and novelists employ these dialects as the voices of their characters. However, these representations are not a transliteration of oral speech, because using a full real dialect may pose a challenge to the flow of the novel and make it difficult to read. Giving too many details and representations may hinder the reading process and affect the reader’s comprehension of the storyline and the author’s message (Fine, 1983, p. 326). In analysing how writers render the characteristic of spoken conversational language, it can be observed that when conversation is used for literary purposes it distances itself from the raw spoken word in reality (Leech & Short, 2007, p. 129). Hence, the process involves selecting representative linguistic features that can demonstrate the spoken language in that speech community. Such changes are intended to make a spoken dialect fit with the rhetorical style of the novel, taking it from the ordinary dialect zone to what Ives (1971) terms ‘literary dialect’. According to Ives (1971) literary dialect can be defined as an “attempt to represent in writing a speech that is restricted regionally, socially, or both” (p. 146). It is crucial to use the adjective ‘literary’ when referring to the dialectal dialogue in the novel, because it indicates that this dialect exists within the piece of fiction and is not a real entity in the way that regional or social dialects are (Azevedo, 2000, p. 30).

Ives (1971) argues that “nearly all examples of literary dialect are deliberately incomplete; the author is an artist, not a linguist, or a sociologist, and his purpose is literary rather than scientific” (p. 147). The role of dialect changes when it is applied to literature. The language becomes an element of characterisation that brings out aspects of the characters’ backgrounds, or it adds a certain atmosphere that supports the novel’s story. It is necessary to change certain aspects and simplify the dialect (Berthele, 2000).
Very often, applying literary dialect in a novel is a deliberate authorial choice that serves the author’s vision and the message they want to deliver to readers. As mentioned above, literary dialect is used to evoke realism in the text and to establish historical and geographical authenticity. For example, Mark Twain, in his novel *Huckleberry Finn*, was aiming for literary realism in the novel through his representation of how his Missouri characters really speak; this use of literary dialect was not random choice, but rather it used intentionally to give the characters some authenticity (Berthele, 2000, p. 590). Literary dialect can be used not only to highlight the regional or social origin of the character, but also to reflect cultural differences and ethnicity, such as the representation of black characters or English characters in American novels (Sánchez, 1999a, p. 198).

A related point to consider is that novelists themselves may fall into the trap of stereotyping by choosing a certain variant to reflect the speech and thought of characters who belong to certain social groups. Readers may also have certain expectations, based on institutionalised classifications, of how a character from a particular social or ethnic background should speak. Irish novelist Lisa McInerney (2017), in an article published in *The Guardian*, has spoken about the criticism she received for using dialect in her novel *The Glorious Heresies* (2014). She comments on one reader’s view that the sophisticated language McInerney used does not in fact reflect a working-class story: “He was adamant my vernacular wasn’t the vernacular: a working-class story should be told through simple prose and working-class characters should have a limited vocabulary, or else they are not authentic.” McInerney counters by asking why the working class should not be articulate, and why articulacy should be limited to university-educated and privileged people. Rejecting the idea that eloquence is determined by social class, she emphasises that writers must understand that their characters are entitled to the right of articulacy. Old-fashioned ideas
about their characters’ heritage must not drive writers to police the fluency and expressiveness of their character’s speech. McInerney emphasises:

Language is not class-segregated. It is not a tool issued by nobility for use only when strictly necessary. Any character can be written in a complex style as well as in the crude vernacular. And the crude vernacular can be as beautiful, expressive and important as classic texts and experimental prose.

Using vernacular must not deny the complexity of speech and thought of the character.

In other cases, writers have highlighted the stigma around dialect in real life and the constructed ideas that have been implanted by institutions in people’s minds. The Japanese writer Haruki Murakami, in his story “Yesterday” translated by Philip Gabriel in *Men without Women (2017)*, uses the concept of dialect in a clever way to show the linguistic discrimination against rural dialects. Kitaru, the main character, who was born and lived in Tokyo, has decided to learn and speak the Kansai dialect, which is one of a group of Japanese dialects in the Kansai region that have strong vowels and which contrast with the Tokyo dialect. The other character in the story, Tanimura, is from the Kansai region and moves to Tokyo, deciding to change his dialect to the Tokyo dialect. Tanimura (the narrator) mentions several times the negative attitude towards his mother tongue, the Kansai dialect, and comments that this dialect is usually used in manga and anime to portray the person who speaks it as different. Throughout the story, people’s attitudes vary towards these two situations as Kitaru is repeatedly attacked as weird and abnormal, whereas Tanimura’s decision to change to the Tokyo dialect is normalised as if it is the expected act from anyone who comes from outside Tokyo.
2.3. Dialect in literary translation studies and how it can be analysed in relation to the style of the translator

This section focuses on dialect from the point of view of translation, and how previous studies have examined it in the literary translation context. It then considers studies that focus on the translator’s style, specifically in relation to tracking the progression of narratological representation in translation. Then in the end I will propose a model to study the translator’s style through the lens of LDD translation, in order to guide the discussion and investigate the research questions.

2.3.1. Translating literary dialect

2.3.1.1. General approaches to translating literary dialect

Translation is not just an exchange of words; it is also a way of communicating between cultures. It helps to create an image in the target readers’ minds that helps them to build up an idea of how others behave and think. In order to facilitate this communication, it is important for the translator to be aware of the context of the source language (SL) text so that it can be recreated, in line with the translation purpose, in the target language (TL). The translator’s awareness of the source cultural context helps them to choose procedures to serve the purpose of the translation. A phenomenon that complicates the task for the translator is the use of conversational dialects in writing such as literature, or what has been referred to previously as LDD.

Translation scholars have paid attention to the issue of translating dialect in general and dealing with LDD in particular (Catford, 1965; Hatim and Mason, 1990; Fawcett, 1997; Sánchez, 1999 a & b; Berthele 2000; and Määttä 2004). Many procedures have been proposed to tackle this issue, but scholars all agree that there is no clear-cut solution to managing this problem and that it depends on the translator’s understanding of the social and
cultural context of the SL and TL, the intention behind the use of dialect in the ST, and the translator’s goals for the translation.

Lefevere (1992a) argues that language is never used in isolation; rather, the use of language is related to the situation in which a particular language is considered appropriate. Authors elevate the communicative effect of their text, or what calls “the illocutionary power”, by utilising “all kinds of discrepancies between utterance (the use of language) and situation (the particular context in which language is used)” (p. 58). That might help to create the communicative effect of the meaning for the readers. According to Lefevere, translators should pay attention to whether the register or type of utterance in the TT is appropriate for the particular context, and also to whether a particular situation is similar, to some extent, in different cultures (p. 58). Translating needs to capture this communicative effect and explain the source’s cultural situation rather than to apply a literal translation of the text or “the illocutionary power of the source text will not be heightened by a mere literal translation of the words on the page in what amounts to a cultural vacuum” (p. 58). He argues that choosing a variety from TL to replace the variety in ST is not the best strategy to deal with a dialectal text and “is likely to sound artificial and may even make the translation less intelligible” (p. 69).

Translating dialect cannot be isolated from associated political and cultural considerations. Hatim and Mason (1990) comment that when dealing with a dialect in a text, it is not always just the linguistic aspect that differentiates a regional dialect, but that political and cultural considerations also contribute to setting these boundaries. Understanding the ideological, social and political implications of the source and target dialects is vital knowledge for the translator when dealing with a dialectal text, since such knowledge helps to produce a translation that avoids problematic misconception by its readers.
Catford (1965), like Hatim and Mason (1990), also thinks that the translator should keep in mind that the source and target dialects extend beyond the limit of language and the location of the dialects. The translator should also be careful about the impact that the translation and the chosen procedures have on the target reader. Catford (1965) gives an example of replacing the southern British cockney dialect with the northern French Parigot dialect, based not on the location but on social implication. Therefore, unwanted messages will be associated with the text where the mark of the dialect in ST may be formally quite different from those of the ST.

The importance of understanding the functions of dialect in the ST is highlighted by Sánchez (1999b) who thinks it is crucial in order to choose the best possible procedures for translation. Fawcett (1997, p. 122) argues that a dialect in a text poses a problem to the translator to the point where translation becomes impossible. He thinks that “dialect translation is by no means as simple and straightforward as one might think, especially since it often relates to questions of status and repression” (p. 76). For him, this form of translation is more representation than translation of the ST (p. 122).

This is a point that Määttä (2004) agrees with him on it as he argues that the novel is a medium to express the ideologies of the language. However in the translation the ‘sociolinguistic stratification’ cannot be produced in translation. Accordingly, the emphasis on the role and intention of using the dialect in the ‘polyphonic structure’ of the novel might give the readers an understanding of the ideological framework of the novel. (Määttä, 2004, p. 336). The focus in translation should be on the general of the novel and its macro context, including the literary dialect, and not on reflecting each single dialectal word or utterance.

In the field of Arabic literary translation studies, a few research studies have addressed the issue of translating dialects from Saudi or Egyptian literature into English. One of these is Rosenbaum’s (2001) research, which highlights the issue of translating diglossia.
from Egyptian literature into Hebrew and English. She argues that when a text is written mainly in dialect, there will be no problem in identifying the dialect. However, she states that the problem becomes more complicated and challenging to the translator when there are some dialect elements in a text that is mainly written in MSA, i.e. elements that uniquely belong to dialect; elements that have the same form in dialect and MSA but are different in meaning; and dialect elements that look like MSA where the words have been modified to comply with MSA grammar. Rosenbaum (2001) states that failing to identify these elements of dialects in the translation process may result in problems in the translation, such as literal translation of figurative expressions, translation shifts, and non-equivalent translation.

In relation to the practice of translating Saudi dialectal novels, Daoudi (2011) outlines the challenges of translating the two e-Arabic novels Banāt al-Rīyāḍ (Girls of Riyadh) and Barīd Mistaʿjil (Bareed Mista3jil). She argues that the emergence of e-Arabic has led to the rise of a new way of writing the novel in Arabic, and she suggests that these new forms of novel-writing are challenging the MSA elite literary language and offering a more diverse multilingual space for the expression of the self. However, she maintains that when these novels are translated into English, the co-mixture of dialects in the ST loses its cultural and linguistic effects, especially in the case of Girls of Riyadh where the author intervened in the translation. She states that changing the intended readers could lead to the loss of e-Arabic dynamics in translation.

Lastly, in the discussion of translating dialect there are a number of specific procedures that have been suggested which can help the translator to overcome this challenge and which may help to fulfil the function of the ST (whether a novel, play, poem, and so on). These suggested procedures are using pseudo-dialect translation which is creating a literary dialect and changing the standard grammar of the language with the standard linguistic features, and making it sound like a dialect (Hatim and Mason, 1990). However, Wekker and
Wekker (1991) argue that creating a literary dialect may invent a non-existent, broken language. Azevedo (1998) also argues that using a creation or ad hoc literary dialect might mask or misrepresent the sociolinguistic variables of the ST. **Parallel dialect translation** which is translating the literary dialect into another target dialect that has a similar connotation or functions could result in it serving the same functions in the TL (Sánchez, 1999b). Lefevere (1992b, p. 69) criticises this procedure by stating that it may have a negative impact on the TL readers, because it may awaken unwanted connotations that are different to the intended function in the source target. **Standardisation** which is substituting the literary dialect with a standard formal variety that removes all dialectal elements from the novel. However, replacing the literary dialect with the standard form could affect the representation of the characters and might substantially alter their relationship with each other and with the reader (Azevedo, 1998). **Dialect compilation** which is translating the dialect into a mixture of target dialects and uses this mixture in the idioms and dialectal expression (Perteghella, 2012).

It is in the end up to the translator to use one or a mix of these procedures or other applicable procedures in order to achieve the desired stylistic and semantic impact. Practical insight on the procedures that are used in translating LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels will be mapped in Chapter Five.

### 2.4. Examining the translator’s style through the translation of LDD

#### 2.4.1. Style and voice of the translator

There was a traditional approach to translation that was circulated with notion such as equivalence has emphasises the transparency of the text and the production of a good translation in which the presence of the translator is not noticed in the text. The translator has been regarded as the mediator between the actual author and the target readers. One
conception that has circulated in literary translation studies views the role of the translator as the conveyer of the author’s message and as seeking an equivalent or a faithful translation without clearly showing her or his presence (Hermans, 1996). The translator is not usually seen as an individual who has her or his own style and imprints that could affect the target readers’ experience and reception of the translation. The author’s message is affected by so many variables, one of which is the translator and their own subjective stylistic choices.

However, there has been a shift in translation studies in favour of the translator’s agency. In particular, the style and voice of the translator in literary translation have been the focus of a number of translation studies. Studies that focus on translator’s style, whether through a corpus-driven study or a descriptive study, include Schiavi (1996), Hermans (1996), Baker (2000), Millán-Varela (2004), Munday (2008a & b; 2009) and Saldanha (2011).

The discussion around translators’ style, specifically in literary translation, has been voiced widely by companion pieces published in *Target* (1996) by Schiavi and Hermans. In her paper “There is always a Teller in a Tale”, Schiavi (1996) argues that the presence of the translator and the fact that some novels are a translation and not the original have not been explicitly admitted; rather, they have been almost neglected. In order to identify the existence of the translator’s voice in the translated novels, Schiavi (1996) tries to build on what Chatman (1978) suggested as the narrative communication in the novel, and she also tries to conceptualise a counterpart narrative process in the translation that includes the translator and the target reader. Chatman’s (1978) narratological representation of the narrative communication is presented in Figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1. Chatman’s (1978) narratological representation of the narrative process

The “implied author”, which is introduced by Booth, 1961, refers to the image the reader invents of the author and her/his beliefs from reading the novel. It is different to the voice of the narrator, as the narrator is an invention of the author to tell the tale, along with the characters and the setting. The implied reader is the reader whom the author has in mind when writing the novel and the presupposition she or he makes about the reader and the reader’s experience.

The reader of the ST may share the same sociocultural context and cultural linguistic code as the voices in the novel, which helps the reader create an image of these voices – such as those of the author, the narrator and the characters. However, the reader of the translation has been introduced to this sociocultural context through the translation and may not share the same experience as the ST author, narrative and characters (Schiavi, 1996, p. 12). Schiavi (1996) argues that readers of the translation have been exposed to an extra layer created by the translator’s stylistic choices, and that the image created for them could include an extra voice, which is that of the translator. She comments that the relationship between the target readers and the author has been interrupted in the translation; in this case, the reader of the translation has been exposed to two different addressors, the author and the translator, and both are original (p. 14). The message of the novel originates in the author, while the language of the translation emanates from the translator. In light of this discussion, Schiavi (1996, p. 14) creates a counterpart to the previous narrative process to describe the translated narrative, which is presented according to his article as in Figure 2.2.
The relationship the author tries to establish with the reader in Chatman’s (1978) diagram (Figure 2.1) is recreated in the translation through the translator’s linguistic code, which in turn establishes a new relationship between target readers and the translator who both share the knowledge of the target culture’s conventions and linguistic codes.

Hermans (1996) has continued this focus on the translator’s voice in his article “The Translator’s Voice in Translated Narrative”. He argues that in the translated text there is always a “second voice”, which is the translator’s voice, and that this second voice is an indication of the translator’s discursive presence. This discursive presence is always in the translated texts, and sometimes this voice is forced to overtly break through the text. Hermans (1996, p. 28) outlines three cases when this discursive presence is manifest in the translation. The first case is when the text’s orientation is towards an implied reader, and when a pragmatic displacement occurs from the translation that requires the translator to interfere in order to redirect the text towards the implied readers. This could be presented through paratextual information (for example, a translator’s note, or a glossary) in order to offer necessary information (such as historical or cultural context) that was easily available or known to the ST readers, but which is inaccessible to the TT readers. Hermans’s second case concerns “self-reflexiveness and self-referentiality involving the medium of the communication itself” (Hermans, 1996, p.28). An obvious example of this situation is “texts which affirm being written in a particular language or exploit... their idiom through polysemy, wordplay and similar devices” (Hermans, 1996, p. 29). In such a case, the
translator may decide to apply a procedure that retains SL references in the TT, which works as a reminder to TT readers that what they are reading is a translation. The third type of case concerns what Hermans refers to as “contextual overdetermination” (Hermans 1996, p. 28). These are cases where the translator interrupts the context of the conversation with an explanation of its references.

The degree of traceability of the translator’s voice can be identified through the procedures chosen to tackle the text and through consideration of whether or not the translator has been consistent in using these procedures. This interference can be noticed more in a culturally embodied text where the translator tries to keep the communication flow with the target readers. Hermans (1996, p. 45) stresses the need to investigate how far the plurivocal nature of translation and the opportunity to extend the principle of the translator’s discursive presence from the translated narrative can be applied to translated texts in general.

This notion has been extended to study the style within the framework of minority translation by Millán-Varela (2004). In her article “Hearing Voices: James Joyce, Narrative Voice and Minority Translation”, she investigates the style of the translator in three Galician translations of Joyce’s short story “The Dead”. Drawing on the Bakhtinian concept of the ‘dialogism’ and building on Schiavi (1996) and Hermans (1996), Millán-Varela analyses first the Galician TTs, which she then comparatively studies with the English text to explore the translators’ voices and how they interact with other voices in the ST. From the TT analysis, she identifies three types of presence of the translator’s voice: visible presence (for example, footnotes), audible presence (for example, grammatical mistakes), and invisible presence (for example, foreignness and textual strangeness). From a comparison of the ST and the TT, she finds that the tendency to generalise the TT through the omission of certain linguistic features, such as reporting clauses and evaluative adverbs, affects the representation of the other voices (that is, the characters and the narrator) in the novel. Moreover, she argues that
translation into minority languages can be affected by other issues related to identity and the power of the target context.

In addition to showing occurrences of translators revealing themselves in the texts, Munday (2008a) proposes a different notion of style and voice in translated text. Munday (2008a) investigates the idea of the style of the translator in a corpus of English translations of Latin American writings. He studies the interaction between the stylistic choices and the ideological beliefs of the translator, and how these can affect the reader's experience. His analysis proposes a modification of Schiavi’s (1996) narratological representation. Munday creates two parallel narratological lines that, contrary to Schiavi (1996), are connected by giving more identification to the dual role of the translator as an actual reader of the original text (see Figure 2.3).

**For ST**

Author - implied author - narrator - narratee - implied reader - reader

**For TT**

ST reader/real translator - implied translator - TT narrator - TT narratee - TT implied reader - TT reader

Figure. 2.3. Munday’s (2008a) modified narratological representation in translation

Munday states that this is crucial for the linguistic analysis of the style of the translator as it helps in spotting any alteration in the translation. Munday (2008a) considers voice in an abstract way. He argues that it is impossible to trace the voice in the text. Instead, Munday (2008a, p. 19) maintains that the translatorial voice only becomes manifest by focusing on the style that is by itself detectable through studying the language of the text. In his critical analysis, he argues that the ideology of the translator – formed through education
and other sociocultural contexts, and which is termed by Munday the “lexical priming” of the translator – can be expressed, either consciously or unconsciously, through the translator’s prominent stylistic choices.

As can be seen, the voice has been used in literary translation studies in different ways that are mainly regulated by two aspects: voice as an independent agency; and voice as a textually manifested style (Alvstad, 2013). Combining elements from these different studies, the study of the translator’s style in this research, which will be presented in the following subsection, will try to link the notion of the translation of LDD in the Arabic novels with the style of the translator as revealed through a comparative study of the work of Anthony Calderbank and Marilyn Booth.

2.4.2. Style and voice in relation to translating the characters’ LDD

Bakhtin (1981) argues that words carry the individuality of their speakers within them and that they cannot be seen as abstract words. This occurs when the author or the character chooses to speak in a certain way or to use a certain word that is not just one from the dictionary but is instead a word that reflects their own sociocultural background and the jargon used in that social circle. According to Bakhtin (1981), the novel, in comparison to other literary genres, is heteroglot or many-voiced. He argues (in Holquist and Emerson’s translation of his work) that the novel is “multiform in style and variform in speech and voice” (1981, p. 261). It is a form that does not express a single voice or point of view, but rather contains a multiplicity of voices used to express different points of view and ideologies. These voices are not limited only to what is known traditionally as the author’s voice; other voices, such as the narrator’s voice and the characters’ voices, may be found in a novel, along with the author’s voice (p. 261). It is through this diversity of voices that ‘heteroglossia’ – a term coined by Bakhtin and glossed by Holquist and Emerson to mean “the internal stratification of any single national language into social dialects” (p. 262) – can
exist in a novel. If we think of the abstract concept of multiplicity of voices in the novel, the
question arises about what happens to these voices in translation. Do new voices join with
these voices? If so, is there any shift in the dynamic role of the voices? And what is the
relation between the voices that are generated in the ST and the voices that emerge from the
TT?

When applying this idea to the translated text, it is essential not only to observe the
linguistic choices in the text and the way the translator chooses to represent the novel’s
narrative and dialogue in the translation, but also to study how the translator interacts with the
other voices in the novel. Translators, in the translation process, rely on their own linguistic
repertoire built up through years of interacting with their knowledge of the sociocultural
context of both source and target cultures. They reflect on that and use it either consciously or
unconsciously in tackling and decoding the voices in the ST.

It could be argued that the image that readers have about the characters in a novel is
based on their own cultural background and the linguistic repertoire that they have built up. It
is the same kind of experience they rely on when relating to the characters’ speech in the
novel. When writing the dialogue of the novel, the author at some point may have assumed
that the LDD and cultural references would be comprehensible or familiar to the reader, due
to the assumed knowledge and experience they share. Therefore, the author is implying
significances and reshaping an existing knowledge for the benefit of the novel. Culpeper
(2014, p. 209), analysing a feature of the speeches in the novel The Queen and I (1992),
comments that “Townsend [the author], like other writers, is not aiming at the systematic and
accurate representation of real-life sociolinguistic facts, but at supplying some markers of
particular varieties, leaving readers to fill in the gaps with background knowledge”. Chatman
(1978, p. 126) argues that traits of characters in the novel can be taken from the characters’
speech and that “thus the traits exist at the story level: indeed, the whole discourse is expressly designed to prompt their emergence in the reader's consciousness”.

What happens to these markers and traits in the TTs when this LDD is taken to a new audience that is unfamiliar with the sociocultural context, the linguistic code of the characters, and the pre-existing knowledge? Is it possible that the shared sociolinguistic experience between author and readers is interrupted? Here, the translator may need to create this shared linguistic experience and familiarise the target reader with the function of characters’ dialectal speech. In order to establish the same relationship that the source readers have with the characters’ speech in the novel, the translator may need to combine their own knowledge of the voices in the source novel with their own linguistic knowledge of the TT, thereby creating a dialogue that helps the target reader create and build an idea of the characters and their backgrounds; and, above all, the translator has to identify the multiglossic code-switching in the novel. To achieve that, the translator may have to employ a language that not merely reflects the LDD of the characters but also, and most importantly, the references that this dialect serves in the novel. Moreover, the translator has the power, through these sets of translation procedures, to direct the narrative and characters to minimise the shared experience gaps (Schiavi, 1996, p. 16).

To consider the role of the translator in translating LDD and to analyse the effect of their stylistic choices on the characters presented in the TT, the level of narration (Bal, 2017) must be unpacked. Here, I propose modifying the narratological representation to include a separate category in the diagram that makes the character visible. As the dialect is mainly present in characters’ speech rather than in the whole narrative, Munday’s (2008a) modification of Schiavi’s (1996) model is not much help for analysing the characters’ LDD in the translation process. Thus, a further modification to the narratological representation can
be made in order for the diglossic/multiglossic situation in the novel to be studied. This is presented in Figure 2.4.

**For ST**

Author - implied author - narrator - characters - narratee - implied reader - reader

**For TT**

ST reader/real translator - implied translator - TT narrator - TT characters - TT narratee - TT implied reader - TT reader

**Figure 2.4. My modified version of the narratological representation in translation.**

In relation to characters’ LDD in the text, the role of constructing the characters’ speech is crucial in my modified version. The translator is in the first place a reader of the author’s words and their novel; she or he is one of the implied readers who is supposed to decode the markers of the chosen dialects and to try to fill the gap with their background knowledge. ST readers are supposed to pick up these signifiers and turn these words into voices and images that might help them to create a visual scene in their mind while reading. These images can be clear or vague depending on the reader’s imagination and their familiarity with the context of the text (places, sound, characters, smells, and so on). Thus, as set out in the diagram, we can think of the translator first as a reader who translates the text before taking it to a different language. She or he translates it in a way that evokes certain images, sounds and, perhaps, smells. This might help to comprehend the context and to make sense of the narrator’s internal dialogue or the characters’ dialectal dialogue. Then comes the mission of creating a parallel story in a different language.

This parallel text to translate LDD will be produced based on the several internal and external factors relating to the purpose of the translation, which in turn will determine the
translator’s procedures in dealing with such a linguistic challenge. It is obvious that translation is a process that cannot be isolated from the environmental factors surrounding its production. When shifting from a focus on the language to the culture, it is important to pay attention both to the cultural power of the target context that influences the translation and to the special purposes the text will serve in the target culture. Bassnett and Lefevere (1990, p. 57) argue that these cultural powers lead translators to manipulate the text and to attempt to imitate a certain discourse in order to be accepted by the target readers. The ideology and power of the target culture quite often play an important role in the translation process, according to the ‘manipulation school’ (Lambert & van Gorp, 1985; Hermans, 1985). Under these circumstances, the translation, and specifically the translation of literature, reconstructs the representations of SC, authors, and text.

The concept of ‘rewriting’ in translation was coined by Lefevere (1992b). He draws attention to how the text is rewritten in various ways to serve certain purposes, such as political or cultural interests. He suggests that the factors that control the acceptance or rejection of the literary text in any translation system are ideology, patronage, poetics, and the universe of discourse. He argues that ideological consideration is the most important – even more so than linguistic consideration – when it comes to the translation process (1992b, p. 37). Ideology is what society shows what is and what is not acceptable in the literary and social norms. For example, Lefevere (1992b) states that a number of details from Anne Frank’s The Diary of a Young Girl were omitted when first published, such as the way she behaved and her sexual life, in order to fit with the image of a fourteen-year-old girl, and how she should behave according to social norms. In turn, these social norms influence the literary system of the time (Lefevere, 1992b, pp. 70–71). According to Lefevere (1992b), ideology serves as the basis of the translation strategy when dealing with the text in the primary stages: it is the guidance the translator follows to shape the translation. The translators themselves,
according to their ideology, can also enforce the ideology of those who impose upon the translators themselves, such as the patrons who are responsible for publishing the translation.

Moreover, translation is also influenced by regulatory forces, whether from within literary systems, such as the professionals (for example, translators themselves, critics, and reviewers), or from factors outside the literary system, such as patrons (persons, institutions). Powerful people, a religious body, a political party, a social class, the media, a publisher, or an educational establishment are all examples of (potential) patrons.

In addition, there are other ‘intra-systemic’ constraints that affect the rewriting of literature, such as poetics and the universe of discourse. Poetics can be defined as “the general principles of poetry or of literature in general, or the theoretical study of these principles. As a body of theory, poetics is concerned with the distinctive features of poetry (or literature as a whole), with its languages, forms, genres, and modes of composition” (Baldick, 2008, p.262). In other words, poetics refer to the aesthetic principles that control the literary system at a certain time. Lefevere (1992b, p. 26) claims that poetics consist of two components: literary devices, which comprise genres, motifs, symbols, characters and situations; and functional components, which concern the relation of the literature to the social system, the role this literature should play in a certain society, and the way it should play this role. An example of this is the rewriting that was done by Fitzgerald to Rubáiyát, the work of the Persian poet Omar Khayyam to make it come close to the target literary conventions (Lefevere, 1992b, p. 8); this resulted in huge changes to the ST. This kind of rewriting manipulates the text to work in accordance with the literary system of the target society. On the other hand, the functional component can be influenced by the ideological constraints from outside the domain of poetics, such as the contextual environment surrounding the literary system. Certainly, professionals and patronage can also play a role in
determining and supporting the dominant poetics in a certain literary system. However, poetics are subject to change, and they have a variable nature.

The final factor that plays a crucial role in rewriting the literature is, according to Lefevere (1992b), the universe of discourse that can also act as an intra-systemic constraint in literary systems. The universe of discourse refers to “the knowledge, the learning, but also the objects and the customs of a certain time, to which writers are free to allude in their work” (Lefevere, 1985, p. 233). Each culture is unique in the way it expresses itself, and elements like costumes, concepts, and ideologies are different from one culture to another. This is, in turn, a challenge for translators. The attitude of the translator’s patron, and the social forces relating to the universe of discourse in the ST and to the other universe of discourse of their own target society, are the factors that determine the rewriting that occurs in the target literary system. This attitude is influenced by many factors, such as the status of ST, the self-image of the target culture, what type of texts are acceptable in the TC, and the intended audience (Lefevere, 1992b, p. 87).

Lefevere’s argument about rewriting has, however, been challenged by some scholars such as Hermans (1999). It can be seen that Lefevere (1992b) has paid considerable attention to social forces, without, however, giving much attention to individual translator agency and translators’ resistance to the influence of these social forces. Specifically, the translator’s role as the main link between two cultures has been shown by Lefevere to be a secondary factor when compared with the influences of social forces. Besides, when when the rewriting is put in the context of LDD it could be seen that there is a strong emphasis on target culture, but little has been said about the author and SC, the importance of the function of the ST, and how this might be decided by the translator to be reflected in the translation. Nord (2002, p. 33) points out the importance of understanding the communicative function of the ST and how this is important as a basis for determining the choice of translation method and strategy.
Furthermore, she argues that “the translation purpose justifies the translation procedures” (p. 35) and that this purpose can be identified in part by the translator analysing the communicative function of the ST. Nord (2002, p. 3) maintains that the purpose depends on the translator’s evaluation of the impact of their translation:

the translator acts as a responsible mediator in the cooperation developing between the client, the target audience and the source-text author. This does not mean that translators always have to do what the others expect – this may even be impossible if the three parties expect different translational behaviours. It just means that the translator has to anticipate any misunderstanding or communicative conflict that may occur due to different translational concepts and find a way to avoid them.

Nord (2002) introduces to the functionalist theory the concept of ‘loyalty’, which refers to the social relationship between the translator, on the one hand, and the client (or patron [Lefevere, 1992b]), author, and TT readers on the other. In particular, she highlights the relationship of the translator with the author, which is based on respecting the latter’s “individual communicative intentions” (p. 4). According to Nord, this might lead to the author accepting any changes that happen in the process of the translation. The translator’s loyalty towards her or his partner performs a helpful role in the ‘powerplay’ between client (or patron), author and reader expectations.

Thus, according to the translator’s evaluation, the purpose of the translation of LDD will affect the chosen procedures. The purpose of the translation could determine that little attention should be paid to the LDD, so the translator will be less concerned about creating LDD in the TT and more concerned about fitting the text within his or her evaluation of the TT’s literary translation norms and readers’ expectations. However, if the translator’s purpose is to recreate the style of the ST and focus on the LDD, that might change the translator’s procedures in this matter.
In light of this discussion, and drawing on the modification of narratological representation (Figure 2.4), the translator’s style and voice will be investigated in the data analysis in this thesis by studying the translation of LDD in the selected novels. My approach is similar to that of Munday (2008a) in its terminological use of “style” and “voice”. Munday (2008a, p. 6) emphasises that “in translation studies, issues of style are related to the voice of the narrative and of the author/translator”. Style is here used as “the linguistic manifestation of the presence in the text”, whereas voice is referring to “the abstract concept of authorial, narrational or translatorial presence” (p. 19). Voice may not significantly add up to an obvious shift in the text; instead, it can decrease or increase the variance between authors translated by the same translator (Munday, 2008a). Consequently, voice can be difficult to specify in the text, but it is through the analysis of style that the voice in the text is determined. Moreover, it is detectable by focusing on stylistic features, either by reading a work that has many translations or by studying different translations by the same translator (Munday, 2008a). By attending to the consistent or random stylistic features in the work of a certain translator, a general idea of the presence of the translator in the text can be gained.

Using my proposed modification to the narratological representation model, I will investigate the style of the translator through the way they construct the characters’ speech in their several translations. This mainly involves examining the conscious and unconscious patterns present in the TT, which indicate the visible or disguised discursive presence of the translator (Munday, 2008a). I do this in subsequent chapters through a comparative analysis of the practices of two translators, Calderbank and Booth. The analysis will look at intertextual and extratextual features in the data analysis stage.
2.5 Conclusion

As background research for this interdisciplinary study, the abstract concept of dialects in linguistics, literary and translation studies has been discussed. Linguistically speaking, different definitions and types of language variations were introduced in the first section. This was followed by a discussion of the concept and the function of literary dialect. In the third section, an overview of the issue of translating dialects in translation studies has been discussed. Then, it has been followed by a discussion on the translator’s style and the narratological representation were I illustrated how it could be linked to LDD translation in order to give a conceptual understanding of the data.
Chapter Three

Background to Arabic Dialects and the Arabic Novel

3.0. Introduction

The main focus of this chapter is to provide the sociolinguistic contextual background for understanding Arabic linguistic traditions and the novel in the Arab region. The English context will be discussed when it is relevant. I will briefly introduce the concept of the formality continuum in English, then I will discuss in depth the historical and contemporary view of the linguistic situation of the Arabic language. As the data of this research are extracted from Arabic novels that include dialectal dialogue, the second section of this chapter will consider the history of the novel in the Arab region and when the use of literary dialect dialogue first appeared in Arabic novels. The section begins with a historical description of the emergence of the novel in Arabic literature. Then it discusses the expanding use of dialect in Arabic novels. I consider the debate regarding the use of literary dialects, with a comparison between the debate as it relates to the Arabic and English languages. At the end of the second section, I give a specific attention to Saudi and Egyptian LDD.

3.1. The English and Arabic linguistic traditions

3.1.1. Standard English and the formality continuum

English speakers around the world position themselves when they speak on a standard/non-standard scale. They gain the notion of Standard English from institutions, such as schools, or
from their first contact with the language through learning English when they are taught to distinguish between the standard written form and the non-standard spoken form. The notion of Standard English varies among Anglophone countries. A number of standard forms of English in different countries may share features but differ in certain ways (Hickey, 2012).

The formation of the concept and rules of Standard English, whether in its written or spoken forms, first arose from internal influences within the country or external factors mainly generated from large and influential countries like Britain or the US. Standardisation began with the need to codify English in the eighteenth century so that there was a public language that could be used throughout the British Empire (Hickey, 2012, p. 1). Eighteenth-century standardisation was also influenced by institutions and social factors. The need to create a unified form of language and a call for “fixing the English language” was emphasised by literary writers. Educational purposes were another reason, and a large number of grammars were codified to assist with language teaching (Hickey, 2012, p. 3). Socially, there was a need to codify the language and stress the correctness of the standard by the middle classes so as to emphasise their social status through linguistic usage (Hickey, 2012, p. 6). The standardisation of pronunciation promoted one regional pronunciation as the correct form; for British English, the speech of the middle class in London was considered the standard spoken form. However, the usage of the standard form as a correct and socially accepted variety has expanded so that it appears to be a variety that does not have any reference to a particular region. It is the non-stigmatised variety that represents the voice of authority (Milroy and Milroy 1999).

The use of Standard English in education and literary production helped to promote it as a correct variety and to establish the criteria by which other varieties could be compared with it. First and foremost, Standard English is the variety that is used in writing (Trudgill, 1999). Education has promoted the standard variety as the logical formal variety that can
express complex ideas (Hickey, 2012; Trudgill, 1999). It is through education that members of a society are taught how to speak and write the language in a “correct” way according to standard criteria; hence, standard variety is referred to as an educated language (Trudgill, 1999; Hughes & Trudgill, 1996). The standard form is also used in teaching English as a second language to learners. Trudgill (1999) has clarified that Standard English is not necessarily Received Pronunciation (RP), as RP is a social accent that is linked to speakers from the upper middle classes. Standard English is also used to promote the great literary productions, such as the works of Shakespeare. Hickey (2012, p. 24) states that although Shakespeare used a number of language structures that no longer exist in the modern English standard, “nonetheless, the association of standard with literature provides support for the view that a standard is aesthetically pleasing, certainly when compared to dialects”. This association plays another function whereby it “highlights the degree of linguistic lag” and evokes a nostalgic feeling for the classical form of language (Hickey, 2012, p. 24).

What is Standard English and what is its relationship with English dialects? Trudgill (1999) explains that Standard English is not a region-specific dialect; rather, it is a variety associated with the educated middle classes. Its grammar differentiates it from other language varieties. For example, British Standard English does not have a double negation, and it has irregular present tense verb morphology in that only the third-person singular receives morphological marking (Trudgill, 1999, p. 125). Also, Standard English differs from other varieties in its vocabulary but not necessarily in pronunciation, that is, accent. However, Standard is not necessarily formal English, as it is spoken in formal, informal and neutral settings (Trudgill, 1999, p. 119). If the sentence has the same referential meaning but differs in its formality, then this is a stylistic choice controlled by speakers based on the social situation they find themselves in. Formality depends on a number of situational and contextual factors, such as social familiarity, kinship relationship, politeness, and setting.
Style moves along a formality continuum, so that speakers move from very formal to very informal (Trudgill, 2000, p. 83). This switching through the formality continuum occurs in vocabulary and on a syntactic level, as well as in pronunciation along a spoken formal continuum. Trudgill (1999, p. 119) argues that speakers are not limited to a single style; rather, it is “the case that the repertoire of styles available to individual speakers will be a reflection of their social experiences and, in many cases, also their education”.

Although the style is determined by the speakers, the range of the style, from formal to informal ends, depends on the language community itself. Some communities require situational switching between formal and informal ends to occur between different dialects, where one is used in formal situations and the other in informal situations; for example, Lowland Scots speakers switch to Standard English in formal situations (Trudgill, 2000, p. 94). Stylistic switching in English involves different styles within the same dialects, whereas speakers of the Scottish dialect switch in formal situations from their variety to the Standard English that is not their mother tongue but which they learn through institutions (Trudgill, 2000, p. 94). Trudgill (2000) argues that this example of Lowland Scots and Standard English takes a larger institutionalised form in diglossic communities: where two varieties exist, each is given certain social functions. Trudgill (2000, p. 96) differentiates between the stylistic switching in English and diglossic switching:

The main differences between diglossic and other situations, then, are that the low diglossia variety is standardised, to varying extents (Schweizerdeutsch and regional colloquial Arabic are both widely used on radio and television, for instance); that the two varieties have names and are felt to be distinct; that the situations where each is to be used are socially fairly well defined; and – and this is of great importance – no section of the community regularly uses the high variety as the normal medium of everyday conversation (this distinguishes it from the English situations, for instance).
The case of Arabic diglossia and the terminological, grammatical and phonological differences between dialects will be elaborated in the following subsection.

3.1.2. The Arabic linguistic tradition and the phenomenon of diglossic switching

Arabic is a Semitic language spoken in 22 Middle Eastern and African countries, where it is the only/first official language or one of the official languages. Arabic communities are described as diglossic speech communities in which two varieties, Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and regional dialects, co-exist. However, a close look at the linguistic map within these countries shows that there are a number of minority communities whose mother tongue is not one of the Arabic dialects. In North Africa, predominantly in Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and Libya, the Berber people speak various Berber dialects. These countries are already bilingual, since Arabic dialects and French are spoken; the Berber communities are trilingual, since they speak Berber, Arabic dialects and French (Holes, 2004, p. 2). Besides the Berber, there are other communities whose Arabic variations are not their mother tongue, such as speakers of Nubian in Egypt and Sudan, Kurdish in Iraq, Bantu in Southern Sudan, Aramaic in a small area of Syria and northern Iraq, and Mehri in Oman.

Owing to the spread of Islam, there are also other parts of the world where there are minorities who speak Arabic as their first language. In Asia, Arabic is a minority language found in southern Iran (Khuzestan), Balkh in Afghanistan, and southern Turkey; in Africa, it is found in northern Nigeria, Mali and Chad (Holes, 2004, p. 2). Arabic is also found in diaspora communities in the US and Europe.

The sociolinguistic landscape shows a diversity of diglossic/multiglossic speech communities in and beyond the Arab region. This situation raises many questions: what does Arabic mean across all these communities, to what extent is it mutually intelligible, and how
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1 Saudi Arabia, Oman, Yemen, Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, UAE, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan, Palestine, Sudan, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Mauritania, Djibouti, Somalia, and the Comoros Islands.
are the horizontal and vertical dimensions (as discussed in the previous chapter) seen in relation to Arabic variations? The next two sections explore these questions.

3.1.2.1. Tradition of linguistic representation in the Arab world

As mentioned previously, dialect sometimes has a stigma attached to it as a result of sociopolitical influences. Arabic dialects are no exception to this phenomenon of stigmatisation. Although the focus in this thesis is on Arabic dialects in their contemporary settings, it is also important to reflect on the tradition of Arabic and the historical and cultural development of what is now known as MSA. This historical reflection is necessary for two reasons: first, to trace and analyse the reasons for the formation of the attitude towards dialect; and second, as a way of seeing when the stigma surrounding Arabic dialects began.

In its classical and modern forms, Arabic has had and still enjoys a strong position within Arabic and Islamic culture. The formation of classical Arabic as a standard form began with the rise of Islam. Based on the Arabic historical narrative, Eisele (2002, pp. 6–7) identifies four dominant motifs, or what he calls ‘topoi’, that help in the making of the classical Arabic language tradition. He shows how each motif promoted certain cultural aspects while at the same time stigmatising others. According to him, the first motif behind language unification was the need for ‘unity’ and for language to be a homogenising tool to acquire unity and to become a kind of identity symbol for the whole caliphate. Prior to Islam, Arabic was a pluricentric language, and several standards of Arabic spoken by several tribes. One of its purposes was for the oral composition of poetry known as mu’allaqāt; subsequently, this several standards have homogenised and taken its holy shape through the language of the Qur’an. There was a call to use the language of the Qur’an to establish the unity of Islamic culture Eisele (2002). This was the initial basis for the institutionalisation of one dialect of the language. The crucial relationship between the Arabic language and the Islamic religion was a reason to keep the language of the Qur’an pure from any
contamination, especially with the spread of Islam and its contact with other languages. ‘Purity’ was the second motif which led to the development of orthography and the codifying of the language, along with the establishment of the structure and grammar of Arabic. This systematisation of the language led to the third motif of ‘continuity’, which resulted in the development of a complex Arabic writing system to safeguard the features of the language over the years. This led to the promotion of a written coded form of language over oral forms, and it paved the way to the stigmatisation of other dialects and foreign languages. Eisele’s (2002) final motif is the cultural competition with other languages in the Islamic empire (Persian and Turkish), and the emergence and decline of Arabic as the language of Islamic culture.

The attitude of promoting classical Arabic as the pure and perfect form compared to other languages and varieties was criticised by the eleventh-century Andalusian scholar Ibn Ḥazm who argued that no language is superior to any other and that the claim of linguistic superiority is always vocalised because people are not familiar with hearing different voices (Shākir, 1983, p. 34). He criticised the claim that Arabic is a pure language and hence chosen by God. He said that the Qur’an clearly stated that each prophet was sent to his people with the language they understood and that all languages are equal in this respect (Shākir, 1983, p. 34). The claim about the superiority of classical Arabic also pointed to the fact that the stories in the Qur’an about previous prophets are told in Arabic; however, Ibn Ḥazm argued that these are in fact just a matter of telling and translating into Arabic the meaning of what these prophets had originally said in their own languages (Shākir, 1983, p. 34).

The motifs used to promote the purity and homogeneity of the Qur’an have overlooked the fact that the Qur’an was originally uttered in the Quraysh dialect. the Qur’an language shows that a number of dialectal terminologies were included in the Qur’an that were related to different Arab tribes and dialects, and sometimes to different neighbouring
languages. Those who oppose using dialect always make use of two verses in the Qur’an which, in their opinion, justify the purity of the language. The first is:

إِنَّا جَعَلْنَاهُ آنَا عَرَبِيًا لَّكُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ} [الزخرف 3]

“We have sent it down as an Arabic Qur'an, in order that ye may learn wisdom.” (12:2)

And the second verse is:

بِلَسْتَ عُرْبِيَّ مُبِينٌ} [الشعراء 195]

“In the perspicuous Arabic tongue.” (26:195)

According to Tafsir Ibn Kathîr, these verses mean: “this Qur’an which We have revealed to you, We have revealed in perfect and eloquent Arabic, so that it may be quite clear, leaving no room for excuses and establishing clear proof, showing the straight path” (pp. 162-163). Ibn Kathîr’s interpretation is that these verses are mentioned in the Qur’an to stop Quraysh from using any pretexts that the Qur’an does not speak their own tongue and that they should not follow it.

A term that has been used in the Qur’an to describe the dialect is:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِن رَسُولٍ إِلَّا بِلَسْتَ عُرْبِيَّ مُبِينٌ} [إبراهيم 4]

“We sent not a messenger except to teach in the language (tongue) of his own people.” (14:4)

The word ‘language’ (or ‘tongue’ as in the original text) in this verse has come to refer to the dialect and is also here used to refer to the ‘orality’ of the language, since, according to the verse, each prophet has spoken to his people in their tongue.

The Qur’an used the Quraysh tribe’s dialect at that time; however, the Qur’an also used words and expressions from other tribes in the region to make it inclusive for the
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2 The prophet Muḥammad’s tribe and the one to whom he started preaching for Islam.
Arabic-speaking territories. In the *Al-lughāt fi’l- Qur’an (The Languages of the Qur’an)*, which is an old manuscript narrated by Isma’il bīn ‘amrū bīn Rashīd and quoting from Abdullah bīn Al Husian al-Mūqri, and which has been edited and published in Arabic by Salah al-Din al-Munajjid (1946), this matter is elaborated and each individual Surah in the Qur’an is linguistically analysed. The book provides the terminologies belonging to each tribe that existed at that time, with an explanation and the name of the tribe who spoke these words. It also includes the name of the nations\(^3\) that had words similar to those in the Qur’an; however, the book still claims that there is nothing in the Qur’an that is not Arabic, but that it happens that these words exist in, for example, all Arabic, Syriac and Coptic languages (p. 9). This is an interesting contribution because it highlights the multilingual or multi-dialectal side of the Qur’an, in contrast to the usual claim, and it shows the coexistence and acceptance of different dialects or tongues in the community at the time the Qur’an was composed. By opening again the discussion on the importance of regional varieties, this coexistence in the holy book can be used to counter the claims for political power in the Arabic-speaking countries that rest on the promotion of the Qur’an as an example of the unity of one language. Indeed, what we see now as a homogenised form of language was in fact a multilingual text that included terms not only from Arab tribes but also from non-Arab nations.

*Al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya (Prophetic Biography)* contains a number of stories that indicate the multi-dialectal reciting of the Qur’an by the Prophet Muḥammad (PBUH). Where he said the Qur’an is to be read according to seven letters, and that any reading of the Qur’an is a correct one, he was using ‘letter’ to refer to dialects (Al-Tahtawi, 2004, p. 27). This leaves no doubt that there was an awareness of the importance of speaking in multiple ways to the multi-dialectal Islamic communities at that time.

\(^3\) The Persians, Romans, Nabateans, Syriac, and Hebrews.
After the death of the prophet, the subsequent Islamic conquest and expansion of the faith greatly influenced the development of Arabic, spreading the language to, among others, Syria, Egypt, Iraq, North Africa and even Spain. Prior to the extension of the Islamic empire these areas were inhabited by Byzantine, Coptic, Persian and Berber peoples, all of whom were non-Arabic speakers; nevertheless, Arabic was present in these areas through traders and minority groups. The linguistic situation in these places before and after the conquest is markedly different. Holes (2004, p. 34) discusses four aspects common to the process of Arabisation of the conquered areas. The first aspect is the pre-conquest contact with Arabs, especially at the borders of these places where there was some contact with Arab tribes and some migration and settlement in most of the conquered areas apart from North Africa. The second aspect is Islam; Holes (2004) argues that initially this did not have a great influence but that over time Islamisation of the language was necessary for educational purposes. The third aspect is urbanisation, as the Islamic empire established cities in the conquered territories that became centres of regional power; Arabic was the language in these cities. Fourth, migration and assimilation involved great numbers migrating from Arab tribes to the conquered areas, especially to those areas that were less Arabised. In addition, the conversion of the native speakers of these areas to Islam and inter-marriage with Arabic speakers also furthered rapid linguistic change and Arabisation.

Versteegh (1984) claims that, after the conquest, the language used between the conquered people and the conquerors was not Arabic or the former native language but a pidgin or ‘creolised Arabic’, and that the radical development of the modern dialect results from this period of pidginisation and creolisation. However, Holes (2004) has rejected this claim, arguing that there are no linguistic data to support it. Holes (2004) points out that there is no evidence in the Arabic literature of the creation of a pidgin language from seventh or
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4 Arabisation describes a growing cultural influence on a non-Arab area that gradually changes into one that speaks Arabic and/or incorporates Arab culture and Arab identity.
ninth century onwards; although there are references to some linguistic changes by non-Arabs, these references are not sufficient to support the creolisation hypothesis. The variation in the language and the changes are, as Holes (2004, p. 25) suggests, evidence that the language was in transition from its “classical forms to its new many forms”. He emphasises that Arabic has gone through many stages from its original classical form to MSA.

Towards the end of the seventh century, and with the expansion of Abbasid dynasty, Arabic established itself as the lingua franca of the extended Islamic empire. By the end of Abbasid dynasty, Arabic writing witnessed a change in its writing system (Holes, 2004). A translation school was established in Baghdad, where the translation of Greek and Syriac writings began. Also relevant is that Arabic lacked the terminologies relating to science, philosophy, and medicine, the subject matter of most of translated texts. Moreover, most of the translators were Christians and Jews who were familiar with the ST language but had still not mastered Arabic (Holes, 2004). This put the translators in a position to change the style of the writing and to coin new words that reflected the knowledge in the source. Another aspect that contributed not only to changing the style of the language but also to including dialectal and nonstandard features in the language was political fragmentation and the establishment of local dynasties (Holes, 2004, p. 40). Through these changes in the writing style, Middle Arabic set precedents for the codification of dialect.

The term ‘Middle Arabic’ was used, according to Hary (1992), to refer to the entire language that changed after its classical form. It includes literary Middle Arabic, which was mostly written and used in formal correspondence, and dialectal Middle Arabic, which was mostly spoken and used on informal occasions. The texts written in literary Middle Arabic exhibit dialectal features in varying degrees. Hary (1992, p. 56) comments: “[Literary Middle Arabic] is a variety composed of… certain features of Classical Arabic, dialectal elements, pseudo-corrected forms, and standardizations of such forms.”
Holes (2004, p. 41) states that this sociolinguistic situation essentially remained the same until the beginning of the nineteenth century. During the period of the Ottoman Empire, Turkish was spoken, but Turks retained Arabic as the language of Islam and linguistic Turkish influences were not significant (Holes, 2004, p. 42).

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, foundations for the revival of literary Arabic were established in Egypt and the Christian areas of Lebanon and Syria (Holes, 2004). In particular, scholarship programmes during Muhammad Ali’s rule sent Egyptian students to Europe, and these played an interesting role in the development of MSA. When these students came back and were ready to transfer what they had learned, they faced the challenge that Arabic lacked a sufficiently technical vocabulary. This challenge prompted the founding of the school of language headed by Rifā’ah Rāfi’ al-Ṭahāwī. This school aimed to translate diverse books that related to history, philosophy, literature and military studies into Arabic and to simplify and modernise the language.

3.1.2.2. The evolution of Modern Standard Arabic

A simplified modern form of Arabic, MSA, has emerged in recent centuries. The practice of according MSA a higher status and treating it as the pure form of the language and the reflection of Arabic culture has continued. The stigmatisation that arose from the classical motifs outlined in the previous subsection has taken new forms in the modern era. The rhetoric of religious unification has expanded to include nationalism and the call for one Arabic-speaking nation to promote the unification and purity of MSA and to secure its continuity through state institutions (Eisele, 2002, p. 7). The practices of religious and educational institutions, as well as language academies, in the Arab region have played an important role in this process. In particular, the Majami’ alLugha al-’Arabiyya (Academies of the Arabic language) have been established in various Arab cities and countries, such as Damascus, Cairo, Iraq and Jordan, first, to guard the MSA from any dialectal and foreign
influence, and, second, to help modernise Arabic by introducing new terminologies and grammar (Versteegh, 2014, p. 227). Alongside the language academies, educational institutions have adopted, and are still adopting, the rigid traditional attitude towards MSA and the inherited stigmatisation of regional and social dialects. MSA is the official language of education in the Arab region, especially in the public schools. However, MSA do not have native speakers.

According to Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic power (as discussed in the previous chapter), the unification of language plays to the interest of elite educated groups and gives them the right to monopolise knowledge production (Bourdieu, 1991). By applying this concept to Arabic, it can be argued that unification in the classical form of the language was used to expand the Islamic empire. In recent times, the education system has favoured educated groups who have promoted an idea of the perfect language in which they are already competent. This promotion of a supposedly pure form of the language, whether for religious or national reasons, has affected not only the regional dialects but also the minority groups and languages within the Arab region. Educational institutions have been established that serve Arabic speakers and overlook the needs of minorities in the community. This has in turn affected other platforms of knowledge production, such as journalism and literary writing.

The Egyptian writer Yūsuf al-Sibāʿī has given an example in the introduction to his novel alSaqqā Māt about the role of educational institutions in the promotion of MSA and the emphasis on ignoring Egyptian dialect within schools. Al-Sibāʿī narrates an incident when he met the head of language inspectors from the Egyptian education ministry who praised his work but also told him that his books were not included in the school curriculum because of his use of dialect, which, in the opinion of the ministry official, was a fault in the novels. The education system in the Arab region has been built on the demonisation of regional and social
dialects and other language minorities. Curriculums and lectures are given in MSA, and students are expected from their first day in school to write and to take oral and written exams in MSA. MSA is used as a tool of power to stress the importance of the criteria that required by the institution, and is regarded as the language of knowledge and the source of idea formation. The institutionalisation of language has planted in people’s minds “the ideology of standard language” (Bassiouney, 2009). This attitude towards the language makes ordinary people see regional and social dialects as faults that should be corrected. Moreover, it denies them the right to contribute to the institutionalised knowledge production. Sayahi (2014, p. 3) has described this phenomenon as “a diglossia paradox”, whereby people, whether illiterate or educated, share the negative attitude towards dialect and pass it down to their children.

3.1.2.3. Diglossic/multiglossic switching in Arabic

Educational and formal settings have adopted MSA as it is a form of production and distribution of knowledge; but what about the larger community outside the institutionalising settings? How does it deal with the linguistic choices within the community?

As mentioned previously, the Arab region is a diglossic/multiglossic speech community, where more than one dialect is used to communicate. The traditional existence of diglossia/multiglossia in the region takes the form of two or more dialects in the same Arabic speech community, for example, Cairene or Najdi. Although dialect in the Arab region is considered the mother tongue of most, it still does not hold the same status as MSA, since the latter is considered to be the language of education and civilisation. Analysing contemporary linguistic code shifting in Arabic requires a deep analysis of the concept of diglossia, which is a specific phenomenon that exists in certain languages, such as Spanish, Greek, and Italian, as well as Arabic.
The pioneering figure in the history of the concept of diglossia in modern linguistics is the German scholar Karl Krumbacher. Krumbacher coined the term in 1902 to discuss the linguistic shifting in Greek and its coexistence in two varieties, Demotic and Katharevousa, in the twentieth century (Sayahi, 2014). The first application of the term diglossia to Arabic was in an article by William Marcais, “La diglossie arabe” (1930), specifically in relation to northern African dialects, such as Algerian and Tunisian. His article makes an interesting reference to the effect of this linguistic phenomenon on the colonialist educational agenda in the region (Sayahi, 2014). Marcais used the French word diglossie to describe the linguistic situation in North Africa, where he was working at the time. In his view, the situation was one of conflict in which the two varieties “work against each other” (Sayahi, 2014, p. 3). He claimed that one of the linguistic features of the region was the coexistence of two varieties, where one dialect was spoken and the other was written. Ferguson (1959) has developed the notion of diglossia by suggesting high and low varieties: the high variety is used in formal settings, such as religious sermons, political speeches and universities, while the low is used, for example, in family conversations, folk literature and soap operas. He applies this distinction to four languages: Arabic, Modern Greek, Swiss German and Haitian Creole. According to Ferguson:

Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation. (1959, pp. 244–45)

Ferguson argues that nine features can help in the analytical distinction between high and low varieties: function, prestige, literary heritage, acquisition, standardisation, stability, grammar, lexicon, and phonology.
Ferguson’s work was a pioneering contribution to linguistic studies that is still used when describing the history of diglossic switching in Arabic. However, it has been criticised by a number of scholars who consider it too general and idealised to apply specifically to diglossia in Arabic (Bassiouney, 2009, p. 11). Bassiouney (2009) also criticises it for focusing on the relationship between high and low varieties, which does not reflect the specific situation in Arabic where there are two high varieties, namely, classical Arabic and MSA. Both Ferguson (1991) and Bassiouney (2009) have drawn attention to the lack of studies on the sociolinguistic factors that trigger switching. Ferguson’s (1959) analysis is a classic account of the phenomena of diglossia because the two varieties do not exist on two different poles that do not mix; rather, people switch between them, they overlap, and speakers tend to mix them both. There is not a clear-cut usage of them. The concept of diglossia has been refined and extended by a number of scholars, including Ferguson (1991) himself.

The concept was further developed by Fishman (1967), whose work extends it in two new directions. First, he argues that diglossia is not just a phenomenon involving two dialects, but rather can include more than two languages that can be found in the diglossic/multiglossic community. Second, he emphasises the importance of functional distribution in the diglossic community. In particular, diglossia can be used to cover a number of sociolinguistic situations, whether in a monolingual society and the stylistic differences within it, or in multiglossic bilingual speech community where different and even unrelated languages might be used by the speech community.

Bassiouney (2009) maintains that, despite the criticism of Ferguson’s ideas, the suggestion of dividing diglossia into the two poles of high and low is still valid, but that they overlap in terms of function. She draws attention to the fact that the prestigious dialect is not just limited to the high form in the community, but that in each community there is a
dominant low prestigious dialect. This low prestigious dialect, which is sometimes predominates over MSA itself, has gained this position for several socio-economic reasons, such as the dominance of the city over the countryside (for example, in Egypt), or for political reasons like the influence of ruling groups in Gulf countries (Bassiouney, 2009, pp. 18–19).

The idea of having strict high and low poles has been rejected by Badawi (1973). Based on his studies of Egyptian media, he proposes five levels: classical Arabic, MSA, a colloquial level among intellectuals, a colloquial level among the literate, and a colloquial level among the illiterate (p. 89). However, Badawi’s work has been criticised for building on socio-economic factors and implying a social hierarchical bias, especially since he uses education as a criterion on which to base the classification (Bassiouney, 2009; Versteegh, 2014). Another criticism was put forward by Hary (1996, p. 71), who commented that, although Badawi stated that the dividing lines between the levels are imaginary and that no one can determine where a level starts or ends, nevertheless by naming these levels Badawi was already drawing lines between MSA and other dialects.

Hary (1996, p. 71) argues that the solution to avoid the ambiguity in Badawi’s (1973) model is to put the dialect on a continuum with no need to establish levels within this continuum (see Figure 3.1). He maintains that viewing the linguistic situation as a multiglossia continuum is practical since it reflects the gradual transition between the two ends of the continuum. Hary (1996, p. 72) suggests that MSA dialect, represented as Variety A, is placed at one end of the continuum, and that dialect, represented as Variety C, is placed at the other end. The ends of the continuum are thus occupied by hypothetical and ideal varieties that do not exist in reality. What does exist is the speech or the writing that moves along the continuum. Hary argues that, by describing it as ‘continuum’, he is providing a workable framework to analyse what falls in between. The text could be closer to MSA
dialect and exhibit a number of MSA features; or it could be closer to regional or social dialects and exhibit a number of dialectal features. According to Hary, these middle varieties, or what he calls Bn, are countless and have no boundaries or categorisations, in contrast to Badawi’s argument (Hary, 1996, p. 72). Hary (1996) also refers to the end that represents MSA as Acrolect and the end that represents regional/social dialect or colloquial Arabic as Basilect, although I refrain from using these two terms in this research as they still imply a hierarchal connection between the two varieties.
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**Figure 3.1: Hary’s (1996) Arabic continuum**

Hary (1996) claims that most existing written works are moving towards Variety A, but that this does not mean that Standard Arabic is a synonym for writing, since written text could move towards Variety C, as is the case with modern drama, poetry and prose (Hary, 1996, p. 74). Hary (1996, p. 74) points out that it is important, when talking about the language of the literary texts, to use the term ‘standard Arabic’ rather than ‘literary Arabic’, “since modern Egyptian dramatic dialogues, as well as some samples of poetry and prose, are literary Arabic written in the variety Bn closer to the colloquial end of the continuum, and are certainly not composed in standard Arabic”.

The notion of the continuum is also discussed by Versteegh (2014), who criticises Ferguson for implying that the two varieties are mutually exclusive. Instead, Versteegh
(2014, p. 243) argues that the speaker actually “moves along a continuum of speech, in which the two varieties are only extremes”. He also describes code-mixing and argues that extra-linguistic factors (such as linguistic proficiency, education and upbringing) regulate the speaker’s place on the speech continuum.

The examination of the data in the data analysis chapters of this thesis will make use of this notion of the diglossic/multiglossia continuum, but it will mainly focus on the dialectal end of the continuum in the analysis of literary dialectal dialogue (LDD) in the selected novels. This framework will enable the LDD to be considered as a transition between varieties with no boundaries between the two ideal suggested poles.

3.1.2.4. Contemporary attitudes towards dialect and written diglossia/multiglossia

In the mid-twentieth century, the gap between MSA and dialects progressively narrowed (Holes, 2004, p. 46). A number of factors helped to expand the platform for dialect, and especially for written dialect. Høigilt and Mejdell (2017) argue that increasing literacy in the Arab world and the growth of digital technologies have advanced contemporary mass writing in the Arab region. In recent years there has been an increase in the rise of dialects and colloquial Arabic (CA) in the public sphere. Egypt has been at the forefront of taking it to the public written platforms, thanks to its long history of using Egyptian dialect for advertisements, whether written (such as in magazines or on billboards) or oral (such as on television or on radio). Mobile phones and the increase of mobile marketing via text messages have also contributed to this development. For example, Saudi Dialect is used in written text messages by Saudi telecom companies (such as Zain, STC, and Mobily) whose strategic marketing plan favours Saudi dialect for messages designed to appeal to their customers and promote new offers. Similarly, Saudi taxi companies like Craeem have used Saudi dialect in a humorous way to communicate with their customers via text messages or street advertisements. Other factors that have taken dialect from its traditional base include
the creation of social media platforms. Social media has contributed to the expansion of the space for the practice of written diglossic shifting by Arab speakers. The attitude towards MSA and dialect as means of communication has evolved to the point where social media users tend to prefer dialect over MSA to communicate their messages.

Høigilt and Mejdell (2017) have investigated this issue in a project conducted in Cairo and Rabat which aims to measure the frequency of the usage of dialect among literate citizens, within a wider study of the attitude towards written dialect in general. Their study shows a shifting attitude among Arab readers and a greater acceptance of the written form of dialect in recent years. There were no significant differences in terms of age and gender when the groups in the two capitals were asked about the frequency of using the two varieties. Egypt demonstrates great flexibility in using Egyptian dialect for written forms, whereas Rabat is still conservative in terms of the platforms for written dialect. There is, nevertheless, progress in Rabat in the acceptance of dialect as a written form when compared to previous decades. It is noticeable that dialect is accepted as a means of communication on social media platforms (for example, Facebook and Twitter). In Egypt, the platforms have been extended to include written advertisements, short stories and subtitles. This confirms that attitude towards written dialect has improved.

3.2. History of the Arabic novel and dialect

Having discussed Arabic as a language in the previous section, this section focuses on the history of novel, and particularly the dialectal novel, and discusses the attitude that is evoked by the novel in both the Arabic and the English contexts.

3.2.1. The beginning of the novel in Arabic literature

According to some English and French scholars, the novel first came to global prominence during the eighteenth century. However, there is controversy as to whether the novel is an
entirely new form of literature specific to more recent centuries, or whether there are definite precursors to the novel in earlier forms of prose narrative. It is believed that there is a longstanding tradition of narrative literature, including epics, popular stories and myths, all of which are found in the literary history of Europe and Asia (Sakkut, 2000, p. 29). The beginning of the novel as a prominent form of Arabic literature is also an issue of debate among literary scholars. Some scholars argue that previously existing narrative writing from the medieval classical Arabic literary tradition, namely epic folk literature, could serve as the basis of the development of the novel (Badawi, 1993, p. 92; Sakkut, 2000, p. 13). Examples of this kind of narrative writing include Kitāb al-Aghānī (The Book of Songs) by al-Iṣbahānī (d. 967), and Alf Layla wa Lyla (A Thousand and One Nights/Arabian Nights). Another genre of narrative writing is the Maqāmah⁵ such as, the Maqāmāt Abī al-Faḍl Badī‘ al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī.

However, other literary scholars believe that what is now known as the novel in modern Arabic literature is a relatively new form of writing imported from the West, and one which differs from classical Arabic popular stories and epics in terms of its characteristics, such as its absence of rhymed prose (Sakkut, 2000). According to this school of thought, the novel in its modern form was introduced to the Arab region in the nineteenth century through the connection with Western literature, both in the form of the original texts and in works which had been translated (Sakkut, 2000, p. 30). Literary scholars who argue that the novel is an imported literary form believe that the Arab world’s relationship with the West and the constant reading of Western literature affected Arab writers in such a way that it helped to give the Arabic novel the features it now has in modern times, and thus the Arabic novel assumed a completely different form from the conventions of classical Arabic literature (Starkey, 2006, p. 23).

---
⁵ According to Badawi (1993, p. 91), the Maqāmah are “works written in a euphuistic, ornate style in a mixture of rhyming prose and verse”.
The question of who wrote the first novel is much debated among Arabic literary scholars and critics. Allen (1992) and Sakkut (2000) regard previous forms (as described above) that appeared before 1913 as incomplete attempts towards writing the modern Arabic novel. They argue that the first ‘real’ attempt to write a novel in Arabic, and specifically in Egypt, was Zaynab (1913) by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal. It is claimed that the structure of the story in this work and the way in which the characters are represented make this narrative markedly different from any previous attempt at story-telling in Arabic literature, and hence it can be considered the first novel in Arabic literature. However, this claim has been rejected by Syrian scholar Bouthaina Shaaban (1999) in her book Miʿat ʿām min al-riwāyah al-nisāʾīyah al-ʿArabīyah (1899–1999). Shaaban (1999) argues that the first attempt to write a novel in Arabic literature was Husn alʿAwaqib by the Lebanese author Zaynab Fawwaz in 1899, fourteen years before Zaynab. Raḍwa ʿĀshūr (2009) in her book al-Ḥadāthah almumkina: al-Shidyāq's al-Sāq ʿalā al-sāq. al-riwāyah al-ʿarabia al-ʿawla, argues that in fact Aḥmad Fāris al-Shidyāq's novel Al-Sāq ʿalā al-sāq fī mā huwa al-Fāryāq 1855 could be considered the first novel in the Arab world and claims that due to political and literary institutions constrains it has been neglected and not considered the first novel. On other hand, Zaynab can still be considered one of the first novels to use dialect in the dialogue.

In the late 1940s, Arabic writers became more sophisticated in their approaches, and they shifted the thematic focus of the novel from imported romantic themes to an approach along the lines of social realism, in which the changes and developments of society were documented (Sfeir, 1966, p. 942). This transition gave the Arabic novel a respectable status among the other literary genres in the Arab world, and it has led to it becoming an effective tool to reflect the character of different regional societies.
3.2.2. The expanding use of dialect in Arabic novels

The literary scene in the Arab world changed, from the mid-1940s onwards, and there was a transformation in the themes and structure of creative writing. These changes coincided with, and may have been the result of, a number of political and social changes in the region (Abu-Deeb, 2000). Holes (2004, p. 374) states that:

The idea that vernacular Arabic might be a suitable medium for serious literature arose in the 1950s following the widespread move to political independence in the Arab world in the aftermath of World War II. Political independence was accompanied by the beginnings of distinct national Arabic literatures in which the plots, settings, and subject matter reflected contemporary local preoccupations.

During the post-war period, people of the region began to lose their belief in Arab nationalism, or Pan-Arabism, and its nationalist notion of cultural and political unity, and they became more inward-looking and focused on the individual nation. These changes in ideology led to a loss of belief in united nationalism, with the result that there was a fragmentation in Arab nationalism. This fragmentation was further prompted by a number of political and social changes of the time (Abu-Deeb, 2000, p. 338). In particular, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the attitude of the Arab leaders towards this issue contributed greatly to challenging Arab nationalism. The conflict that arose from this tension between the Palestinian movement and the Arab regimes, or even among the Palestinian movements themselves, shook people’s trust. Given this situation, there was much unrest, such as the civil war in Lebanon, the Gulf War and the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait (Abu-Deeb, 2000, p. 338). The idea of one Arab country attacking another Arab country and the divisions between the other countries in the region had a negative impact on the old belief of creating a peaceful united region. At the social level, there were also some changes that affected the social class structure; for example, the huge gap between rich and poor, especially after the oil boom in the region (Abu-Deeb, 2000, p. 338).
In addition, a crucial result of this changing discourse in the region was the emergence of ethnic, gender and sectarian minorities (Abu-Deeb, 2000, p. 339). These minority groups, such as ethnic Kurds and Berbers, and Copts, Shia, and Sunni, strived to gain a position in the social structure of the Arab region, and in so doing helped to awaken the consciousness of other marginalised groups in the area. The recent awareness of the importance of challenging the negative stigma that has surrounded gender issues in the region and the emergence of voices calling for gender equality have also contributed significantly to changing the discourse in the Arab world (Abu-Deeb, 2000, p. 339).

All these factors, when linked to the current literary scene in the region, changed the expectations of Arab readers, and all the old themes that promoted nationalism and a united social structure no longer had the same appeal. This change has had a major impact on the way novels have been written, and changes have occurred in the type of language, themes and settings of the novel (Abu-Deeb, 2000, p. 336). The phenomenon of using dialect in the novel and thereby promoting local stories has grown in recent decades, and the new forms of dialectal novels have become more prominent in the Arab literary scene in recent years. Besides all these sociopolitical factors, the rise of digital technology and social media platforms (see Section 3.1.2.4) has significantly contributed to familiarising readers with dialect as a written form.

3.2.3. The debate about using literary dialect

The use of dialect in novels has been criticised by a number of scholars and has resulted in a heated debate. As the focus of this research is the English and Arabic languages, the debate regarding these two languages is highlighted.

In relation to the English novel, Preston (1982) has opposed the use of dialect in English literary texts, arguing that “writing is a poor, secondary system when compared to speech. No tone or quality of voice can be represented; no helpful and delightful
accompanying body language is seen; and no dramatic or embarrassing pauses or rapid tempo can be provided” (p. 304). In Preston’s view, written literary dialect is static and lacks the performance features of spoken dialect. Fine (1983, p. 324) disagrees with this claim, noting that many writers have managed to translate the performance features into print mediums and have successfully captured tone and dialects; examples include Charles Dickens, William Shakespeare, Mark Twain, and William Faulkner.

Preston also argues that using a literary dialect based on respellings of standard words may affect the opinion of the readers towards the characters, and this may cause negative impressions of the characters. He suggests that departing from the standard convention of language by respelling the words leads the reader “to be critical of the speaker”. The link between the dialectal varieties and social hierarchy relegates “those who do not speak the standard to a lower position” (Preston 1982, p. 322). Fine (1983, p. 324) argues, however, that it is doubtful that writers who use dialect are trying to devalue their characters, and some of them, such as Roger Abrahams (1972) and Edith Folb (1980) have used literary dialect because they truly appreciate the spoken dialect and the people they were trying to represent in their writing. In addition, Berthele (2000, p. 590) maintains that using dialect could have a “positive moral connotation, establishing the speaker as natural, sincere, without artifice”.

A similar but more controversial debate on dialect has come to the surface in Arabic literature. The use of dialect in twentieth- and twenty-first-century Arabic literature has caused intense debate between authors and literary critics, especially regarding whether to use dialect or MSA when writing dialogue in novels. This has been a huge issue among authors of Arabic literature, and there are proponents of both sides of the debate until recently.

The proponents of MSA have made four main arguments in support of their position (Sulaymān, 1993). First, they argue that MSA has a rich vocabulary and structure, and that it
is thus best suited to expressing the most complicated ideas, such as philosophical dialogue. Second, the regulated vocabulary and modes of expression of MSA have clear and universal implications for Arabic language across time, unlike the multitude of local dialects, which can sometimes only be understood by contemporaneous readers. As an example, Ṣāḥib Ḥussein, a prominent twentieth-century Arabic novelist, was a great supporter of the use of MSA in novels and criticised any use of Arabic dialect in literary writing, whether in the narrative or the dialogue. Furthermore, he also believed that no Arabic dialect could be more grammatically and structurally correct than MSA, and that it is thus better to make an effort to improve and simplify MSA to meet readers’ expectations (Musli, 2010). Another strong supporter of this school of thought is the writer Maḥmūd Taymūr who began writing in the Carian dialect, but, after joining the language academy, shifted his attitude completely to support MSA in literary work – to the extent that he went back to his dialectal works and rewrote them in a more formalised Arabic (Somekh, 1990).

Third, defenders of MSA argue, from a religious point of view, that MSA is a means by which to protect the Qur'an, and they sometimes even claim that the reason for learning Arabic is to understand the Islamic religion and to read the Qur'an. One way of maintaining this sacred relationship between the Qur'an and MSA is the use of MSA in novels. This argument has been considered and challenged earlier in this chapter, where it was suggested that it is driven by the political power of institutions.

Fourth, the proponents of MSA also argue that its use is necessary to ensure that novels are readable by a large number of people. They note that dialectical forms of Arabic are limited to specific regions, and that novels which use LDD will not have much appeal beyond the borders of that dialect’s country or region. However, the sales and circulation of LDD novels in the Arab world indicate that this claim is not necessarily accurate. Saudi writer Yousef Al-Mohameed has commented on this issue by saying that LDD does not limit
the distribution of his novels in Arab countries as most of his readers are from across the region.\(^6\) His novel *al-Qārūrah* appeared in a series published by an Egyptian public organisation, ‘al-Hiy’ah al-‘amah Līqūṣūr al-Thāqāfah’ in Cairo, and the publisher ran out of stock in a matter of months, demonstrating that Egyptians read the novel despite its central Najdi dialect dialogue. Al-Mohaimeed argues that dialogue is part of the narrative and that LDD does not affect the content or meaning of the novel, as he usually tries to simplify it.

Proponents of using Arabic dialects in the dialogue of novels argue that these dialects richly express the real feelings and emotions of the characters. They support this argument with two principles (Sulaymān, 1993). First, a sense of realism is added to the novel when characters are allowed to speak in their own dialects, especially when the character is illiterate or has limited education. Second, the use of dialect is an important part of characterisation, because each character speaks in their own dialect in a manner that expresses their real feelings. Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm, for example, argues that he cannot create a character such as a taxi driver or a maid who speaks with MSA, because that is not the way they speak in reality, and to make them do so would create an artificial atmosphere in the novel (Musli, 2010). Yūsuf al-Sībā‘ī (1952), in his introduction to *alSaqqā’ Māt*, has elaborated on this issue from his perspective as a novelist. He emphasises that there should be no conflict in the matter of using MSA or LDD in writing dialogue because a writer cannot make a character speak MSA when they do not do so in reality. Al-Sībā‘ī (1952) has shared a sarcastic anecdote about his reaction to the comment that he received and how it nearly affected the writing of the dialogue in his novel *alSaqqā Māt*:

> when I started to write this novel I remembered the education ministry requirements […] so I determined to set up an impenetrable fence that would prevent dialectal expressions from seeping in […] which are determined to impose themselves in the context […] I tried to write in an attempt to conduct the dialogue between the characters in the story in MSA,

---

\(^6\) (Y. Al-Mohaimeed, personal communication, January 15, 2016).
but no sooner had I written a few pages and the writing is getting warmed up until I found the characters in the story speak, in spite of me, in dialect. I have tried in vain to stop them at their limit […] and threatened them that the eloquence of the ministry of education will not add the book to their curriculum […] (p. 4, my translation)

al-Sibā‘ī (1952) ended this anecdote by reminding himself that he wrote for the public rather than for the educated elite, and that the public wants literature that they can understand and interact with. Al-Sibā‘ī (1952, p. 6) has stressed that writers should give freedom to their thoughts without limiting them by linguistic conventions; ultimately, language should follow ideas, not vice versa. Yousef Al-Mohaimeed has said that he uses LDD because he finds it difficult to make a Saudi character speak in MSA when all the events around him would naturally lead him to use his local dialect. He feels that local dialect has a stronger effect than MSA, since LDD makes the atmosphere in the novel warmer and more intimate, and it increases the artistic honesty of the novel. He also draws attention to how LDD has an influence on the readers, because LDD make readers more emotionally attached to the plot of the novel.⁷

A third group of authors has tried to reconcile the two views outlined above, especially by using a mixture of the two levels of language in their dialogue. Najīb Maḥfūẓ, for example, only uses Arabic dialect when the character speaking is referring to a proverb or a traditional song, or if there is something culturally specific that would be hard to explain in MSA (Musli, 2010). This strategy seems to add a cultural flavour to the text without the need to use the dialect for the entire dialogue.

3.2.4. Saudi and Egyptian dialectal novels

The focus of this research is on two dialects: Egyptian and Saudi. As discussed early in chapter, Egypt has a flexible attitude towards dialect by comparison with other countries.

---

⁷ (Y. Al-Mohaimeed, personal communication, January 15, 2016).
There is a long tradition of embodying the use of dialect in the Egyptian novel. The call for the ‘ʻāmmīyah’, which is the use of dialect, started in Egypt in the mid-1940s. This movement called for using dialect in all modes of communication in the country, including education and newspapers, and this movement had its supporters in the literary field, with the result that attempts at using dialect in novels, which had previously been timid, became bolder and more apparent.

In the Egyptian novel Zaynab (1913), Haykal set an early example of using literary dialect in the dialogue, although this was not practised again for a long time (Kilpatrick, 1992, p. 226). The use of dialect in the Egyptian novel was prominent in Tawfīq al-Ḥakīm’s ʻAwdat al-rūḥ (1933). Egyptian novels have gone through many stages. Initially, in the pioneering period of the 1920s and 1930s, during which there was early exploration of the novel as a literary form and its techniques, a cautious approach to the themes of the novel was adopted (Kilpatrick, 1992, p. 233). Then, in the 1940s, there was an important shift in Egyptian literary forms, as emerging writers sought greater realism. The ‘ʻāmmīyah movement’ emerged in the literature of the mid-1940s, and since then writers began using dialect in different ways in the text, with some, such as Najīb Maḥfūz, as mentioned before borrowing cultural references and dialectal expressions. Others used LDD, which is the most common practice in using dialect in novels these days; good example is al-Bāb al-Maftuh by Laṭīfah al-Zayyāṭ. However, in recent decades, and as discussed previously, the attitude towards dialect has changed: writers have to some extent overcome the dilemma of whether to write with dialect or not, and a number of contemporary writers, among them Ḥamdī Abū Julayyil, Youssef Rakha, and Omar Taher, have begun to use one or a mix of Egyptian dialects to write the dialogue of novels. Moreover, some writers have written entire novels, including the narrative parts, in dialect; examples include Safaa ‘abd Elmen’im’s Mn Ḥalwit Al Rooḥ (2000) and Ghada Abdel’s Ayza Atgowaz (2008).
Unlike Egypt, Saudi Arabian literary scene took a long time until it accepted dialect as a written medium in novels. Back to the development of novels in Saudi Arabia, the early attempts at writing novels started in the 1930s; however, these attempts have not been considered successful for several reasons. Al-Ghadeer (2017, p. 397) argues that the early novels were not seen as a form of entertainment, so their readership was limited; this was also due to the domination of poetry in Saudi Arabia. In addition, literary critics have argued that the artistic structure of these novels was weak and loaded with traditional themes (Jarīdī, 2008; Al-Niʿmi, 2009). These novels were not primarily intended for readers’ enjoyment; rather, they focused on using the novel as a means to discuss topics such as cultural and social reform (Al-Ghadeer, 2017), beside MSA was dominated in the language of these novels. Since the 1980s, changes in Saudi society, such as the spread of education, and specifically girls’ education, and the literary openness to other cultures, have helped writers to develop their themes in accordance with global literature. The increase in the number of female novelists has also challenged conventional ideas about gender relations and brought to the fore different critical themes relating to gender, race, sexuality and social issues (Jarīdī, 2008; Al-Ghadeer, 2017). Saudi writers since the 1980s have used their work as a medium to express their opinions and to touch on more diverse sociopolitical topics where the written dialect starts to appear in the novels.

However, Saudi novels that published by outside publishing houses have affected the image that promoted about the Saudi literature. Al-Ghadeer (2017, p. 407) questions the role of large publishing houses in the Arab region and Saudi authors themselves in creating this “internalized orientalizing discourse”. She argues that a glimpse into the way these books have been presented (for example, proactive blurbs, the mention of the nationality of the author, controversial titles) has revealed a “new consumer culture industry” in the Arab region in relation to Saudi novels.
In relation to the LDD presence in the Saudi context, it is not clear when the trend of using dialect in Saudi novels exactly began, but there are some early examples in the 1980s of dialect in the novel’s dialogue, such as in Abdelrahman Munif’s *Cities of Salt* (1984). MSA has had, and still has to some extent, a strong position in the public discourse of the country; it was first and foremost the language of religious discourse in the country, and it has dominated the education sector. Breaking from this public discourse was a dilemma for Saudi authors, since the general attitude in literary production was to praise the use of MSA in the novel. However, there has been a significant increase in the presence of LDD in Saudi novels in the last decade such as in the work of Badryah El-Bishr, Siba Al-Harez, and Ibraheem Abbas. This has coincided with the development of technologies and the huge expansion of social media platforms; which might indicate the recognition by Saudi readers that dialect can be appropriate to writing.

### 3.3. Conclusion

This chapter has provided the background for understanding the linguistic issues and novels that are the focus of this thesis. It began by discussing briefly the history of English, with a particular focus on the formality continuum. Then explored in depth the Arabic linguistic tradition and the contemporary attitude to diglossia/multiglossia and dialect in its written form. The second section focused on the novel and the beginning of the novel as a literary form in the Arab region. The scholarly debate around the validity of using dialect in novels was highlighted. The chapter ends with a quick analysis of the novel and LDD in relation to the Saudi and Egyptian contexts.
Chapter Four

Data and Methodology

4.0. Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections. First, the methodological approach of the research is discussed in detail, which includes consideration of the macro and micro methods used. At the macro-level, the descriptive-explanatory approach is explained. At the end of this section, the micro-methods of textual comparison and interviews are introduced. As the focus of this thesis is Saudi and Egyptian dialects, the second section of the chapter explains why Egyptian and Saudi dialectal novels have been chosen. After that, the chapter introduces the novels that are used as the primary research data.

4.1. Methodology

The nature of this research is empirical, which, according to Williams and Chesterman (2002), is the kind of research that “seeks new data, new information derived from the observation of data and from experimental work; it seeks evidence which supports or disconfirms hypotheses, or generates new ones” (p. 58). This study did not rely on a pre-existing hypothesis; rather, it examined the data so that a hypothesis emerges from this. To serve the purposes of this data-driven research, a mixed methods approach was applied to data collection and analysis. On the macro level, a descriptive-explanatory method was used
to approach the data, whereas on the micro level the data was collected and examined by using the following methods: (1) textual comparison; and (2) interviews with translators. At the micro level, these methods were used in order to explore the multiple layers of the translation product/process and to “provide clues for the explanation of translational phenomena” (Brownlie, 2003, p. 115).

An important point to clarify in the beginning is that I chose to interview only the two translators who I am focused on with regard to style because I am mainly interested in explanation at the level of the individual translator.

**4.1.1. Descriptive-explanatory approach**

In order to investigate the phenomenon of the use of LDD in Egyptian and Saudi novels, and how LDD has been translated, a descriptive-explanatory analysis was adopted as the general methodological approach. The descriptive-explanatory approach was undertaken by conducting a comparative analysis of contemporary Saudi and Egyptian novels in addition to other non-textual research, such as interviews with two Arabic/English literary translators.

Toury’s descriptive-explanatory analysis goes beyond description to offer a notion of explanation to the translational phenomena. It emphasises the need to move from a source-orientated approach to a target-orientated approach in order to examine and explain the nature of the translation product and/or process. Toury (1980) argues that source-oriented theories are abstract and insufficient as a point of departure for research, since they are mainly preoccupy with the source text and protecting it.. He stresses the empirical nature of a descriptive study of translation:

> Since the object-level of translation studies consists of actual facts of ‘real life’ – whether they be actual texts, intertextual relationship, or models and norms of behavior – rather than the merely speculative outcome of preconceived theoretical hypotheses and models, it is undoubtedly, in essence, an empirical science. (Toury, 1985, p. 16)
Translation, according to Toury (1995, p. 24), is a product of the host culture, so the function, process and product of translation according to him is studied inconsideration of TC. The main aim is to understand and explain the translation product and/or process rather than to suggest or present the right or correct translation. This approach does not neglect ST, but it shifts the attention to study the relation between the TT, the TC and the process of the TT’s production. Toury (1995, p. 1) believes that such an approach is the “best means of testing, refuting, and especially modifying and amending the very theory, in whose terms research is carried out”.

As mentioned above, this target-oriented approach does not exclude the ST or the translation relationship, but it changes the priority and level of attention. It begins observation from where the translation activities end, which is the translated text and its position in the social and literary system of the TC. Then the observations go back to study the process, which involves comparing segments from the ST and the TT to identify regularities. Ultimately, it will formulate a generalisation of norms and establish implications for decision-making in future research (Toury, 1995).

One of Toury’s central sociological notions is the concept of translational norms. This concept was previously discussed by Levý (1969) and Even-Zohar (1971), but it was Toury who expanded the concept and took it further (Brownlie, 1999, p. 7). The exploration of norms in a broader sense in translation studies began with his article, published in the 1980s, entitled “The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation Studies” and was then expanded in his 1995 book *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Malmkjær, 2008). Toury (1995) argues that norms are socio-cultural phenomena that lie and move on a scale between two extreme of absolute rules and individual idiosyncrasies. He claims that, by their nature, norms are unstable: they can appear, change and disappear over the time. They are formed through socialisation, which involves individuals shaping these norms or other kinds of sanctions
through their activities (Toury, 1995, p. 62). Norms, according to Toury, can be defined as “the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations” (Toury, 1995, pp. 54–55). Toury states that norms exist in translation practice, but that they are not just limited to the translation process; rather, they are involved at every level of the translation experience. The norms of translational behaviour can be identified by studying the text and identifying regular patterns in the translation. Regularities of the behaviour in the data can indicate the existence of translational norms.

The types of translational norms have been illustrated by Toury (1995) who proposed three types of these norms. First the Initial norms which are related to the basic choices of translation, according to which the translator adopts one of the two following approaches according to Toury (1995, p. 57): either s/he follows the norms in the ST and, in doing so, determines a translation’s adequacy; or s/he follows the predominant norms in TL and culture and, in doing so, determines the translation acceptability. The approach to the translation determines textual procedures (Nord, 2002). Preliminary norms are Toury’s second type: these are concerned, first, with the translation policy (refers to factors govern the choice of source works to be translated) and, second, with the directness of the translation (the tolerance for indirect translation). Operational norms – Toury’s third type of translational norms – relate to the direct decisions made during the translation process. Operational norms can be subdivided into two types: matricial norms, which concern the distribution of linguistic materials in the text, regarding the location of the text, segmentation, omission and addition; and textual linguistic norms, which concern the relation between the ST and the TT, that is, what remains under the translation process and what will change. Textual linguistic norms which govern the choice of target textual-linguistic material to replace ST textual and
linguistic material. Textual linguistic norms can be general and apply to the translation by translation, or they can be particular and related to a particular text or mode of translation.

He proposed that two major sources for investigating the transitional norms: textual sources (the translated text itself), and extratextual sources (such as statements by translators or others involved in the process of translation). He argues that text is “the primary product of norms-regulated behaviour”, in contrast “normative pronouncements” may be biased or show a contradiction between the explanation and the actual behaviour results (Toury, 1995, p. 65). However, the combination of both is helpful in identifying translational norms.

Toury’s approach has received a number of criticisms in the field of translation studies. One criticism is that the interpretation of the translation may include some subjectivity or insufficient self-criticism on the part of the researcher who studies the translation (Arrojo, 1998; Hermans, 1999). In relation to this criticism, I am aware of the bias and subjectivity that can occur, especially when analysing the data. While analysing the data and interviewing the translators, I tried to be self-reflective and to remind myself that the research is about examining what the translators are doing, not how they should be doing it. The observation is still could be considered imperfect and the influence of the researcher personal judgment and interpretation are acknowledged in all stages.

Another aspect that might help to minimise subjectivity in this study is the nature of the present research, which has used a mixed methods approach at the micro level of the research. This includes quantitative and qualitative textual analysis and interviews with translators, which, taken together, might provide substantial data to minimize the potential biased in findings. A detailed analysis of each method and how it was applied to investigate the research questions will be elaborated in the following section.

This approach has also been criticised for neglecting the translator as an individual agent operating in a situation particular to that individual. The target-oriented approach can
result in a shortage in the sources of explanation for the translation behaviour (Pym, 1998). The focus in this research is on studying the translator’s individual style, so it is necessary to pay attention to the individual agency of the translator.

To highlight the importance of the translator’s role, I adapt, in the explanatory part, a broader maximal methodological approach, which is the source of explanations proposed by Brownlie (2003). Using a case study of the English translations of the works of French philosopher Jean-François Lyotard, Brownlie (2003) proposes four possible sources of explanations of translational phenomena: the individual situation; textuality; translators’ norms; and the target culture field.

First of all, the individual situation and individual translator, according to Brownlie (2003), should be considered as a source of explanation of the translational phenomena, since the whole process depends partly on the translator’s own choices. The individual situation refers to the context of the production of a certain translation and the individual translator’s particular attitude and choices. More precisely, the context of situation is related to factors such as the translator’s background, which includes their experience as a translator, knowledge of subject matter, and linguistic/translational knowledge and skills. Other factors that relate to the context of situation are the translator’s working conditions (for example, time constraints, payment, equipment), collaboration with others, the role of the editor, the type of publication (book, article) or genre, the date of publication, the nature of the ST, and whether the TT is a first or revised version (Brownlie, 2003, p. 116). The translators’ different attitudes and choices are related to some extent to the variations in the style and the translator’s preferences. According to Brownlie (2003, p. 118), when the descriptive analysis coincides with the translator’s statement, then it can be presumed that “the translator’s attitudes played a conditioning role with respect to behaviour”. However, it is not always
straightforward, since translators sometimes show a mixed attitude and uncertainty or they give a statement that does not correspond with their translation products.

Textuality is the second source of explanations. This relates to the language and function of the text. The language of the text could regulate translators in the translation process. Brownlie (2003) gives four conditions when textuality plays a role in the translational phenomena: the TT as a text in its own right (the addition of inter- and intra-sentence connectives, the addition of repetition, and the creation of semantic links and syntactical parallelism); the TT as a TL text produced for a target culture audience (adaptations to TL norms); the TT representing the ST by acting as a substitute (imitative representation, such as borrowing or literal translation); and intertextual relations. Obviously, these conditions could co-exist in a single translation.

The third source of explanation is translators’ norms, which refers to the acceptable approach when translating a certain type of text. Some textual patterns found through descriptive analysis might be attributed to the translators’ norms. Translators’ norms are more related to regularities in the translator’s practice in translating a particular text. To investigate the existence of these norms, Toury (1995) and Brownlie (2003) suggest using a double approach consisting of textual analysis and translator’s statement. Brownlie states that the benefit of adapting double methods for investigating regularities is that it overcomes the shortage in findings or the inaccuracy from using one method, and it adds depth to the analysis. However, the use of two methods is intended for the purpose of understanding and “descriptive richness” rather than for seeking validity (Brownlie, 2003, p. 126). Brownlie outlines four relationships between survey data and corpus data: (A) match (correspondence) between translators’ statements and corpus data where there is consensus among translators and regularity in the corpus data; (B) match (correspondence) between translators’ statements and corpus data where there is a lack of consensus among translators and lack of regularity in
the corpus data; (C) non-correspondence between translators’ statements and corpus data where there is consensus among translators but irregularity in the corpus data; (D) non-correspondence between translators’ statements and corpus data where there is a lack of consensus among translators but regularity in the corpus data (Brownlie, 2003, pp. 126–128).

In case of contradiction between translators’ statement and corpus data the regularities should not be taken to indicate normative consensus (Brownlie, 2003, p.130).

Finally, the fourth source of explanation is the target culture field, which is the intersection between the translation and other fields, such as publishing and academia. This is related to the normative notions that are imposed by other agents, such as those commissioning a translation and readers. These other agents can subsequently influence the translation.

Brownlie (2003, p. 115) states that these sources of explanation for translational phenomena do not operate separately; rather, they overlap with each other, and the extent of the overlap depends on the wider social context. There may be more than one source of explanations that work together at the same level or in different directions to give a maximal explanation for the translational phenomena under investigation.

The present research uses Brownlie’s (2003) sources of explanation as guidance for the explanatory part of the study, as they help to give more agency to the translator as an independent player in the process. For investigating the textuality in the ST, the analysis of the function of LDD in the ST also helps to direct attention to the communicative function of the ST, and more precisely to ascertaining how these functions have influenced the translation procedures. This also highlights the other factors that affect the process of translating LDD. The findings from both textual analysis and interviews will be used to give more context and understanding to the practice of translating LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels in these two translators’ works.
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4.1.2. Micro-level methods

4.1.2.1. Comparative textual analysis

Comparative textual analysis was conducted as the first method in order to collect and categorise the primary data for the research. A key initial stage in the comparative analysis involved analysing LDD in the STs. The source textual analysis was concerned with confirming the diglossia/multiglossia in the novels and then locating the LDD in the diglossic texts. This aimed to understand the differences between the LDDs that were used in the novels, such as which Saudi or Egyptian dialects are presented in the text. In particular, this stage focused on providing evidence as to why the selected novels can be considered LDD novels, how the LDD in the novels is represented, how it is semantically and syntactically different from the spoken dialect in everyday life, and, finally, what changes authors have made to the spoken dialect when they write their dialectal dialogue. To identify the LDD, I used my own knowledge of the dialects, consulted with other native speakers, studied the profile of the characters in the novel, and make use of the oral (podcast, radio and television shows) and written (such as dictionaries, forums and social media) media material. It should be noted that the transliteration of the LDD in the discussion chapters also made use of these resources.

After completing the identification process of the STs, I then identified the availability of the English translations of the selected texts. After confirming the availability of the TTs, I started to create unidirectional parallel corpora. To obtain satisfactory results that covered the procedures that were used in the English translations of the selected novels, I worked on each novel with its translation individually. LDD and its translation were mapped into a series of paired segments. These series of paired segments were organised by following two steps. First, the data was compared, by identifying LDDs in the STs and analysing all of the LDDs and their translation. After this, each paired segment was divided into a number of
categories depending on the adopted translation procedures. The program that was used to organise the paired segments was Microsoft Excel. Each novel had its own Excel file that was divided into a number of sheets, with each sheet representing a translation procedure. In a word document, and while I was doing the analysis for each individual novel and its translation, I added my comments and analysis for a substantial number of examples to assist me in the description. It is important to clarify that the Microsoft Excel program was used only as a management tool for clearly organising the data. After that, the data was turned by Excel into visual charts to facilitate understanding it. Where relevant, the quantitative data will be included in the data analysis chapters in the form of percentages. Due to the overlap between procedures, where a number of procedures were used simultaneously for the same sentences, the percentage will be an approximation. The main expected outcome from the quantitative method was to give an indication or estimation of the frequencies of procedures in the translations. In addition, the quantitative evidence was intended to strengthen the validity of the observations, especially in relation to stylistic features, and to highlight the significance of stylistic features that might be overlooked in the first descriptive chapter.

The detailed mixed method linguistic comparison provides an understanding of the translation procedures in each novel and its translation, which helped me to generate the final hypotheses. Moreover, studying the language of the text helps as Munday (2008a) states in understanding each translator’s style.

Most importantly, this method was the information base for the second method that I adopted, which were interviews with the two translators. The textual analysis helped in structuring the interview questions and pointing to the major issues concerning each novel and its translation.
4.1.2.1.1. **Selections**

It is clearly impractical and impossible to include the whole selected translations in the analysis, so a sample from the texts should be selected. The selection technique used in this research was inspired by purposive sampling, which “involves selecting a sample based on pre-defined critical parameters” (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013, p. 34). A focus on the characteristics of the population might help in answering the research questions. The selections were made in two stages when conducting the comparative textual analysis. In the first stage of the data analysis (as discussed in Chapter Five), the focus was on mapping the translation procedures adopted to translate LDD in Arabic diglossic/multiglossic novels regardless of who the translator of the text was. The selection method was applied at this stage across each novel by choosing a sample from a number of chapters. The chosen chapters were from those that include more LDD, whereas those chapters that include more narrative than dialogue were excluded. However, due to the variation of length between each novel – which meant that a chapter in one novel could equal in length three chapters in another – no maximum of 15 chapters from any one novel were included in the selection. Within the selected chapters I divided each paired segment in each novel, as stated previously, into separate categories, where each category represents a translation procedure. Next, I select examples from each category to represent each procedure in the discussion chapters. The representative examples were chosen based on internal and external factors. External factors that are relate to the context for example the regional varieties. The internal factors are the linguistically representative of each procedure.

In the second stage of the data analysis (which is presented in Chapter Six), the selection was changed. I continued with selections, but with a slightly different approach to that of the first stage of the data analysis. In the second stage, an in-depth study of the work of two translators – Anthony Calderbank and Marilyn Booth – was carried out. The work of
each translator was divided into a main data set and a subsidiary data set. Two novels (one Saudi and one Egyptian) from each translator were chosen as the main data set, and all the LDD in these novels and their translations were comparatively analysed.

However, the situation was slightly different in relation to Booth since in the Saudi novel Girls of Riyadh there was a conflict between the novel’s author and the translator which consequently affected the final version of the novel. Booth has said that permission was needed from the publisher to give examples from her original draft, and she states in her published article “Translator v. author” that she herself needed permission to publish examples from the original in the article: “permission was given by Penguin for this essay’s use of quotations from my original version of the translation” (Booth, 2008, p. 210). I tried to contact Penguin to get permission to use examples from the original draft or at least the first ten chapters of the Booth’s translation draft; after a number of exchanges, Penguin sent an email stating that they hold no rights over the production material. This was later mentioned to Booth in the interview, but she reiterated that, according to her agreement, even she needed permission to use examples from her draft, and that any examples should not be used to “malign” or “insult the translation”. Due to this, there was a difficulty in determining the style of the translator from the published translation, thus, it was decided that it could not be used as a main data set nor could any quantitative data be presented from it. Consequently, I used another Egyptian novel from which to extract the whole LDD in order to have enough primary data. The published version of Girls of Riyadh has still been used, but in order to compare it with the examples from the draft translation that were published in Booth’s article.

As for the subsidiary data set for each translator, selection was once again used. The analysis followed the same procedures as those in Chapter Five, where comparative analyses of selected LDD were conducted. The reason for this subsidiary analysis stage was to confirm

---

8 See the description of the novel in the data section for further details.
9 See Appendix 4.
the translation patterns and procedures that were shown in the main data analysis stages. I selected examples that were again interesting, telling and revealing about the procedures that emerged from analysing the translator’s style. These selections were chosen to be included in the data analysis discussion for each translator. Again, Microsoft Excel was used to organise the paired segments into separate sheets and to give an overview of the quantitative data. A Word document was used along with Excel to enable me to explain the context of the sentences and to avoid isolating the paired segments from their ST and TT contexts.

Any selection method may imply subjectivity, especially when studying the style of an individual translator. Leech and Short (2007), in a parallel discussion about measuring the style of the authors, state that in general any sampling or selection method may involve some subjective decision on the part of the researcher. They propose that the list of linguistic features to be counted is indefinitely large, if we want a quantitative description of a text to have a fine enough mesh to catch the linguistic details which contribute to reader’s feeling for differences of style. The quest for a completely objective measurement of style must be abandoned on this score, as well as on that of determining frequencies for the language as a whole. (Leech & Short, 2007, p. 37)

This is an important consideration in relation to the translation analysis, especially in the case of a translator’s style. I tried to overcome this difficulty by making sure that the selection was representative of the main scope of the research, which is LDD and the procedures for translating LDD.

4.1.2.2. Process-oriented approach: Interviews

As I am interested in explanation at the level of the individual translator, interviews were used as a second method in this research to investigate the relation between the translation of LDD and the translators’ stylistic choices. I interviewed the two translators, Anthony Calderbank and Marilyn Booth, in order to investigate the reasons and motives that led them to choose certain procedures. In addition, this method was conducted to explore the extent to
which the translation procedures were influenced by TL constraints, the idea of the implied readers of the translations, the translators’ perception of their role, and the role of ST authors and publishing houses. The interviews were ‘semi-structured’, which means that “an interview schedule tends to be used, but more of the questions are open-ended and there is more flexibility to allow variation in the order in which the questions are asked, as well as to introduce new questions” (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013, p. 172). I concluded that semi-structured interviews were best suited to the research as they enabled me to cover a greater number of topics in addition to providing an open space for the interviewees to talk individually about their own work.

The interviews were conducted either by meeting the interviewee in person or by using Skype. The main language of the interviews was English, although there were a few Arabic words used in the context (these were later translated into English when quoted in the research). Both interviews were recorded with a recording device and I subsequently transcribed the recordings onto a Word document. I interviewed Calderbank first; we arranged a Skype call and the interview lasted for 1 hour 40 minutes. There was a further follow-up interview two months later on Skype which lasted for 1 hour 8 minutes. The interview with Booth was face to face and took place in her office at the University of Oxford; the interview lasted for 1 hour 19 minutes.

The interview questions were divided into three sections. The first section contained general questions about the translators’ background, how they learnt Arabic, where they had travelled in the Arab world, and how many dialects they have been exposed to and could speak. This section was intended to gain background knowledge about their relationship with Arabic dialects. There were a few technical issues and time limitations regarding the interview with Booth, and due to these limitations I was unable to ask her the questions from

---

10 For reasons of confidentiality, the full interviews are not included in the appendices, but excerpts from them are provided in Appendix 3.
the first section about the translator’s background. Also, the discussion at the beginning of the interview was not recorded. However, this information was collected from her personal page on the University of Oxford website and from her previous interviews.

The second section of interview questions related to the translation approach in general and covered the themes that each translator prefers to translate, whether they are keen to contact authors before or during the translation, the readers they have in mind while translating the text, and the role and influence of publishing houses. In addition, they were asked questions about their study of the language in the STs, whether they pay attention to the different voices in novels, their approach to reflecting the voices in the translation, and their techniques for building the TT characters.

In the third section, data-driven questions were asked about the translations themselves. The construction of the questions was based on the analysis of the novels. Both translators were asked detailed questions about each specific procedure that emerged from the comparative textual analysis, and they were provided with a number of examples from their translations. This section aimed to understand the underlying translation procedures that emerged from the textual analysis. It also helped to reduce any bias that had occurred in the data analysis discussion of the procedures.

After interviewing both translators and transcribing the interviews, qualitative analysis was performed with the help of NVivo. The lengths of the two interview transcripts were hard to manage, as Calderbank’s interview was 18,767 words and Booth’s interview was 12,931 words. Thus, the manual analysis was difficult to perform and it was necessary to use a tool to facilitate the comparative analysis. NVivo was used in this research as a data management tool for the analysis of the two interviews (Wong, 2008). The focus was more on coding the interviews under certain nodes to give more time to determine the translator’s tendencies, to recognise themes and to explore the translation practices.
More specifically, the transcripts of both interviews were imported to the program for a comparison analysis, the investigation of the themes that could address the research questions and for tracking the connections or differences between both translators’ practices. The analysis followed a thematic approach: I read through each interview and coded the themes for subsequent creation of a comparison table for the two translators. The analysis generally followed the themes identified in the textual analysis, but there were a number of categories and subcategories that emerged from the interviews with both translators. Then I coded the answers to the interview questions by selecting translators’ comments and putting them under certain ‘nodes’ (for example, dialect exposed to, and relation with authors).

Thematic analysis in NVivo helped in organising the data and in understanding the relationship between nodes. This was especially useful for clearly ascertaining the similarities and differences between the two translators’ practices.

The outcome that was expected from the interviews was to obtain empirical data directly from the two translators and to gain access to their thoughts and opinions regarding the translation of LDD in their translations.

4.2. Data

4.2.1. The rationale behind choosing Saudi and Egyptian dialects

My starting point to map the history of the translation of Arabic novels into English was to study Altmann’s (2005) *Modern Arabic Literature in Translation* and the bibliographical list attached to Büchler et al. (2011). The two bibliographies list the literary works, such as
poetry, fiction, drama, memoir and short stories that were translated from Arabic into English. I examined the lists and extracted the names of translators who have translated Saudi and Egyptian novels. However, these two bibliographies do not go further than 2011, so to check the most recent publications I consulted UNESCO’s Index Translationum for new publications from Arabic into English. The next step was to check individual translators and extract their works relating to Saudi and Egyptian novels. Given that not all the translators have websites to document their recent translations, I had to conduct online research with websites that regularly update lists of the work of translators from Arabic to English, such as ArabLit – Arabic Literature and Translation, the Wikipedia page entitled “List of Arabic English translators”, Goodreads, and Amazon Books. I checked the name or the profile for translators in these lists or articles and I finalised the selection of translators based on two criteria: first, they had to have translated at least one Saudi novel and one Egyptian novel; and second, both novels had to contain dialect in the dialogue (whether or not the dialogue consists partly or fully of dialect). Due to the specificity of the research scope, any work that did not fit these two criteria was excluded from my list. A number of 5 translators’ works were chosen in the first data analysis stage. The aim is to only focus on translation procedures and get an overview about the practice of translating LDD. In the second data analysis stage, I choose two translators out of these five to conduct an in-depth descriptive analysis at the level of the individual translator.

Why choose Saudi and Egyptian dialectal novels? The rationale behind selecting these two dialects is based on a number of reasons. The first reason is the contrasting nature of writing dialect in the two countries. The history of writing and publishing novels in Egypt began in the early twentieth century, whereas the first real attempt at writing a novel in Saudi Arabia was, as mentioned in the this chapter, not until the middle of the century, and novel-writing did not reach its full potential in Saudi Arabia until the 1980s. Egypt has partially to
some extent overcome the discussion of whether or not to use a dialect and has moved on to discussing the sufficiency of dialect as an independent means of writing; in Saudi Arabia, however, the former discussion is ongoing within a context of rigid attitudes held by educational and literary institutions. For these reasons, choosing the Saudi and Egyptian dialects provides an interesting contrast regarding the time gap in the exposure of readers of Arabic literature to the literary production of these two countries and these two dialects. Another reason is that the social context of the two countries is different, which may affect the reasons for using dialect in both places, and this in turn impacts on the translation procedures. Dealing with two different social contexts may enrich the research and show the different styles of translators in dealing with a challenging issue, such as two dialects (Saudi and Egyptian) or the different dialects in the text. Moreover, my own knowledge of the two countries’ dialects and different social contexts has helped me to analyse the STs and to track the changes that have been made through the translation process.

However, from the translation production of these two countries it can be seen that translations from Saudi novels are not comparable to those from Egyptian novels. Egyptian literature was one of the first literatures in the Arab region made accessible to English readers. Büchler et al. (2011) have attributed that first interest to a number of reasons, above all to the colonial history that links Egypt and the UK. In addition, Egypt is a regionally dominant player in a number of domains, such as media production (p. 17). Moreover, there has been an increasing interest in women’s writing since the 1980s with the writer Nawal El-Saadawi. The translation production of Saudi novels is significantly less, and a great number of the stories that attract most attention in English translation are either controversial or banned in Saudi Arabia, or they are about women and gender issues in Saudi. This also plays an important role in the balance between the chosen novels in the corpora, where I included only six Saudi novels but nine Egyptian novels for both data analysis stages.
4.2.2. Selected novels

As mentioned above, the data will be extracted from 15 Saudi and Egyptian novels. These particular novels were chosen for two reasons. First, the initial check of the novels revealed that they all contain LDD. Second, the availability of the English translation played a crucial role in deciding which novels to include in the data. Most of the novels were published in the last decade; however, also included in the research are a number of early novels that are important because of their use of dialect in the dialogue of the novel.

The introduction to the research data is divided into two main sections, one for the Saudi novels and the other for the Egyptian novels. The novels will be listed in the following section.

It is central first to give a general view about the code-mixing and LDD in the corpora. Notably, Saudi and Egyptian authors in the corpora have used multiglossic switching in their novels where they were using code-mixing of MSA and one or more literary Saudi or Egyptian dialects as linguistic representations. It seems that authors have chosen what I term heterolingual manipulation in their writing to manipulate accepted literary production that imposes one form of language (MSA in this case) and to try to create their own identity outside these institutional linguistic norms. Authors occupy a middle ground: they generally comply with these institutions’ impositions of a ‘correct’ form of language by moving through a multiglossia continuum, leaning mostly to MSA in the narrative (with some literary dialect juxtapositioning), and creating their dialogue by relying on the other end of the continuum when they use dialect (Hary, 1996). Through this heterolingual manipulation, authors have challenged the promotion of a single unified literary production. They present their texts as a multilingual space to transcend the boundaries of the old monolingual literary production. It can be seen from the themes discussed in the novels that LDD was used as a
means of identity expression or linguistic resistance to issues such as nationalism, state power, social class and gender discrimination.

At a micro level, the dialogue moves towards dialect, which means there is a space to add MSA words in the dialogue. Characters use diglossic/multiglossic switching depending on the setting or their interaction with other characters; power relations or social factors can determine the context in which the dialogue is uttered and hence the nature of the switching. Authors in some cases use dialect levelling or diglossia levelling (Bassiouney, 2009) whereby some structural features are reduced to simplify the dialogue for readers. It is worth mentioning that the writing of LDD in most cases follows the grammatical writing system of MSA.

On the other hand, one negative point that appears in the novels is the absence of diacritic markers in the dialogue. This sometimes makes it difficult in short sentences to differentiate whether a word is an MSA or dialect word. The analysis of individual cases is elaborated in the data analysis chapters.

4.2.2.1. Saudi novels


*Mūdan al-Mīḥ (al-Tayh)* (1984), written by Abdelrahman Munif, discusses the transformation of Bedouin life in the Arabian Peninsula after the oil boom in the area. The novel tells the story of the discovery of oil next to a small oasis, Wadi al-’Uyun, and how the lives of the Bedouin citizens were changed by the arrival of American companies. Munīf touches on specific issues such as the modern capitalist society and the petro-capitalism that rose from the discovery of oil, clashes between West and East, and class issues and the struggle of the working class (Young, 1990). It is not clear which Bedouin tribe the dialect
represents; however, it can be assumed from the setting of the novel that it represents the Bani Khalid tribe. This tribe’s members reside in eastern and central Saudi Arabia where the story takes place and where the author of the novel is from. The novel uses a multiglossic continuum that is dominated by a simplified Bedouin dialect. There is also heavy use of Bedouin proverbs and metaphorical idioms in the dialogue. The novel is an important literary work in the Arab world. It reflects the history of the Arabian Peninsula after the discovery of oil and the changes that occurred as a result..

The first three volumes of the novel were translated by Peter Theroux. The data in this research are drawn from the first volume of the novel, *al-Tayh* (1982), translated as *Cities of Salt* (1989). The English translation was originally published in hard cover by the American commercial publisher Random House in 1987, and then appeared in a First Vintage international edition in 1989, which is the edition that was used in this research. Munīf’s *Cities of Salt* was the first Saudi novel introduced to English readers.

4.2.2.1.2. *al-Shamīṣī (2001) / Shumaisi (2005)*

*Al-Shamīṣī* is the second novel in a trilogy called *atāya al-‘azīqah al-mahjwwrah* (*Phantoms of the Deserted Alleys*) by Turki Al-Hamad. Each novel in the trilogy takes its name from a place in Saudi Arabia, with this novel named after a district in Riyadh. The trilogy revolves around the life of Hisham, the protagonist. *al-Shamīṣī*covers his life after he moves to Riyadh to study at the university. The novel portrays the clashes in Saudi Arabia society at that time, which were a result of the uprising of extremists and youthful resistance. It covers the period between 1967 and 1974, which was a politically and socially critical time not only in Saudi, but also across the Arab region and the world in general. Hisham and his friends are engaged in and consistently debate the political scene, where Saudi youth present themselves as Nasserites, Ba'athists, Marxists and Islamists. The dialect that appears in the novel has
elements of the central Najdi dialect. The novel was translated as *Shumaisi* by Paul Starkey in 2005.

**4.2.2.1.3. al-Qārūrah (2004) / Munira’s Bottle (2010)**

*al-Qārūrah* was written by Yousef Al-Mohaimeed. The central character of the story is Munira, a Saudi woman in her early thirties who is traumatised from her experiences of deception in her love relationship. Through descriptions and interactions with her family in the novel, a glimpse is given into the social life in Saudi society in the 1990s and during the Gulf War. It shows the influence of Islamists on the role and position of women in Saudi society, which is presented through her relationship with her extremist brother. The title of the story is a reference to a bottle, given to Munira by her grandmother, in which to store her stories. As the story is set in Riyadh, the author chose the Najdi dialect (the dialect of the cities in the centre of Saudi Arabia) to reflect the dialogue of his characters. However, there are other dialects that appear throughout the novel, like Hijazi (Jadawi), Qasimi, Kuwaiti and Yemeni dialects. The novel was translated by Anthony Calderbank and published in 2010 under the title *Munira’s Bottle*.


This novel was written by Rajaa Alsanea and is her first and only novel. The novel offers a look into the lives of four Saudi Arabian women in their early twenties. It discusses the different aspects of their lives and the challenges these women face both inside and outside their communities. The novel brings to attention several themes, such as the relationship between genders in Saudi Arabia, gaps between generations, and dysfunctional family relationships. The novel first took the form of a weekly newsletter, emailed to a list of subscribers over the course of a year. The author then collated it and published it in book form. Al-Ghadeer (2006) states that this novel initiated the entrance of ‘chick lit’, into a
Saudi context. The dialogue includes a mix of Saudi dialects (central Najdi, Hejazi and Qasimi) to show the different characters in the novel that represent the different regions in Saudi Arabia. There are other dialects present in the novel also, such as Lebanese and Kuwaiti. The novel sparked mixed reactions in Saudi Arabia. Some Saudi readers criticised it for presenting an incorrect and distorted image of Saudi society. The novel was banned briefly in the Saudi market; however, this served as a PR boost for the novel and it became a bestselling book in Arab bookstores.

In 2007, the novel was translated as *Girls of Riyadh* by the English translator Marilyn Booth. However, Booth was not happy with the published translation. Booth stated that the publishing house and the author interfered with, and made major changes to, her initial translation. To defend her translation, in 2008 Booth published an article called “Translator v. Author (2007): Girls of Riyadh go to New York”, in which she discusses transparency in translation, with reference to her translation of *Girls of Riyadh* (Booth, 2008).

The data from this novel will be examined in two ways. In Chapter Five, the novel is treated as a work that was co-translated by Booth and Alsanea, since the focus in this chapter is translation procedure in general. However, in Chapter Six, in which the focus is on Booth’s style, the published version will be contrasted with Booth’s article.

### 4.2.2.1.5. al-Ḥamām lā yaṭīr fī Buraydah (2009) / Where Pigeons Don’t Fly (2014)

This novel is written by Yousef Al-Mohaimeed. It follows the main character, Fahd, from his childhood in Riyadh until the point he decides to move to the UK. The story presents the life of Fahd in Riyadh and how his self-identity and his social relationship are affected by his father’s involvement in the famous armed attack on the Grand Mosque in Mecca in 1979. This results in Fahd and his girlfriend being arrested by the Committee for the Promotion of Virtue, an event that makes him plan to leave. The novel brings several issues to light that are relevant to female–male relationships in Saudi, religious authorities, trauma and politics.
Again, the novel was banned in the country due its strong criticism of religious authority. The fractured storytelling style of the novel reflects the trauma and grieving of Fahd. The dialect used by characters in the novel has elements of the central Najdi dialect. The novel was translated into English by Robin Moger in 2015.


This is a novel written by Yousef Al-Mohaimeed. The story is set in Riyadh and follows three characters: Turad, a middle-aged Bedouin man who has come in from the desert in search of work; Nasir, an orphaned baby who has been abandoned in the street; and Amm Tawfiq, an ex-slave who was brought from Sudan to Saudi Arabia as a child. Through the stories of these three characters, Al-Mohaimeed explores many themes related to the issues of identity, slavery and social discrimination. This novel was also banned in Saudi Arabia. The dialects that appear in the novel are the central Najdi dialect and the Sudanese dialect.

This was the first of Al-Mohaimeed’s novels that Calderbank translated into English. He first translated two chapters in 2004 that were published in English in Banipal, a magazine for Arab literature. Calderbank then translated the whole version for publication with Penguin.

4.2.2.2. Egyptian novels


al-Bāb al-Maftuḥ is a novel by Latifa al-Zayyat that was published in 1960. The novel is one of the works that supports and continues the realist movement in novels in the 1950s. The story revolves around young Layla and her brother, who are involved in university activism and call for popular resistance. al-Bāb al-Maftuḥ is set in Egypt between 1946 and 1956. It discusses the resistance of the Egyptian people to English colonialism, the importance of national unity and the call for independence. The novel covers an important period in the
history of modern Egypt and draws attention to political issues as well as to other social issues. One of the social issues that the novel addresses is the importance of the participation of women in activism. To reflect the power of youth and to highlight the social issues at that time, al-Zayyat chose to write the dialogue in the Cairo dialect. The work was translated into English by Marilyn Booth with the title *The Open Door*.

### 4.2.2.2.2. Matāhat Maryam (2004) / Maryam’s Maze (2007)

This is the first novel by Mansoura Ez Eldin. It focuses on the individual journey of the novel’s heroine. It describes life from the internal world of Maryam and her personal exploration. The novel shifts between contradictions, such as dreams and reality, memory and forgetting. Because the novel is mostly an internal observation of the heroine, the amount of dialogue in the novel is limited. However, the few sections of dialogue that are present in the novel are in the Cairene dialect, which makes it of interest to this research. The novel was translated into English by Paul Starkey in 2007.

### 4.2.2.2.3. Dhāt (1998) / Zaat (2004)

*Dhāt* is a sociopolitical novel written by Sonallah Ibrahim. The novel is structured in a unique way, with alternating chapters. One set is focused on the characters and their lives, while the other set includes sections from newspapers, headlines, quotes, and political speeches, offering a view into Egyptian society at that time. Through Zaat’s life and her interaction with her family, friends and colleagues, the story highlights the major changes that have occurred in the Egyptian society since 1952, such as political and economic corruption, religious conservatism, the gap between social classes, and immigration. The dialogue in *Zaat* was written in the Cairene dialect. The novel was translated into English by Anthony Calderbank in 2004.
4.2.2.2.4. al-Fā‘il (2008) / A Dog with No Tail (2009)

The narrator of Hamdi Abu Golayyal’s novel is a Bedouin man who moves from a rural area to Cairo in the 1990s to pursue his dream of becoming a writer. The story moves in a series of vignettes, each one representing an aspect of the narrator. The novel brings attention to several themes, such as identity, oppression and social classes. It also highlights the power that resides in communities through the diglossic use of language. Abu Golayyal states that the goal of his writing is to “to make literary language reach the level of spoken language – in simplicity, lightness, and the power to convince” (Lindsey, 2010). The dialect used in the novel is the Cairene, with elements of the Egyptian Bedouin dialect. The novel was translated by Robin Moger into English in 2009.


This critical novel was written by an Egyptian author of Nubian origin, Ali Idris. The novel tells the story of a whole generation of Egyptian Nubians through the character of Awad al-Shalali, who grows up in a Nubian village in upper Egypt and witnesses the neglect and destruction of his Nubian heritage. Al-Shalali continuously searches for his identity and is always challenged by society and the authorities. The novel is politically charged, with several themes that are related to social class, the marginalisation of minorities, and identity crises. The language of the dialogue in the novel is a mix of Sudanese, Nubian words, and the Cairene dialect. The novel was translated into English by Peter Theroux. It was the first Nubian novel to be translated into English.

4.2.2.2.6. al-Khibā’ (1999) / The Tent (2000)

This is the first novel written by Miral Al-Tahawy. The novel is told through the eyes of a young girl called Fatima, who observes the life of the women in her household and her conservative Bedouin society. The main theme of the novel is patriarchy and the gender
discrimination that these women experience. An interesting element of Al-Tahawy’s writing style is her use of stream of consciousness, which adds to the vivid image of the young narrator. The dialogue of the novel is written with elements of the Bedouin Egyptian dialect. Anthony Calderbank translated this novel into English in 2000.


This is another novel by Miral Al-Tahawy that was translated by Anthony Calderbank. Its context is similar to that of The Tent, as its focus is also on the Bedouin Egyptian community. This novel tells the story of Muhra, and it shifts between past and present scenes and stories. Muhra attempts to seek the truth about her mother by looking at old family photos. The story again touches on the themes of patriarchy and gender discrimination, which are present in Muhra’s community. Another issue that is discussed is the shaking of a community identity in the face of wider and greater community domination. The novel also uses Egyptian Bedouin dialect in the dialogue.


Awraq al-Narjis was written by Somaya Ramadan. Its central character is Kimi, an upper-class girl who travels to Ireland to study for her doctorate. In Ireland, Kimi begins to have an identity crisis and feels both physical and psychological exile, which leads to mental health problems. Kimi speaks both in the Cairene dialect and in MSA in the novel, and she also speaks in English. Bassiouney (2014, p. 245) analyses the speech of Kimi from a sociolinguistic point of view, commenting that “the schizophrenia that she suffers from is also reflected in the split of language that is difficult for her to overcome”. As for the writing style, intertextuality is used as a writing technique, including the folk and the mythical, from the Egyptian to the Irish. This novel was translated by Marilyn Booth into English in 2006.

Hamdi Abu Golayyal’s novel follows the anonymous narrator who leaves his small village to move to Cairo, where he rents a room in building No. 36 in Manshiyat Naser. The novel uses the “house narrative”, where the whole story revolves around the lives of the tenants who live in this building. Through these tenants’ stories, the author sheds light on issues such as capitalism, class discrimination and the consumer-oriented economy. The novel has a sarcastic tone and a narrational tension that shows the contradictions in society. The dialect used to represent the people is Cairene Egyptian Arabic and Bedouin Egyptian Arabic. The novel was translated by Marilyn Booth. The third edition of the ST, published in 2009, is used in this research.

4.3. Conclusion

In this chapter, I introduced my methodology at both the macro and micro levels. The descriptive-explanatory method, which was chosen as the general approach to the research, was discussed. The micro-level mixed methods approach, involving quantitative and qualitative comparative textual analysis and interviews, was outlined. The second section considered the more specific reasons for choosing Saudi and Egyptian dialects. The novels that were used as the main source of data for the research were presented in detail.
Chapter Five

Translating Literary Dialectal Dialogue in a Corpus of Saudi and Egyptian Novels

5.0. Introduction

This first descriptive chapter focuses on studying literary dialectal dialogue (LDD) that has been translated in a corpus of only ten Saudi and Egyptian novels, the other five novels will be included in the next chapter that focus on style. A clarification of the terminologies used in the analysis is provided in the first section. Then the discussion turns to a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the procedures that were used by the translators to tackle the issue of translating LDD in the texts. Each procedure is discussed separately, providing relevant examples from the corpus. The key primary findings from the first data analysis are highlighted at the end of the chapter.

5.1. Strategies versus procedures: A terminological consideration

Before analysing and discussing the collected data, some of the terminology used during the study should be clarified. In translation studies, the performance of the translator in solving the translation problem and transferring the content from one language to another is given several labels. Most commonly, it is referred to as strategies, methods, techniques or procedures. An ongoing debate in translation studies concerns how to distinguish between these terms, and, as Pym (2011, p. 92) comments, the whole area of describing the translation process is “a terminological mess”. I will focus here only on explaining two common terms
that are related to the process of linguistically translating a text: ‘strategy’ and ‘procedure’. In relation to translation studies and translator performance, Pym (2011, p. 92) defines ‘strategies’ in translation as “inferred macrotextual plans or mind-sets that organize translators’ actions in terms of potential loss and gain with respect to the attainment of a purpose”. In other words, strategies focus more on the general approach to the text and may imply an intentional plan to tackle certain issues. As for procedures, Pym (2011, p. 88) regards them as the “pre-established set of sequences of actions leading to a solution”. Procedures deal more, therefore, with the word level and not the overall approach to the text. Newmark (1988, p. 81) states that “translation procedures are used for sentences and smaller units of language”. In other words, procedures comprise the process adopted by the translator to deal with a text. As the focus of this research is on LDD, which deals more with the linguistic part of the text than with the whole, I will use the word ‘procedure’ to refer to the way the translators have chosen to deal with LDD in translation.

5.2 The translation of Saudi and Egyptian dialectal novels

As discussed in the previous chapter, authors use heterolingual manipulation in their novels in order to occupy a middle ground between the accepted linguistic code of literary production and the linguistic significance of the communities and identities they are representing in their stories. Authors move along the multiglossic continuum, heavily leaning towards the dialect end to construct most of the linguistic elements of the dialogue. The formation of LDD in both the ST and TT is a linguistic challenge. The question now is how the translators of Saudi and Egyptian novels have dealt with this issue of the dialect in the literary dialogue.

The following data analysis will highlight the procedures that are found in a corpus of ten Saudi and Egyptian dialectal novels. The data included in the following analysis is
extracted from: 1. Mūdan Al Mīlḥ (Cities of Salt); 2. Dunqulah: Riwāyah Nūbīyah (Dongola); 3. alShamīsī (Shumaisī); 4. Matāhat Maryam (Maryam’s Maze); 5. Dhāt (Zaat); 6. al-Qārūrah (Munira’s Bottle); 7. Banāt al-Riyāḍ (Girls of Riyadh); 8. al-Bāb al-Maftūḥ (The Open Door); 9. al-Ḥamām lā yaṭīr fī Buraydah (Where Pigeons Don’t Fly); 10. al-Fā’il (A Dog with no Tail).

Two points require clarifying in relation to the writing of Saudi and Egyptian novels. First, the use of diacritic markers plays a crucial role in the Arabic writing system as it shows how a word is pronounced. In most of the LDD in the ST, diacritic markers are partially absent, so it is sometimes difficult in short sentences to classify whether the words in the selected data should be pronounced in MSA or according to the pronunciation of the dialect used in the novel. I used my own knowledge of the dialects, in addition to the contextual and dialogue information surrounding the LDD and the background information of the character that is speaking, to judge the sentence. Any sentence that in my judgment leans more towards MSA was discarded. Second, the letter ق (qāf) is realised as a glottal stop in the Cairo and the Delta spoken dialects but as a hard ‘g’ in upper Egypt. However, Egyptian writers retain MSA phonological realisation for the letter ق (qāf) as ق (qā) when writing LDD.

The reason behind this chapter is mainly to explore how the translators in the corpora have dealt with LDD by examining a selection from ten novels (five Saudi and five Egyptian). The aim of this chapter is to give a quantitative and qualitative overview of how LDD has been translated in English and what the frequent procedures used in English translations are when one of the Saudi or Egyptian dialects is used in the dialogue. What are the changes that the LDD undergoes in the translation process? Furthermore, the findings of this chapter will be used for comparison in the next chapter, which presents an in-depth analysis of the individual translators’ styles.
Overall, the comparison of parallel corpora reveals that the procedure used by translators can be classified into three categories. First, the most frequent procedures, which are evident in almost all translation of the novels in the corpus, include using marked form, standardisation, borrowing, substitution, and paraphrase. The second category comprises the semi-frequent procedures which do not score a high percentage in the novels and are apparent in only half of them, such as semi literal translation, omission, addition, explication, Adaptation and paratextual procedure. The third category contains the least frequent procedures; these procedures, which only appear in less than quarter of the corpora i.e. changing narrative to dialogue, using broken English. These findings, especially in relation to only the first two categories, will be expanded and described in more detail, with examples from the translations, in subsequent sections in this chapter.

It is important to note that the procedures do not function separately and that there is an overlap between some procedures; for example, marked style can exist with borrowing in the same sentence. However, the procedures are considered separately in the analysis stage and here for the purposes of description and illustration, even if several procedures may occur in the same sentence. In other words, each procedure will be discussed as a separate category, with its frequency (represented as a percentage for each individual procedure as extracted from the Excel sheets) and a number of examples that represent the procedure. Particularly in relation to procedures such as borrowing and substitution, the focus will be on the part of the sentence that represents that procedure to clarify how these are presented in the translated novels. The frequency percentages represent the percentage of those procedures out of the overall percentage in each novel. Procedures in the novels will not be compared here based on percentage; these figures are provided here only to show the frequency of each procedure related to LDD in each novel.
As this is interdisciplinary descriptive-explanatory research that focuses mainly on dialect and how it is recreated in translation, it is important to give a descriptive analysis of the examples, to discuss the linguistic nuances in detail and to analyse how these nuances are reflected in translation. Then, in the second part of the chapter, I will discuss how this descriptive analysis can be considered according to Toury’s regularities of behaviour that lead to norms.

5.2.1. Using marked form

The use of marked writing style to tackle the LDD in TTs is one of the most frequent ways that translators choose to approach LDD in the ST. By marked writing style I mean a style of writing that imitates spoken conversation. It includes contractions, slang, incomplete syntax, and abbreviations, and the use of short or incomplete sentences. Marked writing style is presented in the selected translations through as the use of contractions, phrasal verbs, idioms, incomplete syntax (such as removing subject and auxiliary verb), slang, and colloquial words. The marked writing style was either a direct representation of the dialect or a compensation to present the conversational style of the dialogue.

This procedure was the most frequent in all of the translated novels, with high frequency in the corpora, as shown in Figure 5.1.
The selected novels include a substantial number that use marked writing style. This striking result stems mostly from the prevalence of contractions and phrasal verbs in dialogue to illustrate the marked style of the dialogue in the translated novels. However, there are different preferences for using marked writing style in each novels.

The most frequent procedure to represent the marked writing style in the translations is the use of contractions. The translators try to represent the dialect in the STs by using contractions as a means to create in the TTs a marked style that resembles the conversational writing style. Most of the contractions are the common contracted forms that occur between the subject and the verb ‘to be’ or that come with interrogative or negative sentences. The following example is from *The Open Door*:

**Example 5.1 (ST, p. 4; TT, p. 6)**

ماتخافيش ياماما، ماتخافيش، أنا عارفه ان محمود بخير. دلوقتي ييجي، ضرورى ييجي ضرورى ضرورى، الصبح ..
“Don’t be afraid, Mama. Don’t worry, I know Mahmud is fine. He’ll come now, he must, he’ll come. This morning...”

The representation of the Cairene dialect in this example is presented in the following way: (1) omitting the glottal stop in the emphasising particle ʾān/ʾān/ and the dot below the letters ی/yāl in the repeated word ضروري/ḍaruwwrī/ which means “must”; (2) negative marker /mā/ and inflectional negation marker /-shal/ in the verb ماتخافيش/matkhāfīsh/ which means, as translated in this example, “do not worry” or “do not be afraid or scared”; (3) the Egyptian adverb دلوقتي/dilwaṭī/, which means “now”, although it can be noticed that the letter /qāf/ is kept in MSA. The translator has chosen to render the dialects in the sentence through contractions of the negation and the subject with modal auxiliary verb ‘will’, along with using repetition.

The same situation of rendering the LDD with contraction occurs in Maryam’s Maze:

Example 5.2 (ST, p. 17; TT, p. 8)

مفيش حد هنا بالسم ده.

“There’s no one here with that name.”

The LDD is shown through: (1) shortened negative marker /mā/ and case marker -ش/-sha/ at the end of the preposition في/fī/; (2) the noun حد/had/ which means “somebody”; (3) the aspectual marker لـ/lal/; (4) the Egyptian demonstrative marker ده/dah/ .These indications of the Cairene dialect in the ST were made through the marked writing style presented by the contraction of the adverb with the verb ‘to be’.

There are some cases where the translator has used a less common contraction, that is, one that is more a spoken than a commonly written form. An example from the novel Zaat is:
Example 5.3 (ST, p. 163; TT, p. 154)

“Look, your daughter's dead, and that’s it. It was her fate. May Allah compensate you for her loss.”

Here, the contraction is between the noun and the verb ‘to be’; this is more common in spoken English. It is used as a compensation for the dialectal word بنتك/bintak/, which means “your daughter”; the word is presented in a dialectal syntax through the omission of the glottal stop in the noun.

Another unusual contraction occurs in Munira's Bottle:

Example 5.4 (ST, p. 39; TT, p. 24)

“the war’s started.”

The verb بدأ/bādā/ is pronounced and written in the central Najdi dialect with the omission of the glottal stop after the letter د/d/, in contrast to its MSA counterpart. It is presented with the short vowel /i/ at the beginning and the absence of the phonological feature /ʼa/, which occurs in the middle of the MSA counterpart verb بدأت/badʿat/. This central Najdi verb is rendered through the omission of the ‘h’ and the vowel in the verb ‘has’ and the use of contraction.

As seen from the above examples, contraction is sometimes used as the only means to reflect the whole dialectal sentence in the translation of dialogue, and where there is no other compensation for the dialectal representations in the ST.

The second representation is the use of phrasal verbs and idiomatic expressions, which were used by the translators to give a conversational style to the translated parts of the
LDD. A phrasal verb is a combination of a verb and a particle that can function in a sentence as a single verb. When combined, both words give a different lexical meaning. Although phrasal verbs are more accepted nowadays in formal writing and settings, a number of the phrasal verbs in the translations are mostly used in spoken and conversational settings or sometimes in marked writing styles. This procedure has been used as a substitute for the dialectal verb in the STs. Consider the following example from *A Dog with No Tail*:

**Example 5.5 (ST, p. 26; TT, p. 20)**

"It's a load of sand: seven meters. You'll carry it up the seventh floor. Do what you want. If you want to contract it out and bring a couple of other guys with you, I don't mind."

The LDD in the ST example has been presented by the following means: (1) prefixal conjugation /ha/ before verbs, which indicates the future tense in Egyptian dialects; (2) the omission in the preposition to refer to the speaker as someone who lives in Cairo but is from outside Cairo (probably the Delta); (3) negative marker /mā/ and inflectional negation marker /sha/ after the verb. The dialect form has been reflected in a number of ways. As the focus here is the phrasal verb and idiomatic expressions, the sense of the prefixal conjugation /ha/ has been replicated through the use of “Carry it up” and “contract it out”.

Another example of capturing the marked form of the dialectal verb through the use of phrasal verb and idiomatic expression in *Cities of Salt* is:

**Example 5.6 (ST, p. 50; TT, p. 47)**

- وفحص صوته كثيراً، حتى أصبح همساً:

- لازم يسرح بالغلم أو يلغب الأولاد .. منعب الهذال.
He added, almost in a whisper, “He should be roaming about with the sheep or playing with children.”

In this example, the collocation ِيسرح بالغنم /yasraḥ balghanm/ means “to freely graze sheep”. This collocation is used in the Saudi Bedouin dialect to refer to a shepherd who takes his/her sheep and goats in the early morning to search for food. The verb ِيسرح /yasraḥ/ means to “proceed freely or without restraint”, but it also has a temporal dimension that implies going out in the early hours in the morning. In the TT, the markdness of the collocation has been considered and the translator uses the idiomatic expression “roaming about”, which means to wander or range about freely, which may also imply doing an activity with no restraint. The temporal dimension of the verb has not been replicated, probably because the focus of the speaker was more on the effect of the activity rather than on the time.

Consider, finally, the following example of the representation of phrasal verbs from *Munira’s Bottle*:

**Example 5.7 (ST, p. 53; TT, p. 39)**

اَسكتي ياامرأة، وتعوّذي أنت من الشيطان، ولتشغليني عن الطرىق

“Shut up, women! Take refuge from Satan yourself, and don’t take my mind off the road.”

Although the author presents the word “women” as it is in MSA with a long vowel and glottal stop, the multiglossia of the dialogue leans mostly to the Najdi dialect end. This is indicated by making the implied pronoun to second person ‘anti’ visible after the verb the two verbs in this example, ِاسكتي /āskutī/ and تشغليني /tushghalinī/, and the exclamation mark. The character of the old man who utters this sentence uses dialect in the conversation. In the TT, the translator has opted to represent the markedness of the sentence especially by dealing with verbs. Each verb from the ST has been translated to a phrasal verb in the TT that gives a close meaning to ST. The dialectal verb ِاسكتي /āskutī/ here means “to be quiet”, but it also
implies an aggressive order; this rude command to be quiet has been captured by the phrasal verb “shut up”. 

تعوذني /taʿwaidhī/ is used with a religious reference meaning to seek God’s protection, or, as it is translated in this sentence, to take refuge from Satan. As for 

تشغليني /tushghalinī/, which means “do not disturb me”, the translator has opted for the marked indication of the idiom, “don’t take my mind off”, instead of the verb “disturb”.

The third representation of the marked writing style is through using TT colloquial and slang words. Here is an example from The Open Door:

Example 5.8 (ST, p. 9; TT, p. 11)

مالك يا بني، طمنى؟

“What’s wrong my boy? Tell me …”

In this case, the character addresses her son using 

يا بني /yā bni/, which literally translates as “my son”. The dialect is shown through omission of the vowel at the beginning of the noun بني/bni/ after the vocative particle يا/yā/, as well as omission of the dot under the letter يā at the end. The use of the colloquial phrase “my boy” as a translation of يا بني reflects intimacy and a close relationship in English dialogue.

The same colloquial expression is used to translate the synonym for the word يا بني /yā bni/ from the Saudi dialect, which is ياوليدي /yā wālīdī/. Consider the following example from Cities of Salt:

Example 5.9 (ST, p. 22; TT, p. 16)

يكفي .. ياوليدي...

“that’s enough, my boy.”
The word يوليدي /yā ṭlīdī/ is an eastern Bedouin dialectal diminutive form of the word ولدي /wlādī/, which means “my son”. Again, the translated word “my boy” captures the informality and the caring and intimate feeling implied by the dialectal diminutive.

Another use of colloquial words, especially in the case of switching within the same novel, occurs in Shumaisi:

Example 5.10 (ST, p. 30; TT, p. 26)

ماهي كانت قصر يازول ...

he spoke in a rapid Sudanese dialect: “It was a palace, man… It was a palace belonging to one of the elite.”

In this conversation, the character is speaking in a Sudanese dialect and uses a slang word، زول /Zūl/، that is usually a second person pronoun used here to sarcastically or angrily address a man. In translation, the word has been replaced with “man”, which is also a slang direct address used to refer to a fellow.

Finally, short sentences are also used in the translations to indicate LDD, as can be seen in the following examples:

Example 5.11 (ST, p. 133; TT, p. 114, my underlining)

نائمة لكن ليه تسأل كذا؟ ماتثق بي. "Asleep. Why are you asking all this? Don’t you trust me?" (Munira’s Bottle)

Example 5.12 (ST, p. 4; TT, p. 6, my underlining)

ماظاهاش يابابا ، دي مظاهرة سلمية. “nothing to worry about, Papa. It’s to be a peaceful demonstration.” (The Open Door)
The subject and the verb ‘to be’ in these two examples was not presented, thereby shortening the sentences and making them less unmarked and more conversational.

5.2.2. Standardisation

Standardisation is when dialectal words are substituted by unmarked form. Specifically, this procedure involves the translator choosing to omit all the dialectal references in the original text and to opt for more standard terms words. In this situation, the translator does not include any marked writing style, such as the examples mentioned above – contractions, phrasal verbs, and colloquial or slang words. It is important to highlight that standardisation occurs mostly for sentences that do not have strong cultural references. The focus is not on the presentation of the sentence but on the translation of the LDD words themselves. As Figure 5.2 indicates, standardisation is a frequent procedure that is present throughout the entire corpus.
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**Figure 5.2. Standardisation**

However, the results obtained from the preliminary analysis of standardisation also show that the frequency percentage varies. Particularly worth noting is the wide disparity between the application of standardisation in the translations. Standardising the dialect
below 15% of the total procedures in more than half of the novels, and in some cases, such as *Shumaisi* and *A Dog with No Tail*, standardisation accounts for less than 2%. The highest score for standardisation were in *Zaat* and *Munira’s Bottle*, both translated by Calderbank.

The following example of standardisation comes from *Dongola*:

**Example 5.13 (ST, p. 30; TT, p. 18)**

"Do you like what he said, sir?" asked the sergeant, as if to bait his superior. "Are we supposed to do nothing when he insults the government?"

In this example the subject and verbs in the rhetorical questions were removed and implied in the object pronoun. The use of colloquial honorific title *يابك/yā bik/* “Bey” which is a formal title for a man in power and important officials. In addition, ellipsis (double dots) is used, probably to hint the omission of the question parts. However, what happens in the translation is the restoration of both rhetorical questions. The ellipsis has been removed, which leads to the changing of the incomplete dialect question form and the rendering of the question in its complete form, with auxiliary verb, subject, and main verb in the TT.

A similar case of rendering the question in its full form occurs in the translation of *Zaat*:

**Example 5.14 (ST, p. 127; TT, p. 117)**

"your servant Kamal, car clearance. What can I do for you?"

The phrase *أي خدمة/āyy Khidmah/“any service” means the offer of any service to someone, usually in providing service settings. It implies a sense of informality and causality when it is used in the conversation. The auxiliary verb and subject are again omitted here, as is the case
in the Cairene dialect, and the sentence has been shortened. In the translation, the question has been presented in its full formal form as a direct wh-question. Moreover, instead of a series of very short sentences, the translator has used a comma as a pause before clarifying the job description.

Another example of standardising LDD in the translation can be found in *Girls of Riyadh*:

**Example 5.15 (ST, p. 15; TT, p. 6)**

وِبَعْدَهَا أَسْتَخْفَى مَثْلَ مَا تَبيِنَ. (15)

“And after that you can be as foolish as you want.” (6)

The word 
/astkhfi/ is a Najdi expression meaning “lose your mind”, which also implies reproof; also, the sarcasm of the dialectal confirmation word 
/mā tabīn/, which means “as you like”, has been softened by the standard word “foolish”.

Another example from the same novel is:

**Example 5.16 (ST, p. 47; TT, p. 30)**

وش تسوين يا أميمتي؟

“what are you doing, Mother?”

The Najdi LDD is shown in this example through: (1) the Najdi interrogative particle 
/wish/, which is used to request specific information where it means “what”; (2) the verb 
/tsawiyyn/, a second-person feminine singular non-past active indicative of 
/sawiyal/, which means “what are you doing” or “what you are up to”; (3) the word 
/amimtī/, which means “my mom” and is a diminutive form of the standard word 
/‘ummī/. This is an expression used in the Najdi region to show unconditional love and respect for the
mother. The whole sentence was standardised; the effect of showing love and respect to the mother by using a diminutive word in the ST has changed in the TT by the unmarked form.

The data analysis also reveals that some translators standardised a few dialectal terms or expressions and used the generic translation of source terms. The generic word can be defined here as the general word or phrase that is used to describe a group or a class of something without referring to a specific individual thing from that group or class. An example from *Munira’s Bottle* is:

**Example 5.17 (ST, p. 47; TT, p. 31)**

اَصْبِرْ يَا جَنْيِنِيَّ …

“patience, my child …”

The expressionِ يَا جَنْيِنِيُّ/ِยَا جَنْيِنِيُّ/ literally means “my foetus”. This metaphorical expression is used in the Najdi dialect, usually by mothers, as a way to show their love for their children, with the sense that no matter how old they are, they are still this little foetus inside their body. The term was standardised in the translation with the generic term “my child”, which still reflects the intimate feeling of the mother in the ST.

Another example of using a generic term is from *Cities of Salt*:

**Example 5.18 (ST, p. 50; TT, p. 47)**

وَإِذَا جَآَهَا الْوَسْمِي وَكَأِنَّ الْإِمْطَارَ كَثِيرَةٌ تَتَغْيِرُ حَيَّةَ النَّاسِ وَيَتَغْيِرُ الْوَادِيُّ. (50)

“If we get good rains, everything will change – the wadi will be a different place.” (47)

The wordِ الْوَسْمِيُّ/ِالْوَسْمِيُّ/ means the rain that falls at the beginning of spring. It is derived from the wordِ الْوَسْمُ/ِالْوَسْمُ/, which means the marks left on the skin after cauterisation. The Bedouin useِ الْوَسْمِيُّ/ِالْوَسْمِيُّ/ to refer to the rain that comes after the dry season. It is a metaphor for the effect of the rain on the land when the crops start to grow, and it reflects the obvious signs
of the rain after the dry season. The translator has standardised the word and used the generic term to describe this rain as “good rains”. This retains the sense of joy and hope after the arrival of this rain, but it does not reflect the temporal aspect of this rain.

5.2.3. Substitution

Substitution is here used to describe the translation of ST concepts by using a substituted referent from the TT that performs a similar function. In relation to the topic of this research, and based on the results obtained from the data analysis, substitution was used mainly when translating linguistically specific expressions from the SC or with some culturally specific expressions, such as jokes, religious expression or idioms.
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**Figure 5.3. Substitution**

Figure 5.3 shows that substitution constituted no more than 14.49% of procedures in the corpus novels with the exception of *Shumisi* in which it constituted approximately 27% of all procedures. Despite its fairly low frequency, this procedure was consistently found throughout the whole corpus.

An example of substitution from the data is the following idiomatic expression uttered by one of the main characters in *Where Pigeons Don’t Fly*:
Example 5.19 (ST, p. 86; TT, p. 76)

“if death let me choose between them, I would ask he take the bird of ill omen” (23)

The expression 

= "the face of the owl". In Saudi Arabia, and across the Arab region in general, there is a superstition that owls relate to bad luck and evil. This idiomatic expression is used in the Najdi dialect to describe someone who brings bad news or bad luck; it is also sometimes used to refer to ugly facial features. In the TT the idiomatic expression was translated as “the bird of ill omen”, which is also a metaphorical idiomatic expression that means a person who brings bad news.

Another example in relation to cultural references is from the novel *Girls of Riyadh*:

Example 5.20 (ST, p. 16; TT, p. 8)

“No, you idiot, I mean, turn to your left like the hands of a clock when it’s eleven – you will never get it, will you – you’ll never pass Gossip 101!”

The word 

= "the basic knowledge of gossiping". This collocation is translated as “Gossip 101”; the number 101 is a colloquial expression usually used in the university context to mean an introductory course, often with no prerequisites and, outside the university context, it can also mean an introduction to the basics of something. It is usually combined with another word that denotes what is being introduced. The collocation “Gossip 101” performs the same function as the ST terms and is a more accessible referent in the receptor culture. Moreover, it preserves and reflects the humour in the original collocation.

From *The Open Door*, consider the following:
“Tired – or was it just so you could come and get dressed and make yourself dandy for the reception."

Here, the character is mocking his friend for coming to the party by saying to him /tīstawjāh/ which means literally to “to make yourself a noble”. He means to tell him that “you come here to us you are dressing fancy cloths just to make yourself noble”. In the translation, the expression “make yourself dandy” has been used. What is interesting in this translation is the relevancy of the word to TC. According to the Cambridge dictionary, the word ‘dandy’ refers to a man, especially in the past, who dressed in expensive, fashionable clothes and was very interested in his own appearance. Connecting this historical connotation to the word could help the readers to understand how the character is mocking the other for being extravert and for his attempt to create this noble image for himself.

In addition this procedure is exemplified in Shumaisi:

Example 5.22 (ST, p. 8; TT, p. 6)

“you are a disgrace”, she said to him, “and your room is a tip! Hisham's room doesn't need any effort to clean or tidy! As for your room… God Almighty, it needs a whole army of workers!”

The Najdi dialectal words that have been substituted in this part of the dialogue are /ṭimal, ṭimal, ỷastār, ỷastār, ḥusā, ḥusā, ḥusā, ḥusā, ṭimal/.
ṭamil/, which means “you are dirty and unclean Dahiam”; here, this is translated as “you are a disgrace”. It should be noted that this does not necessarily reflect on the cleanliness of the room but is more of a personal attribute. Interestingly, the character continues shaming him, saying “you are a mess and your room is a mess”; however, the repetition of the word /ḥwsāḥ/ “mess” has been omitted in the translation and is instead substituted with “and your room is a tip”, in order to say that his room compares to his messy character. Lastly, the character ends her argument by saying that the room needs بلدية كاملة /balādīh Kamīlah/, which literally means in MSA a “whole municipality”, but in the Saudi context balādīh usually refers to garbage collectors. The translator picks up on the dialectal rather than the literal meaning of the word, translating it as “a whole army of workers”.

5.2.4. Borrowing
Borrowing is a procedure used to transfer a word from the SL into the target culture. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) state that this procedure is usually used to create “a stylistic effect” for the text and to introduce some of the source’s local style into the TC (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, p. 17). Following such a procedure will keep the SC present in the translation (Fawcett, 1997, p. 34). Borrowing has always helped to introduce many loan words into other languages, which could become accepted over time as part of the TL.
Figure 5.4. Borrowing

As Figure 5.4 shows, most of the translators in the corpus used the procedure of borrowing, with a highest frequency of 7.69% and a lowest of 2.33%. Although the procedure does not occur in the dialogue in Maryam’s Maze, that does not mean that it is not used. A quick analysis shows that it is present in the narrative through the borrowing of several words which were explained in the glossary that included in the novel.

A closer look at the selected novels reveals that this procedure is used more with terms relating to clothes, cultural expressions, religious expressions, places, honorific titles, celebrations or public figures. The use of borrowing is consistent in the corpus; however, translators have approached it in many different ways. First, there are translators who include in the dialogue borrowed words with no explanation in the translation or even in a glossary. This is mainly the case in three novels: Cities of Salt, Shumaisi, and Where Pigeons Don’t Fly. In other novels, borrowed words are combined with other procedures or followed by an explanation to help the reader grasp the sense of the borrowed words.

Few translators mainly rely on in-text explanations, such as in Booth’s translation of The Open Door and in a few cases in Girls of Riyadh, where she adds a parallel concept in
English after the borrowed word to help the reader understand the borrowed cultural terms. For example:

Example 5.23 (ST, p. 8; TT, p. 12)

"Zayy al-qamar, he’s as gorgeous as a full moon."

The expression زي القمر / Zayy al-qamar/, which is in Egyptian Arabic and means literally “like a moon”, is usually used to praise someone and to comment on their beauty. As can be seen from the translation, an explanation was added in the sentence next to the borrowed word.

A similar example of this procedure of borrowing with an explanation, but where the latter is not included in the dialogue but after the quotation marks, can be found in the translation of Dongola:

Example 5.24 (ST, p. 99; TT, p. 68)

"My son is dead, people! Dead! Ya badailli." This meant, what a loss! “My dear Awad!”

The meaning of the Nubian expression يا باديئلي /Ya badaill/ in the above dialogue has been explained in the ST in a footnote as meaning “what a loss”; however, in the translation that footnote is included as an explanation after the borrowed word.

The case of Dongola is interesting for the variation in opting for an explanation or not. The translator varied between in-text explanation and no explanation at all, even for Nubian words that would be unfamiliar to readers of the English translation. On the other hand, in the translations of A Dog with No Tail, Munira’s Bottle, and Zaat, the translators choose to treat the borrowed words as a natural part of the English dialogue. They include the
borrowed words in the TT, with no in-text explanation or footnote, but they do include a glossary at the end of the novel to explain all the cultural terms included in the translation. One interesting case in Calderbank’s translations is the consistent appearance of the vocative particle  يا/ya/, which can be considered a new and experimental addition in the target English context. For example, in Munira’s Bottle:

Example 5.25 (ST, p. 119; TT, p. 111)

كيف أصير أنا المجرمة يا منيرة...

"How am I the criminal, ya Munira?"

The two letters يا/Yā/ are a grammatical structure called the vocative. The vocative usually consists of two parts: the first is the vocative particle, which is يا/yā/, which is followed by the second part (noun or phrase) for the one who is being addressed. It is usually used to attract someone’s attention.

5.2.5. Paraphrasing

The use of paraphrasing procedure in the context of translating dialect is the omission of the dialectal denotative meaning of the word, followed by the addition of an amplification or explanation of the connotative meaning. It has been used with culturally specific expressions or dialectal proverbs.
The results obtained from the preliminary analysis of paraphrasing shows that it is a procedure that translators in the study preferred to use as an option to balance and not to overload the text with cultural references. However, as is also the case with substitution, the procedure in most of the novels in the corpus does not exceed 15% of the overall procedures in each novel, as shown in Figure 5.5, with the lowest frequency of 4.4% in Girls of Riyadh. In Shumaisi and Dongola, dialectal cultural reference phrases are frequently naturalised and paraphrased. This is largely because, at least in these two novels, the translator tends to reflect the communicative nature of the phrase within the dialogue rather than to give a literal meaning or to borrow the whole phrase. The following is an example from Dongola:

Example 5.26 (ST, p. 44; TT, p. 29)

وأنا من جنيه لألف.

“And I’ll give you all the money you want.”

The dialectal idiomatic phrase وأنا من جنيه لألف/wāna mn janīh lāʾalf/ is used in the Egyptian context in general, and in this excerpt from the dialogue in particular, to mean that the
speaker will support the other man financially no matter what the amount of money needed. It literally means: “I am ready to give you from one pound to one thousand.” In the translation, the communicative meaning of offering financial support is rendered as “I’ll give you all the money you want”.

In a metaphorical context in the form of a song, an example of paraphrasing from *Munira’s Bottle* is the following:

**Example 5.27 (ST, p. 115; TT, p. 98)**

 لو صدقت أفنيت روحي في هواك!

“If your heart is true I’ll love you even more.”

This metaphorical expression is from a famous Saudi song in the Najdi dialect: the singer is trying to tell his lover that if she reciprocates his love he will spend the rest of his life loving her; literally, the metaphorical expression means “if you tell the truth I will spend my soul in your love”. The translator chose to omit the second part of the metaphorical expression أفنيت روحي في هواك “I will spend my soul in your love” and compensate with a meaning that captures his offer of long-lasting love.

Another example from the novel *Maryam’s Maze* is related to an idiomatic expression:

**Example 5.28 (ST, p. 20; TT, p. 10)**

بطلي بقى فلتقتني بشقتك المعفنة دي، م النهاردة مش هاقعد لك فيها.

“Stop it. I can’t take it anymore! You’ve driven me crazy with this grubby flat of yours. I’m not staying there anymore!”
The idiomatic expression /falātīnī/ literally means “you have split me into two”; however, it also has a metaphorical nature in the Cairene dialect with the meaning “you have annoyed me and I am fed up with your talk”. The meaning of the expression is explained in two sentences: “I can’t take it anymore! You’ve driven me crazy”.

Paraphrasing procedures are also used with culturally specific collocations, such as in the following example from Girls of Riyadh:

Example 5.29 (ST, p. 14; TT, p. 5)

ماشاءالله . ملح وقبلة

“Ma shaa Allah* God willing, no envy touch her, she’s so pretty.”

The collocation ملح وقبلة /milḥ wi qablah/ means ‘pretty’ and ‘accepted’. This collocation is usually used in the Najdi and northern Saudi dialects to comment on the attractiveness of someone who has a charismatic character that makes people accept them. The translation captures the meaning of the collocation that relates to facial attributes, since the word “pretty” means someone attractive; however, the part relating to character has been dismissed.

A final example of paraphrase is the following idiomatic expression from The Open Door:

Example 5.30 (ST, p. 70; TT, p. 78)

مواصفات ابن الحلال، انه يكون ابن ناس وكويس ومريش ومقطع من شجرة ولايسكرش ولايدخن.

“And the goods on the lovely man. Son of a good family, a real plum, seemly and solid and reeking with money, no relatives alive to come sniffing around, doesn’t get potted, doesn’t smoke.”
Here are a few cases of paraphrasing in relation to the traits the speaker uses to describe the potential husband. First, the expression ابن حلال /ībn ḥalāl/ means “legitimate”; however, it is used culturally to positively refer to someone as a “kind good person”. This is fairly paraphrased to “lovely man”. The other expression is ومقطوع من شجرة /wimʾtooʾ min shajarāḥi, which has the literal meaning “he was cut from a tree” and is used in Egyptian culture mainly to refer to the fact that someone has no living relative, or more precisely that one or both parents have passed away and that there is no sibling or extended family. The character says this to imply that she wants to marry a man who does not have any relatives, since then she can live in peace without relatives bother the couple or trying to create problems. The translator has explained this metaphorical expression by translating the expression to “no relatives alive to come sniffing around”.

5.2.6. Literal translation

Literal and semi-literal translation is a procedure used to “convey the content unchanged while observing TL norms” (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, p. 95); in other words, it keeps the same lexis by following TL grammar (Newmark, 1988, p. 70). It can be seen, by some, as a useful way to remain close to the source expression by keeping its meaning. In relation to the data analysis, literal translation is used with dialectal cultural words or expressions (for example, proverbs) that have a metaphorical nature.
It is apparent from Figure 5.6 that literal translation is not present in all the selected data. The results show that around two-thirds of the novels in the study include literal translation with a frequency below 6%. This percentage demonstrates that translators in the corpus are not totally in favour of literal translation when it comes to translating LDD. Further analysis shows that literal translation is mostly used to translate proverbs in *The Open Door* and *Cities of Salt*.

The following is an example of literal translation from *Munira’s Bottle*:

**Example 5.31 (ST, p. 74; TT, p. 32)**

"The grass in the garden is already dead, see. The rain won’t make any difference."

This is a Najdi dialectal proverb that indicates that sometimes there is no point in responding after something has happened because it will not make any difference. Although it has a meaning based on its metaphorical nature, the expression can be guessed from the literal translation.
Literal translation may, however, sometimes fail to capture the functionalism of the expression. Ivir (1987, p. 41) argues that “when the extralinguistic realities of the two cultures differ at a particular point, the literal translation of an expression will not in itself be sufficiently transparent to fill the gap”. In other words, when there is no shared extralinguistic reality, the use of the literal translation may sound odd to the target readers and may provide an abstract expression. Here is an example from *Girls of Riyadh*:

**Example 5.32 (ST, p. 16; TT, p. 8)**

المهم شوفي البنت هادي... أما عليها مواهب.

"Anyway, check out that girl – she’s got ‘talent’, all right!"

The word *مواهب* /mawahib/ this word is street slang with a cultural connotation in Saudi Arabia. The meaning is more related to a description of a woman’s physical attributes, or what is rendered in English slang as “assets” rather than “talent”.

Another case of not fully capturing the meaning through literal translation is the following proverb from *Cities of Salt*:

**Example 5.33 (ST, p. 78; TT, p. 76)**

إلحق العيار لباب الدار.

Pursue the scoundrel to the door of his house.

This Bedouin proverb /إلحق العيار لباب الدار/ which means “follow the wicked to the door of his house” is used here to warn the people to be aware of a wicked human but at the same time to be patient to see whether the situation will end or not. In this case, the character is impatient with the Emir and he does not believe the excuse that is given to him. The character implies through this proverb that there is something not right here but
that they should be patient and wait to see where this is going to take them. This not clearly
captured through the semi-literal meaning of the proverb.

Understanding the elements of the dialectal expression is important for clearing up
any pragmalinguistic misunderstanding when rendering the literal meaning of the words. As
these expressions have a metaphorical nature, the denotative meaning of the ST words should
be considered when deciding which synonym to choose so as to avoid any loss of meaning
and awkwardness in the context.

5.2.7. Omission

There are cases where translators omit a dialectal word or expression without compensation.
This procedure has been used with some of the dialectal words in sentences within the
dialogue.

![Figure 5.7. Omission](image)

Figure 5.7 shows that omission is not present in almost half of the data. The frequency lower
than that of other procedures, with a highest frequency of 8.6% in *Where Pigeons Don’t Fly*
and a lowest of 0.2% in *The Open Door*. In *Where Pigeons Don’t Fly* the omission is
surprisingly not limited to sentences, as in other novels; instead, the translator chose to omit
an entire song that a character was chanting in a dialogue as well as a few dialectal conversations. The following example presents such omission from the translation of *Where Pigeons Don’t Fly*: dialectal conversations at the end of chapter three, where there is introductory information about why the father of the main character Fahd has been jailed and how that has affected his family, particularly his sisters, have been omitted:

**Example 5.34 (ST, p. 3; TT, p. omitted)**

In this conversation, the narrator talks about how life has been harsh on the family of Fahd’s father because of his involvement in the seizure of the Grand Mosque led by Juhayman in 1979, which was a turning point in Saudi history that resulted in the *Sahwa* movement taking control. The above dialogue hints at how the people in Saudi Arabia have regarded and reacted to this event, and how it not only affected the father who is in jail but also brought shame to his family. The dialectal conversation is between Fahd’s grandmother and a lady whose son is engaged to Fahd’s aunt. After the incident, she visits the family to tell them that they will call off the wedding because “we didn’t know that your son is in jail!” The grandmother firmly replies, “he was imprisoned in a political issue, not an issue related to morality, honour, or religion!” The grandmother gives a strict instruction to the woman to tell everyone this, saying that “the house of Saflawy’s family is the house of honour and
manhood”. The frustration of the grandmother in these sentences indicates her realisation of how stigma will be attached to her and her house because of her son, and how she should be firm about it. Although this is a brief conversation, this detail shows how the family of anyone involved in the event will be judged by society. The strict character of the grandmother and how she firmly deals with this scandal are not shown in the translation here or later.

Another example of omission occurs in Maryam’s Maze:

Example 5.35 (ST, p. 20; TT, p. 10)

صرخت رضوى فردت عليها المرأة:
- احمدي ربيأ إني ساكته عليك. دا أنا قانية في بيتي مرة. دى جزاتي إني مافضحتكشك؟
- وقعت الجملة على مريم كالصاعقة خاصة مع تصاعد المرأة وهو يسرد تفاصيل علاقات رضوى بأخرين ..

“You should thank God that I’ve kept quiet about you,” replied the woman. “Is this my reward for not exposing you?”

This last sentence struck Maryam like a thunderbolt, especially when the woman’s voice got even louder and she started reeling off the details of Radwa’s relationships with other people…

The translator has omitted the second sentence in the conversation which means “I keep in my house a prostitute”. The owner of the house describes Radwa as a prostitute which according to an explanation by a native speaker, is used in Egypt, especially in the local context of Cairo, as an extremely strong insult of a woman to indicate that she has had multiple relationships or to imply that she is not a virgin. In the ST, this is what might shock Maryam, as the word is strong and scandalous in the Egyptian context of the novel. Although it can be guessed from the translation that there has been a scandalous conversation, the strong insult itself has been omitted.
A final example of omission at the word level is from *Cities of Salt*:

Example 5.36 (ST, p. 44; TT, p. 41)

ابن الراشد ماهو بشئ ياولد العم، ابن الراشد ذويل ويقول مايسمع.

“Ibn Rashed is nothing, cousin. He just says what he hears.”

The speaker here says ابن الراشد ذويل ويقول مايسمع /Ibn al-Rashed dhuīl wa yaqūl mā yāsma/ which means “Ibn al-Rashed is just a tail, he says what he hears”. The Bedouin word ذويل /dhuīl/, which means “tail”, has been omitted. The word /dhuīl/ is the diminutive form from the word ذيل /dhīl/ and is purposely used by the speaker to disgrace Ibn Rashed and imply that he is just a follower of the prince and not a decision-maker. The word seems a reflection of the negative opinion of the people of Wadi al-Uyoun towards Ibn Rashed.

5.2.8. Addition and Explicitation

The addition in the corpus involves either adding new information that was not in the LDD in the ST or adding syntactic additions that explicate the implicit information in the LDD which is obvious to the ST readers but not to the TT readers.

![Figure 5.8. Addition](image)
The addition of new information not in the ST occurs in six of the ten novels, as shown in Figure 5.9, with a frequency that does not exceed 3.5%. It is used in some cases to add emphasis in the translation, such as in the following example from *Girls of Riyadh*

**Example 5.37 (ST, p. 14; TT, p. 6)**

أحلى من العروس بكثير! تصدقين أنا سمعت أن الرسول دعا للشينة؟

She’s a good deal prettier than the bride. Can you believe it, I heard that Prophet Mohammed used to send up prayers for the unlovely ones!

In this example, the translator has added the expression “a good deal” to emphasise the attractive traits of the girl compared to the bride. The idiom is an American spoken expression that is used when the speaker thinks something is good. The superlative statement is in the original; however, the expression has been added in the TT for emphasis. However, according to an American English speaker this expression seems unusual to be used of a person, since it is usually used in relation to objects.

In other cases, new information, not present in the ST, is added to the sentence in the TT for reasons either of characterisation or of censorship. In the following example from *A Dog with No Tail*, the curse word has been omitted from the ST sentence حمدي العبيط بيفكرك... أمك /Hamdi alʿabīṭ biʾwlak ... ʾumak/ which means “fool Hamdi says … your mother”. The omission could be because of censorship, or at the publisher’s request, or because the author felt the readers would get the curse without openly voicing it in the written text. However, the removed curse in the ST can be guessed by readers from the sentence, as the following example shows:

**Example 5.38 (ST, p. 29; TT, p. 22)**

حمدي العبيط بيفكرك... أمك.
Hamdi the Fool says to you, “Your mother's cunt.”

In the TT, the translator has made a decision to complete the sentence and make the curse obvious to the readers. The word “cunt” has been added. The offence becomes visible in the translation, unlike in the ST.

Besides the addition of new information, Explicitation is also used to introduce new information in the TT that is implicit in the ST (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958). Figures 5.9 and 5.10 reveal the markedly lower rates of addition and explication compared to other procedures applied in the translations.

As an example of clarifying new information to explicitate what is implicit in ST, consider the following example from The Open Door:

Example 5.39 (ST, p. 73; TT, p. 82)

"When's the big day, God willing."
Here the aunt is asking her nephew when they should plan to set a date for his sister’s wedding by saying \( \text{وَنْويِتُ ْوَأَمْتَا ْإِنَّ شَاءَ اللَّهُ} / \text{wanīatū ʾamtaa ʾin shāʾ Allāh/}. \) She does not ask the question directly; instead, her question literally means “when are you having the intention, God willing”. In the Egyptian or general Arab cultural context, particularly in Islamic families, it is usual to attach the word “intention” \( /nīaṭū/ \), which here refers to the wedding with the willing of God. This is mainly in the hope that God will bless the act. The word “wedding” is not mentioned in the conversation, and the aunt mainly asks this question to shift the conversation. In the TT, the translator makes this implicit information about the date of the wedding explicitate to the readers by adding the expression ‘the big day’ that refers to weddings.

Another example comes from Dongola:

**Example 5.40 (ST, p. 33; TT, p. 20)**

"Leave him alone – he's just a stupid Zamalek supporter. All the servants are for Zamalek."

In this example, the character is trying to make fun of the other person by saying he is a Zamālkāwi, which means he is a supporter of the Al Zamālk football team, the rivals of his own team. Zamālk or calling someone Zamālkāwi can be used either to refer to an area in Cairo or to the famous Egyptian football team. As the fact that he is talking about a football team is implicit in the ST, the translator has added the word “supporter” to make this explicit for TT readers.
5.2.9. Adaptation

Adaptation procedure is used here to describe the replacement of a situation and the translation of dialectal religious prayers in ST into TT. It was shown low percentage that does not exceed %6 in three novels, where in other two was significantly low.

![Figure 5.10. Adaptation](image)

An example could be taken from *A Dog with No Tales*:

**Example 5.41 (ST, p. 97; TT, p. 66)**

\[\text{ياواحد .. يأهل المروءة .. يواحد!}\]

“Help, O God! Help, good people! O God.”

In the ST the character was shouting one of the God name /yā wahid/ which means “the only” to ask for help. This have been adapted in the translation to the interjection religious formal “O” with the word “God”, to form a prayer in TT.
5.2.10. Peritexts and dialects

Peritexts are the other texts supplied by the translator to give the reader more information about the text or about the cultural and historical references in the text. Genette (1997) describes peritexts as “liminal devices and conventions, both within and outside the book, that form part of the complex mediation between book, author, publisher and reader: titles, forewords, epigraphs and publishers’ jacket copy are part of a book’s private and public history”. Paratextual intervention is an important aspect of translation in general and in studying the translation of dialogue it is frequently “metatranslational in nature, reflecting on the problems of translation in the text in question” (Hermans, 2014, p. 287). Pym (2011, p. 87) argues that studying peritexts “can reveal a great deal about the social context in which translations are carried out, especially with respect to target audiences”. The paratextual presence in the data has been examined to indicate if the dialect was presented in these paratextual procedures or not. It was found that paratextual data varies between translators. Paratext in the selected novels is presented through three types of peritext: translator’s introduction/note; glossary; and footnotes.

5.2.10.1. Translator’s introduction/note

A translator’s introduction or note is usually at the beginning or the end of the translated work. It provides background information about the author, the book itself, and the translator’s reflections on the plot, the writing style, and/or comments about any other challenges or obstacles they faced when translating the text into the TL, including the language of the ST. Of the ten novels in the corpus, only four include an introduction or note.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1. Translator’s introduction/note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translator’s introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- <em>Open Door</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- <em>Zaat</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the four, two give a detailed description of the language and varieties in the ST and how these were translated. The translator’s introduction to the Open Door, for example, provides introductory information about the LDD and explains how this issue was tackled in the text. The introduction gives the historical background to the debate around LDD in Egypt and positions the novel within the second wave of writing LDD in Egypt. It also explains the feminist implications behind the linguistic choices in the dialogue of the heroine, and it offers a brief analysis of the code-switching in the characters’ speech. The translator repeatedly refers to the LDD as colloquial. Another introduction that mentions the language is found in Zaat, where the translator comments on the dialectal nature of the dialogue, referring to it as Arabic but without being more specific. The translator presents an interesting discussion about the title, and he explains how he translated the title according to the dialectal phonetic sound of the words rather than to the actual writing of the name or the written form of the ST. Interestingly, the introduction in Girls of Riyadh is written by the original author, who is identified on the cover as co-translator. She comments on the process of dealing with dialects in the translation:

in my Arabic version of the novel I interspersed the classical Arabic with language that reflects the mongrel Arabic of the modern world – there was Saudi dialect (several of them), and Lebanese-Arabic, English-Arabic and more. As none of that would make sense to the non-Arab reader, I had to modify the original text somewhat. (2007, p. viii)

5.2.10.2. Glossary

Translators usually include a glossary to supply more information about some content in the text; typically, this is placed at the end of the translation. The information explains some of the borrowed words, as well as certain names or historical incidents in the text. In the chosen
corpus, this procedure was used in five novels: *A Dog with No Tail*, *Munira’s Bottle*, *Zaat*, *Girls of Riyadh*, and *Maryam’s Maze*. Glossaries are presented in two different ways. Starkey, Moger and Calderbank, in their translations, use glossaries as a way to explain the borrowed and culturally specific words that they include within the text. These words are not necessarily all dialectal words, but some. The following is an example from the glossary of *Zaat* that explains the dialectal honorific title used in the dialogue:

**Example 5.42 (TT, p. 349)**

“Sitt: women, old woman, grandmother. Sitti means ‘my sitt’ and implies some respect or affection.”

A similar case occurs in the glossary to *A Dog with No Tail*, which also includes dialectal words used in the dialogue of the novel, such as amm, bashmuhandis and Mailliun:

**Example 5.43 (TT, p. 151)**

“bashmuhandis: a conflation of ‘bash’ (Turkish, meaning head or chief) and ‘muhandis’ (Arabic, literally engineer) though in the novel it denotes not a narrow technical qualification but is a semiformal designation of rank indicating high social status. It is also used in general conversation to indicate respect or to ingratiate.”

Booth and Al Sanea, on the other hand, use the glossary in *Girls of Riyadh* to explain the cultural implications of the surnames of the novel’s characters or to explain the name of the online group that the author has used to send her emails. It is not used to explain LDD words.

5.2.10.3. Footnotes

Footnotes are the least-used of all the peritexts in the translations. Even when there is a footnote in ST to explain dialectal terms, the translator sometimes tries to incorporate it as an explanation within the text itself. Footnotes are present only in *Shumaisi* and *Girls of Riyadh*. 
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The footnote procedure is used particularly in *Girls of Riyadh* to explain the dialectal borrowed words from the ST. For example, within the text the translators have borrowed the word ‘E wallah’ (p. 6), about which they then give more information in a footnote:

**Example 5.44 (TT, p. 6)**

“**E wallah means swearing in God’s name that something is true.”**

### 5.2.11. Speech and sound representation

In a few translations, the translators use a number of compensation procedures that are not necessary for translating LDD, but which give a sense of conversational style that is usually already in the ST. Below, I give a general idea of how these are used in the translations.

#### 5.2.11.1. Sound imitation

Sound imitation is present in a few novels to imitate a conversational style. For example, in *Munira’s Bottle* the main character gasps when a familiar song is suddenly played on the stereo:

**Example 5.45 (ST, p. 115; TT, p. 98)**

يالله .. تصدق؟

“Allaaah… just imagine?”

Allah, is a borrowed word, mainly meaning “God”, but the character uses it to evoke nostalgia and to reminisce over a past event. The translator tries to capture this by adding a triple ‘aaa’, which could imitate the character’s sound intonation as she recalls the memories that had been awakened by the song.

Another example of imitating the sound intonation comes from *Girls of Riyadh*:

**Example 5.46 (ST, p. 49; TT, p. 43)**
“Soo, Lamees, what are we going to do with you? Isn’t it enough, what you did last week, when you wouldn’t tell me which girl it was who put the red ink on the teacher’s chair in the class?”

The ‘o’ at the end of word “so” is tripled to reflect the angry and threatening sound intonation of the school principal.

5.2.11.2. Emphasis and emphatic devices

Representation of the conversational style of the dialogue is also occasionally achieved through non-orthographic features such as ellipses, exclamation marks and dashes in most of the examined novels.

As for ellipsis, it is already in the ST and is reflected in the translation or removed from it and replaced. In some cases, it is used in STs to reflect pauses and incomplete sentences, such as in this example from The Open Door:

Example 5.47 (ST, p. 3; TT, p. 6)

Mama… Mama.

However, sometimes the speech representation changes through the translation process: either the ellipsis is omitted, as is usually the case in Shumaisi, Cities of Salt and Dongola, or it is changed to another emphatic device such as exclamation.

There is also a tendency in The Open Door to replace dots with a dash in the TT:

Example 5.48 (ST, p. 76; TT, p. 84)
“People – what have they got to do with it, or with us? No, I don’t understand anything, Isam, nothing at all, and –”

Overall, the use of these non-orthographic features varies between novels and their translations. To some extent, these devices have been reduced in the translations. It is not clear what triggers the three options of keeping, adding, or removing emphatic devices, especially in relation to ellipses. This might be attributable to stylistic preferences in the translation.

5.3. First findings: Rewriting of the LDD and norms

An initial objective of this project was to identify how translators deal with LDD in the translation of Saudi and Egyptian novels. The quantitative and qualitative descriptive textual analysis in this chapter indicates regularities of behaviour across the translators. The analysis of the data shows that the translators opted for various procedures rather than choosing a single solution to deal with the problem. The data also reveals that in practice none of the translators rendered the source dialect into a target dialect. Interestingly, however, translators do not tend to standardise or erase the conversational elements of dialogue. On the contrary, they recognise the conversational aspect and try to adhere in general to that in their translations. In fact, their procedure is one of compensation rather than translation of the dialect. Fairly similar varieties of procedures were used to translate the different regional and social dialects in all the previous examples from the STs. Translators also seem to use the same procedures with dialects that co-exist in the same novel, and this shift is not always hinted at in the dialogue. One of the few attempts is in Shumaisi where, before the relevant sentences, the translator writes the name of the different dialect that is spoken by the Sudanese character.
The quantitative analysis shows that some procedures are more frequent than others in the translation of LDD. The most frequent categories, which are present in almost all the novels, are: using marked writing style, standardisation, substitution, borrowing, and paraphrase. It seems that the translators in the corpus concentrate on reproducing the intention behind the use of dialect in the ST (Määttä, 2004, p. 335). This is clear in the data through the translators’ focus on retaining the different layers of the structure of the novels and, in particular, on producing informal conversational style for the dialogue while to some extent preserving the formality, to some extent, of the narrative. At the same time, the translators keep the Arabic present in the TTs and make it clear that the text is a translation by borrowing Arabic words in the dialogue and in the text in general.

In considering the changes that LDD went through in the translation, the question arises of whether or not translators have an intention to adapt the LDD novels to a certain poetics? The findings from the descriptive textual analysis suggest that the rewriting of LDD in the TTs is, to some extent, influenced by poetics and the universe of discourse of the TT (Lefevere, 1992b). The translators aim to produce mainly an informal conversational writing style in order to adhere to the general principle of the English literary system about writing informal dialogue in novels. Consequently, the translations present a reading experience that might to some extent adapt it to the TT literary productions. The LDD has changed in the translation process to become literary informal dialogue (LID).

Analysing the data within Toury’s (1995) norm framework reveals that the regularities of behaviour across the translators’ work, particularly at the macro level of rewriting the LDD into informal conversational style (LID), indicates certain norms that these translators follow in relation to the translation of Saudi and Egyptian novels. It seems the regularities of behaviour have been developed to adjust the novel to the TL’s literary presentation, where it is acceptable to use marked writing style in the dialogue of novels. The
frequency of the marked writing style indicates that translators are situating LDD in the conversational sphere, so they draw on the informality of spoken elements of the dialect in the translation. However, the textual analysis is not enough to confirm if translators are following a norm. Thus, as suggested by Toury (1995) and Brownlie (2003), combining the descriptive analysis with interviews with all translators would help to examine if there is a translational norm in the case of translating LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels. Hearing from the translators themselves will help to understand how the rewriting might be influenced by the role of patronage and what role ideology plays in the process.

Finally, the question arises of whether, if we look more deeply than at these external results and investigate the practice of the individual translator’s style within these regularities of behaviour, an in-depth analysis of a number of works by the same translators can reveal variations and particularities related to individual practices? This question is especially relevant where there is, as shown in the previous analysis, indication of variation in the application of certain procedures, such as in a translator’s use of borrowing. The descriptive data analysis in this chapter provides an introduction to a deeper study of the style of translators in relation to translating LDD, which is the focus of the following chapters. Above all, the next chapter investigates the practice of two translators, Calderbank and Booth, in order to explore whether they have preferred stylistic choices, and whether such choices can be attributed to the “translator’s style”.

5.4. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the data analysis from the selected novels. In the first part, the terminology used in the data analysis was clarified. The second part provided a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data. In particular, it discussed the procedures used by the translators to deal with LDD in the selected novels, with relevant examples from the corpus. The chapter ended by analysing the primary findings of the first stage of analysis.
Chapter Six

The Translation of Literary Dialectal Dialogue in the Work of Marilyn Booth and Anthony Calderbank: A Comparative Study

6.1. Introduction

The previous chapter analysed the procedures used by translators to deal with LDD in the selected corpus of Saudi and Egyptian novels. The primary focus was on mapping the procedures themselves, rather than on specific translators. In this chapter, the discussion centres on two translators, both of whom were mentioned in the previous chapter: Anthony Calderbank, and Marilyn Booth. The purpose of this in-depth investigation is to discover the extent to which each translator has developed a certain style of translation and to explore the individual translator’s style within the frame of translating LDD. Calderbank and Booth have been chosen from among the previous translators for several reasons. First, in order to establish a translator’s style, it is necessary to examine more than one translation, and the output of both Calderbank and Booth provides sufficient data. Second, both have a literary and academic background which suggests that they might be reflective and aware of their translation practice and the translator’s style in general. Third, they both exhibit some elements of a definite and clear approach towards LDD and translation in general. More precisely, both have used procedures that establish their presence from the start by writing peritexts, such as introductions and glossaries.

The comparative descriptive analysis of the two translators will use quantitative and qualitative approaches. The similarities and differences of the overall application of
procedures will be the basis of the analysis. The data for this chapter comprises five novels translated by Calderbank and four by Booth.

This descriptive chapter with a practical illustration of the modified narratological representation that I proposed earlier explores whether or not these two translators adopt a certain style in their translation of LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels. By focusing on the ST and TT characters’ dialogue that I added to the model, I consider how these characters’ speech is represented in the translations and I examine the relation between the translation procedures and the positionality and style of the two translators in the TT.

6.2. Who are Anthony Calderbank and Marilyn Booth?

6.2.1. Translators’ background

Before analysing the two translators’ procedures and style, some background information about them provides context. Calderbank and Booth are both literary translators who specialise in translating from Arabic into English.

Anthony Calderbank is a British translator who is known for his translations of Arabic literature – most notably, Egyptian novels – into English. He graduated from the University of Manchester in 1982, where he studied Arabic and Persian. He then moved to Cairo and lived in Shubra where he worked in a small primary school. In 1987 he returned to England where he taught Arabic at the University of Salford. Since 1990 he has once again been in the Middle East where he has worked in various positions. He was a lecturer in the Department of English and Comparative Literature at the American University in Cairo, before moving to Saudi Arabia in 2000 where he worked for the British Council in Khobar and Riyadh. In my interview with him, Calderbank said that he had the chance either to live in or to visit a number of countries in the Arab region, including Syria, Yemen and the Gulf states. He is currently based in Tunisia where he works remotely for the British Council in Libya.
Calderbank has an online presence where he has written, under the name “Tony Calderbank”, a number of articles for the British Council’s *Voices* magazine. Among the topics he has discussed are second-language acquisition, multilingual education, and teaching and learning Arabic varieties.

Calderbank has given a number of interviews in which he has spoken about his approach as a literary translator. For example, he has commented in an interview included in Büchler et al. (2011) that his approach to translation is to leave a sense of the Arabic language in the translation to remind readers that it is a translation and to draw them towards the Arabic text. He believes that a formal education is not enough to make a literary translator, and that other things required are an understanding of the SL and the culture itself, an ability to write creatively in the TL, and, most importantly, confidence in making translation decisions (Büchler et al., 2011, p. 67).

The second translator discussed in this chapter is Marilyn Booth. She is an American translator who has been translating Arabic literature into English for more than fifteen years. Booth graduated in 1978 from Harvard Radcliffe College with a BA in Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations (Arabic), with a focus on the history and literature of the modern Middle East. She then obtained a DPhil from the University of Oxford, where she researched Arabic literature and Middle Eastern history. The title of her research was “Egypt in its Own Words: Mahmud Bayram al-Tunisi (1893–1961) and the Literature of Vernacular Expression (1919–1934)”. After spending time working in non-academic jobs in Egypt, she moved back to the US and began her teaching career at Brown University. This was followed by positions at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, the University of Edinburgh, New York University Abu Dhabi, and the University of Oxford where she currently teaches subjects related to Islamic and Middle Eastern studies, gender in Middle Eastern literature, modern
Arabic literature (especially the literature of Egypt) and literary translation as creative practice.

Besides teaching and working as a literary translator from Arabic into English, Booth has a long academic background that focuses on activist-oriented research related to gender and feminist translation from the Middle East. Her substantial number of publications focus on the “contemporary practices of Arabic literary translation, especially first-author/second-author [translator] interactions and the politics of publishing and marketing” (Oxford University website, October, 2016). She has written a number of books relating to gender studies in the Egyptian context, for example: *Classes of Ladies of Cloistered Spaces: Writing Feminist History through Biography in Fin-de-Siècle Egypt* (2015), and *May Her Likes Be Multiplied: Biography and Gender Politics in Egypt* (2008). She has also edited *Harem Histories: Envisioning Places and Living Spaces* (2010).

Booth is quite vocal about her practice as a translator and co-author of her translations, whether in the published translations (such as in the translator’s introduction or the acknowledgements) or in her published articles.

### 6.2.2. Data

As this study focuses on Saudi and Egyptian dialects, the data was drawn from Calderbank’s and Booth’s translations of Saudi and Egyptian novels that contain a significant amount of LDD. The data was divided into a main data set and a subsidiary data set, and it was analysed in two stages. For Calderbank, the main data set that was chosen comprises his translations of *al-Qārūrah* (*Munira’s Bottle*) by Yousef Al-Mohameed and *Naqarāt al-Dhibā’* (*Gazelle Tracks*) by Miral Al-Tahawy. The analysis of these two books covered all the LDD in the novels in order to track the procedures Calderbank used and to formulate the basic categories for the procedures that characterise his translation style. The next stage of analysis involved selections from no more than 15 chapters from Calderbank’s translations of the subsidiary
data set, namely: (1) Miral Al-Tahawy’s *al-Khibā’* (*The Tent*); (2) Yousef Al-Mohaiemeed’s *Fikhākh al-Rā’iha* (*Wolves of the Crescent Moon*); and (3) Sonallah Ibrahim’s *Dhāt* (*Zaat*). The reason for using this supporting data set was to check the frequency with which the translation procedures are used, and to establish a link between this frequency and Calderbank’s translation style.

A similar technique was followed for Booth: four of her translated novels were chosen and also divided into a main data set and a subsidiary data set. The main data are *Awraq al-Narjis* (*Leaves of Narcissus*) by Sumayyah Ramaḍān, and *Lusus Mutaqa’idun* (*Thieves in Retirement*) by Ḥamdī Abū Julayyil. The next stage of analysis involved random selections from no more than 15 chapters from Booth’s translations of the supporting resources: *al-Bāb al-Maftuh* (*The Open Door*) by Laṭīfah al-Zayyāt, and *Bānāt al-Riyadh* (*Girls of Riyadh*) by Rajaa Alsanea (examples from Booth’s manuscript and the Alsanea’s published translation).

As mentioned in Chapter Four, there was an intervention by Alsanea in the translation of *Girls of Riyadh*. The translation of this text was controversial due to the conflict between Booth on one side, and the author and publishing house on the other side. Booth was trying to experiment with the translation by applying procedures that tend more towards the ST; the author and the publishing house, however, opposed these procedures and requested a more neutral procedure in order to make the text sound like an English novel. After the disagreement, the author made many changes, editing Booth’s translation and insisting on being credited as a co-translator along with Booth. Booth was unhappy about the intervention and the edits, so, in order to defend her own style and her authority over the published text, she wrote two articles that explained, from her point of view, the damage that had been done to the published version.
It was difficult to obtain any examples from the original draft except for those which Booth had published in her article “Translator v. Author (2007): Girls of Riyadh go to New York” (2008). For this reason, the examples that are examined to define Booth’s style in the following discussion are from her article, in addition to the examples from the three Egyptian novels. Any examples from the published version of Girls from Riyadh are used only when there is a discussion about the intervention in Booth’s style. Due to this issue with the novel, an important note should be clarified here regarding the quantitative analysis for this novel. As this chapter focuses on Booth’s style, and due to the conflict between her and Alsanea, a quantitative analysis from this novel will not be included in the discussion. Although I will use examples from her drafts that she provided in her article, these examples are not enough to generate quantitative data. Besides, these examples are to some extent too limited and subjective to be used to give a statement about the frequency of procedures in the draft. Consequently, the quantitative analysis will rely on the data from the three Egyptian novels.

6.3. Translator’s style: Meta-style, and the style of translating LDD

As I argued in Chapter Two, the style of the translator can be unpacked by analysing how they deal with constructing the characters’ speech in the translation, especially if that speech is written in culturally bounded dialogue such as dialect.

To analyse the style of the translator, the following section presents a descriptive analysis of the translation of dialect, specifically focusing on the transition and construction of LDD from ST to TT. I examine how translators build the characterisation elements in the TT. As a way to examine it, the style of the translators is considered to constitute a whole approach to the text; thus, dialogue, while no doubt independent in the text, is nevertheless also part of its surrounding context. I approach the LDD as an intrinsic part of the story where
characters expose their personalities and thoughts, whereas the rest of the text is extrinsic and shapes the frame for the story.

For this reason, I present the following comparative analysis of the work of Calderbank and Booth by first giving a brief general analysis of each translator’s meta-style for LDD. By meta-style of translating LDD, I mean the overall style the translator has used in the text surrounding the dialogue, including titles, names, narrative, and paratextual information that are not related to the LDD. Then I will present a detailed analysis to understand characters’ speech constructions in the TT. Finally, I will focus on how the translator’s voice becomes manifest through their stylistic choices and how these affect specific issues such as sociolect and idiolect. The aim is to see the interrelation between the translation of dialogue and the novel as a whole, and this interrelationship in turn relates to the translator’s style.

6.3.1. Calderbank’s meta-style

First, an examination of the peritextual interventions indicate that Calderbank uses an introduction twice in his translations, primarily to give some general information about the communities in which the stories take place, and to provide the reader with some analysis of the main characters and their backgrounds. In relation to titles, the analysis shows a few changes in TT. For example, the original title of *Munira’s Bottle is al-Qārūra*, which means “the bottle”; however, the name of the protagonist in the title was added in the TT. Another case is the Egyptian novel *Dhāt*, which Calderbank has changed to *Zaat*; the first letter of the word was changed according to the Egyptian pronunciation of the letter ذ (Dhā). On the other hand, the title of the novel *Fikhākh al-Rā’iha*, which literally means “the traps of the scent”, was translated as *Wolves of the Crescent Moon*. The wolves and the moon are mentioned in two chapter titles within the novel: “Moon Passion” and “The Heroism of the Wolf”.
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Secondly, a number of changes have been applied to the structure of sentences, as compared with the ST. For example, one of the narrative techniques favoured by Al-Tahawy is the ambiguous pronoun, by which the author refers to a certain character as “she” or “he” without mentioning the proper name. This refusal to make the referents known adds a sense of mystery to the story. This occurs in *Naqarāt al-Dhibā’* (*Gazelle Tracks*) and *al-Khibā’* (*The Tent*); the author sometimes resolves the ambiguity of the pronoun referents by introducing the proper name of the character after a few paragraphs. On other occasions, she drops only hints about certain characteristics of the character without explicitly mentioning their name. Such pronoun ambiguity has not been preserved in the translation, with Calderbank changing the pronoun to the proper name the first time any character appears. The mysterious mode of the original is changed in the translation.

Throughout the novel, the narrator talks on many occasions about a male character without explicitly mentioning his name; it seems that the narrator does this on purpose to distance herself from this character, who is in fact her father. Throughout the whole description of the character, the narrator uses the implied pronoun, which is an intrinsic part of the verb in the sentence, and the character is referred to as “he”. This has served to reflect the tension in the relationship between the narrator and her father. In the translation, however, Calderbank has explicitly written out the proper name as “Mutlig”. As in the following example, the character was saying in ST “I would be standing next to her when he came in …”, however, the “he” was changed:

**Example 6.1 (ST, p. 74; TT, p. 56)**

كنت بجانبها دائما عندما يدخل كل يوم حين يشعر بستيقظها …
I would be standing next to her when Mutlig came in, his intuition having informed him that she had awoken.

Another change Calderbank makes to the structure of the narrative is to change the narrative mode from the first person to the third person, or vice versa. For example, in Chapter 26 of *al-Qārūrah* (*Munira’s Bottle*), the narrative mode is switched between first person and third person. In the ST, the first paragraph of the chapter is narrated from a third-person point of view. After that, and for the rest of the chapter, a first-person point of view is used. Consider the following example from *Naqarāt al-Dhibā*’ (*Gazelle Tracks*), where the narrator is talking about Muhra in the third person, so that a reader might assume that the narrator is someone other than Muhra, distinguishing it from all the other chapters. However, in the translation Calderbank uses the pronoun “I” to indicate that the narrator is still Muhra and not someone else.

Another example of Calderbank’s editing of the information in the ST is his replacing the title of a novel in the original with a different novel that has a similar plot that is related to the main character. In the original novel, the character reads a part of *ماجدولين*, the Arabic name for the French novel *Sous les Tilleuls*. In the translation, Calderbank replaces this with another French novel, *La Dame aux Camélias*, but he uses the English title of the novel, *The Lady of the Camellias*:

**Example 6.2 (ST, p. 64; TT, p. 48)**

She would recite passages from *The Lady of the Camellias*.

He does something similar in *al-Qārūrah* (*Munira’s Bottle*). In the original, the name of the souk is “al Sedra”, which is changed in the translation to “Souk al-Kabari” (p. 43), another souk that existed during the period of the novel, but which was later removed.
Explicitation is another procedure sometimes used in his translations to translate the cultural terms included in the text. These are incorporated into the narrative through explanations of the cultural terms that give additional information. Consider the following examples from *Naqarāt al-Dhibā‘* (*Gazelle Tracks*):

**Example 6.3 (ST, p. 21; TT, p. 13)**

سَينْسَى اسْمُهَا وَيَقُولُ أَنَّهَا كَانَتْ مِثْلَ الْجَازِيَةِ الصَّرِيفَةَ ..

He can’t remember her name exactly, but assures them that she was even fairer than Al-Jaziya, the noble heroine of the Bani Hilal epic.

**Example 6.4 (ST, p. 26; TT, p. 19)**

يُضِيفُونَ لِقْبَ ((الطَّاسِلَةَ)).

They always added the adjective Al-Basil (which means “fearless”).

Al-Tahawy’s novels are marked by long sentences that reflect a stream of consciousness mode of narrative. This writing style is adopted either to represent trauma, as in *al-Khibā‘*, or to represent the floating between imagination and reality, as in *Naqarāt al-Dhibā‘*. The STs have a substantial number of sentences without full stops, but only commas, which is generally acceptable style in Arabic. However, in English, long sentences are not the norm, so Calderbank shortens the sentences in the translation, which subsequently affects the mode of narrative.

Lastly, Calderbank’s presence is evident through his own solutions to deal with the juxtaposition of MSA and dialectal lexical items in the narrative. As discussed in Chapter Four, there is a multiglossic switching that mainly leans to the MSA end in the narrative part. This means that in a number of novels there is some integration of dialectal terms in the narrative part. This juxtaposition is especially noticeable where the narrative is completely or
partially in the first person, such as in Al-Mohaimeed’s and Al-Tahawy’s novels. One of the procedures Calderbank adopts to deal with this is the use of the marked writing style consisting of phrasal verbs and contractions. For example, in Munira’s Bottle the informal style occurs in several parts of the narrative where Munira addresses the readers directly. There were few cases he used marked style in narrative where there are no dialectal lexical items in the text.

6.3.2. Booth’s meta-style

Booth’s scholarly career and research activities provide an academic presence in her activities as a translator. This presence has been established in many ways, one of which is her use of long introductions that provide historical context and sometimes end with a reference list, such as in her translation of al-Zayyat’s novel, The Open Door. In the extended introduction to The Open Door, Booth highlights the historical, political, and social background that influenced al-Zayyat and contributed to shaping the novel.

There is also evidence in Booth’s introductions of either personal contact with the author while translating, or extensive research on the author and their activities both inside and outside the literary world. In the acknowledgements to her translation of Thieves in Retirement, Booth states: “I’m grateful to Muhammad [a scholar of English and Arabic literature] for his insistence and to Hamdi [the author] for his friendship, patience, and good humour at being pestered with questions” (Abu Golayyel, 2006, p.ix).

Unlike Calderank, Booth does not make complete changes to the titles of the translated novels; the changes are related only to the acceptable syntactic and semantic structure of the TT. However, in Leaves of Narcissus she changes some of the characters’ names; for example, from Siobhan (ST: 97) to Tara (TT: 76), the name of the housekeeper from Berny (ST: 79) to Beth (TT: 63) and Kimi’s classmate Amina (ST: 87) to Laila (TT: 68).
When it comes to the procedures for dealing with the language of the narrative, an in-depth study reveals that Booth’s texts are loaded with borrowed words and a thick translation\textsuperscript{11} that explains the cultural references and idioms in the ST, which provides the reader with new concepts that reflect the culture of the ST and its language.

Like Calderbank, Booth also makes use of explication and the provision of extra information for her readers in the TT. This information includes linguistic, geographical, or historical information that is not explicit in the ST, and which would be regarded as common knowledge for the source readers. For example, in *The Open Door* Booth:

**Example 6.5 (ST, p.27; TT, p. 32)**

ويشتم سنسفيل جنود الامبراطورية البريطانية.

Cursing the grandfathers of the British Empire, and the grandfathers of the grandfathers...

The word سنسفيل/sansafeel/ is a cultural curse word used in most of the Arab region. It is probably a nonsense or jocular word used for swearing. Some people claim it means “origin” or “descent” that goes back to one’s great-great-grandparents. In this part, Booth provides an explanation of the term that may help the target readers understand the meaning.

Furthermore, extra information is added to explain language or cultural references that are not explicit to the TT readers. Booth explains the meaning of names that are not explicit in the text. Consider the following example from *Thieves in Retirement*:

**Example 6.6 (ST, p. 30; TT, p. 25)**

اسمه جمال وأفضل ان اسميه الرجل الأنيق..

Gamal’s moniker means ‘Gorgeousness’, but I really should call him the Guy with style.

\textsuperscript{11} Appiah uses the term “thick translation” to refer to a translation “that seeks with its annotations and its accompanying glosses to locate the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context” in an effort to attend to “how various other people really are or were” (Appiah, 1993, p. 817).
In the ST, the name “Gamal” has been mentioned with no explanation of the meaning, as the name’s reference will be obvious to Arabic speakers; however, in the translation Booth makes the meaning explicit.

Another example occurs in *Thieves in Retirement*, where the author recalls details from Naguib Mahfouz’s novel *al-Harāfish* and refers to one of the female characters in that novel (who resembles a female character in *Thieves of Retirement*). Booth translates the title as *The Riffraff* and explains the reference, adding extra information that explains the intertextuality that is not implicit for TT readers:

**Example 6.7 (ST, p. 31; TT, p. 26)**

كانت جميلة، كانت جميلة وفاتنة حسب وصف نجيب محفوظ لواحدة تشبهها في الحرافيش، كانت ابنة الجيران ولأدري

لماذا لم ترق لجمال سوي في ليلة عرسها.

The woman was good-looking. Good-looking and alluring in the way of a woman Naguib Mahfouz described some time ago in his novel *The Riffraff* – this woman looked pretty much like that character.

In this example, the name “riffraff” in ST is mentioned without reference to the nature of this name. For Arab readers and even viewers, *al-Harāfish* is a famous novel written by Mahfouz, which was later adapted into a film that was shown in the Arab region. Booth has added the word “novel” and italicised the word *The Riffraff* as italics is the convention for presenting a novel’s title in English.\(^\text{12}\)

An interesting element in Booth’s translation of narrative is that she shows the gender marker in the TT. A feature of Arabic is that the gender marker is strongly visible in all level of the text. However, this is not always the case in English, as English adjectives are neutral and most nouns are not gender-specific. Booth tries to make the female gender marker in the

\(^{12}\text{Mahfouz's novel has been translated into English by Catherine Cobham as *The Harafish* (1992).}\)
TT visible by adding words to show the gender, usually with a word meant to describe a female. This highlights not just the words but the fact that these words are used to describe a female in this context. This procedure is called ‘resistance’ and is regarded by Massardier-Kenney (1997) as one of the strategies used in feminist translation to challenge the literary and linguistic system. According to Massardier-Kenney (1997, p. 60), resistance in translation is about “making the labour of the translation visible through linguistic means that have a defamiliarising effect that work against easy fluency”. This procedure has been adopted by feminist translators to challenge the linguistic norms of the TL. So, to show gender in the translation, Booth often adds words to reflect the feminine voice of the narrator.

Consider the following example from *Thieves in Retirement*:

**Example 6.8 (ST, p. 51; TT, p. 50)**

الدكتورة أصلًا من قنا، ابنة عامل سابق مازال يحظى بشهرة لابأس بها، فقد أطلق اسمه على إحدى الماكينات...

The Doctoress was a native of Qena, daughter of an ex-worker whose fame still reverberated since his name had been given to one of those enormous industrial machines...

In this example, Booth translates the word دكتورة /daktūra/, which is an term used to describe a female doctor in the ST, as “Doctoress”, an old-fashioned English word also meaning a female doctor. This is a way of making gender visible in the ST.

In *The Open Door*, Booth explains the feminine-implicit information in the original:

**Example 6.9 (ST, p. 6; TT, p. 8)**

وهزت ليلى كتفها ووقفت أمام باب الشقة في انتظار ابنة خالتها جميلة.

Layla gave her shoulders a dismissive shake and stood by the front door to await her cousin Gamila, her mother's sister's daughter who lived on the seventh floor.
In Arabic, there are different terms for a cousin from the mother’s side and a cousin from the father’s side, and a feminine gender marker is added if the cousin is a son or a daughter of a sister. To stress the visibility of gender terms, Booth includes an extra explanation of the term through the addition of “her mother’s sister’s daughter”. However, in *Girls of Riyadh*, because of the author’s intervention in the final version of the translation, this procedure is neutralised. The opening of the novel can be taken as an example of how the translator’s procedure has changed:

**Example 6.10 (ST, p. 9; TT, p. 1)**

سَيدَاتِي آنْسَاتِي سَادَتِي... أنتمِ على موعدٍ مع أكبرِ الفضائحِ المحلية،

Ladies and gentlemen: You are invited to join me in one of the most explosive scandals and noisiest…

The speech starts with the opening سَيدَاتِي آنْسَاتِي سَادَتِي/ sīdātī anīsatī sādatī/ which means “Ladies young misses, gentlemen”. In her article “Translator v. Author” (2008), Booth defends her gendered resistance approach which she originally used to translate this introduction as:

Ladies, Girls, and Gentlemen: Get ready, because you are about to rendezvous with some of the most explosive scandals and noisiest... (Booth, (2008), p. 202)

She justifies the translation of the word “girls” as a way of resisting and challenging the language system and the gender system of the TT. In addition, she argues that the whole novel revolves around these “girls”, so, by omitting this term from the beginning, the visibility of the girls is affected. It amounts to a deliberate attempt to silence these “girls” and to give their voice to the narrator.
Finally, the use of the marked style in the narrative is not limited to the use of contractions and phrasal verbs but is also present in colloquial idiomatic expressions and slang words. The STs are mostly narrated from a first-person point of view, except for *The Open Door* which is narrated from a third-person perspective. As is the case with Calderbank, there are occasions when the narrator has used dialectal words or idiomatic expressions in the ST’s narrative. The markedness in the text is recreated in the translation by the use of the marked writing style in the narrative. Booth in several cases uses marked English structures and words in the translation of different parts of the narrative where there are no dialectal lexical items in the context and which are written in MSA.

6.4. Analysis of the translator’s style of translating LDD

Having briefly discussed both translators’ meta-styles in order to understand the wider context of their translations, I will now move to the comparative in-depth analysis of their translations of LDD. The quantitative analysis reveals that there are some variations in the frequency percentage of the procedures. This variation between translations by the individual translator can be attributed to many reasons, not all of which are related to the translators, such as the length of the ST novel, the nature of the ST, the amount of LDD within the novel, and the overlap of categories, which subsequently are reflected in the frequency percentage of the procedures within the novel itself. As in the previous chapter, the quantitative method will be used here only to give an indication or estimate of the frequencies of procedures. The frequencies will not be compared with each other nor will they be individually compared between the translators. Instead, they will be used to give an overall sense of the procedures in each translator’s work. The analysis will focus on the most interesting stylistic features that emerge from the textual analysis.
Generally, the in-depth study of the work of both translators shows similarities and differences in the application of procedures to translate LDD. As the analysis in Chapter Five suggests, the in-depth analysis also indicates that marked writing style – more precisely, the use of contractions – is the most frequent procedure in the work of each translator. Marked writing style, borrowing, substitution and paraphrase are present in all the data of the two translators. However, the quantitative analysis also reveals that there are a few procedures that are more prominent in the work of one translator than the other; this difference will be discussed in detail with relevant examples in the descriptive analysis below.

In the following analysis, and as the case in the analysis of Chapter Five, procedures will be discussed separately for the purpose of description and illustration. Each procedure will be supported with an estimation of its frequency and examples to highlight the similarities and differences between the two translators’ practices.

6.4.1. Using marked forms

The results obtained from the preliminary analysis of the two translators’ work show a remarkably high frequency of marked writing style as a procedure. It scores a high percentage in both translators’ procedures across all the novels. As can be seen from Figures 6.1 and 6.2, the use of marked style reaches frequency of 49.29% in Calderbank’s work and 58.90% in Booth’s work. Both Calderbank and Booth share a number of key features in applying it in their translations. The most common use of marked writing style in both translators’ work is the use of contractions, phrasal verbs, colloquial words, initiating signals, and repetition. Interestingly, contraction, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, is the most common procedures in the two translators’ work.
First, Calderbank relies on contraction to emphasise the markedness of LDD in the ST. Consider the following example from *Gazelle Tracks*:

**Example 6.11 (ST, p. 111; TT, p. 87)**

أنت جمّال.

“You’re just a camel herder.”
In this example, الملال/أنت جمال/ānta Jammāl/ which means “you are a camel herder”. The expression is in the Egyptian Bedouin dialect, which is represented by the glottal stop on the letter alif (ٌ) and the shaddah (۱) (which is a sign of emphasis equivalent to writing a consonant twice in the orthographies of languages like Latin and Italian); the word with shaddah is mainly used in a dialectal context. Calderbank uses contraction to create the same effect along with the word just.

Aside from the normal case of using a contraction between the noun or pronoun and the verb “to be”, Booth tends, in certain cases, to use contractions that are more common in speech than in writing, such as in the following example from Leaves of Narcissus:

Example 6.12(ST, p. 71; TT, p. 56)

أمال يعنى انت بس اللي بتفتكرى كل حاجة؟

“D’you think you’re the only one who remembers everything?”

The ST sentence shows a clear dialectal structure which is represented here through the use of Cairene dialect system morphemes such as (1) the aspectual marker بـ/bi-/ and (2) the relative marker اللى/alli/. The sentence also uses colloquial phonological features, such as the omission of the glottal stop in the pronoun انت/ānta/ and the omission of the dots under the letter يا/ya/. As can be seen in the translation, the marked style of the ST has been recreated, first, through the elision of the vowel in the auxiliary verb “do” and its substitution by an apostrophe, and, second, through the contraction between the pronoun and verb “to be” in “you’re”.

The same translation procedure is also used in The Open Door:

Example 6.13 (ST, p. 13; TT, p. 14)

كدابة! كدابة ليه؟
“Liar! What d’you mean, liar?”

The content morphemes in this example are lexically and phonologically in the Cairene dialect. First, the letter ذال /dha/ is realised as /da/ in Carine dialect in the word /kadabah/ which means “liar”; also, the position of the vowel after the letter /da/ is contrary to its MSA counterpart where the vowel comes before the letter /dha/. In addition, the ECA question word لیه /līh/ is used. The translation reflects the marked form through the use of elision, as in the previous example, and by importing the marked features from the ST, such as the repetition of “liar” and the exclamation mark.

Phrasal verbs are the second most preferred technique for applying marked style. For example, from Munira’s Bottle:

**Example 6.14 (ST, p. 97; TT, p. 81)**

عارفة! ثم أضفت ببرود " لیه منفعل؟"

“I know that. What’s he so worked up about?” I said coldly.

In this example, nearly all the lexical items in the dialogue belong to the Najdi dialect, such as the Najdi interrogative particle لیه/līh/, which is used to ask for reasons and explanation, when it means “why”. The only exception is the word منفعل/munfaʿil/ which means “very upset”, which can be used in the Najdi dialect or in MSA with a slight change in its pronunciation. What can differentiate the two pronunciations is the position of the diacritics on the letter /mīm/. In MSA, the word would be with دامم /Dammah/ (on top of the letter منفعل/munfaʿil/), whereas the dialectal word would be with كسر /Kasrah/ under the exact letter and the fourth letter /ʿaīn/ منفعل/minfiʿil/. There are no diacritics in this example, but the dialectal reading of this word in ST could be triggered by the preceding interrogative particle لیه/līh/. In the TT, the confusion about the pronunciation has been solved by using the idiom “worked up about”.
The third representation of the marked writing style present in the two translators’ work is the use of English colloquial and slang words. The following are from Calderbank’s translation of *Gazelle Tracks*:

**Example 6.15 (ST, p. 110; TT, p. 86)**

ابن من يأولد؟

“whose son are you, boy?”

**Example 6.16 (ST, p. 116; TT, p. 91)**

بيت من هذا بحلوة؟!

“whose house is this, sweetheart?”

The Egyptian dialect has been reflected in the dialogue first through the use of the words ولد /walad/ “son” and حلوه /hilwa/ “sweet”, which are only used in dialectal context, and secondly through the use of the vocative يا /yā/. The dialect in the two sentences is reflected through the use of the colloquial words “boy” and “sweetheart”.

Booth opts for a similar use of colloquial words in her translations, as can be seen in the following examples from *The Open Door*:

**Example 6.17 (ST, p. 23; TT, p. 26)**

أنا في الحقيقة احترت وياك ياماما، كل حاجة أعملها تطلع غلط في غلط!

“Ama, I don’t know what to do! You’ve completely confused me now. Everything I do turns out to be wrong, wrong, wrong!”

**Example 6.18 (ST, p. 4; TT, p. 6)**

ماتخافش يابابا ، دي مظاهرة سلمية.
“Nothing to worry about, Papa. It’s to be a peaceful demonstration.”

The speaker uses the Cairene nouns ماما/mamah/ and بابا/babah/ to address their parents. These two words are repeated constantly throughout the novel. Booth tries to reflect this informality by opting for the American informal terms “Papa” and “Mama”. She usually uses them whenever these expressions occur in the dialogue.

Mimicked spoken conversational language is another type of marked form. Calderbank recreates initiating signals that render the conversation as more like impromptu speech. Consider the following example from Munira’s Bottle:

Example 6.19 (ST, p. 28; TT, p. 14)

أوووه... الظاهر أنني غلطان.

“Oh. It seems I have the wrong number.”

In the ST, the writer uses the initiating signals أوووه/āwwwh/, which are used to indicate surprise and are more of a spoken than written convention. This is translated as “oh”, which is also an interjection that is usually used in spoken communication as an expression of surprise or as a direct address to attract the attention of the person being spoken to.

Another example from the same novel:

Example 6.20 (ST, p. 92; TT, p. 76)

أنت يا أم جوتي بنتي!

“Hey, Miss Brown Slippers!”

This sentence is uttered in the Kuwaiti dialect by a young girl who is staying in the temporary shelter for Kuwaiti families in Riyadh and is provocatively shouting to Munira. The Kuwaiti dialect is presented through the word جوتي/jūṭī/, which is the Kuwaiti word for
shoes, and the *shaddah* (ُّ) on top of the letter نون /nūn/ in the word بني /bunny/ which means “brown”, which indicates the Kuwaiti pronunciation of the word. The provocation is illustrated in the ST by starting the phrase with the pronoun أنت/انتي/annti/ which means “you”, which is a spoken, but impolite, way to get someone’s attention. Calderbank recreates the provocation by starting the sentence with “Hey”, which has a similar impact as the ST as it is used to attract someone’s attention, sometimes not in a very polite way. The use of capital letters adds contextual emphasis to to show that it is being used as a name and the exclamation mark adds extra volume. Interestingly, the context that is being narrated by Munira indicates that Munira is in the shelter helping Kuwaiti families, and from the dialect in the sentence it is clear that the young girl is speaking in a different dialect; however, in the translation, although it is mentioned that Munira is in a shelter helping the Kuwaiti families, it does not clearly indicate the existence of a different dialect entering the conversation.

Like Calderbank, Booth also mimics spoken conversational language in the ST by recreating initiating signals from the TT that show the conversation to be more like impromptu speech. This can be seen in the following example from *Leaves of Narcissus*:

**Example 6.21 (ST, p. 20; TT, p. 15)**

فتضحك: يووه، بقى بعد ماشب ودوه الكتاب.

She laughs. “Yoooo! As they say, ‘once he’d gone totally grey, they gave him a book one day!’”

In the ST, the character uses the exclamation يووه /yūūh/, which is used to express a range of emotions, including surprise, anger, disappointment, or joy, or as a reaction to a remark; it is more of a spoken than written convention. This has been translated in the TT as an exclamation sound used to express joy.
In addition to initiating signals, the use of chat and texting symbols to fill the ellipses of omitting the curse word occur in *Thieves in Retirement*:

**Example 6.22 (ST, p. 29; TT, p. 24)**

When Sayf threatened him "#!*@ your mother!"

In the ST, the beginning of the curse is omitted. The reason for this omission is not explained; perhaps the author has omitted it because the vulgarity and sensitivity of the curse might be obvious to Egyptian readers. It is highly unlikely that this was a decision made by the publishing house, as there are other curse words that were not omitted from the ST. In her translation, Booth uses these random symbols found in phone-texting writing styles or used in social media to imply hidden curse words. In the TT, they function to imply that there are strong curse words under these symbols; in the ST, the same function is performed by the ellipsis.

Finally, repetition is present in the STs, but this is retained in only a few cases in Calderbank’s translations. On the other hand, Booth keeps the repetition that exists in the STs. Consider the following example in the Cairene dialect from *The Open Door*:

**Example 6.23 (ST, p. 4; TT, p. 6)**

“Don’t be afraid, Mama. Don’t worry, I know Mahmud is fine. He’ll come now, he must, and he’ll come. This morning …”

Another example of repetition:

**Example 6.24 (ST, p. 11; TT, p. 13)**
“You Mahmud, you. You.”

Repetition is not a technique that is used in English writing style. However, Booth tries to maintain the linguistic features of the ST by rendering the repetition in the TT.

6.4.2. Standardisation vs colloquialisation

The frequency of standardisation in Calderbank’s and Booth’s translation shows a distinct difference in the way these procedures are applied in their work, as can be seen from Figures 6.3 and 6.4. In Calderbank’s work, the frequency varies between novels with a highest frequency of 32.11% in Zaat and a lowest of 3.38% in The Tent. In Booth’s work, the frequency of standardisation is very low, not exceeding a rate of 5.8%.

![Figure 6.3. Standardisation (Calderbank)](image)
As discussed previously, Calderbank reflects the dialectal features from the ST by rendering the words in the unmarked English syntactical and semantic written form. Consider the following example from *Munira’s Bottle*:

**Example 6.25 (ST, p. 14; TT, p. 120)**

"Do you know his real name?"

The features of the Najdi dialect and oral communication in these sentences are presented through the grammatical structure of the sentence: first, through the omission of the question letter /a/ at the beginning of the sentence; and second, through the subject-verb inversion where the verb with its implied pronoun comes at the end of the sentence. The indication that a sentence is a question is sometimes through pronunciation of the sentence with a question-like intonation, or, as here, writing it with a question mark. The dialectal grammatical structure in the sentence has been neutralised with unmarked English grammatical structure where it starts with an auxiliary verb that is followed by a pronoun and the verb.
Another example is from *Gazelle Tracks*:

**Example 6.26 (ST, p. 15; TT, p. 8)**

حبايبنا وطول عمرهم خدامينا.

“our dear friends who have always been our servants.”

In this sentence, the grammatical features of the plurals of the nouns ending with ينُ/ynal, like in حبايبنا /ḥbāyebnā/ and خدامينا /khdamīnā/. The word حبايبنا /ḥbāyebnā/, which means “our beloved”, is usually used for an intimate and long relationship, but not a romantic one.

In the collocation طول عمرهم /twal amrahm/, the letter /alif/, which represents the long vowel sound in the middle of the word طوال /twal/, is omitted to represent the pronunciation of the word in Egyptian, where the vowel is dropped. In the translation, the dialectal grammar has been replaced with plurals and the present perfect tense. The word حبايبنا /ḥbāyebnā/ is translated as “our dear friends”, which implies a certain distance between the speaker and the people about whom they are speaking.

It is again interesting that there is a markedly lower rate of standardisation in Booth’s translations. On the contrary, she uses in the most cases colloquialisation when it comes to MSA dialogue in her translations. The MSA dialogue is not the focus of this study; however, simple analysis of the novels reveals that the use of marked writing style is used in her translation with the highest application in *Leaves of Narcissus*, especially in Kimi’s mother’s dialogues. Consider the following example from a conversation between Kimi and her mother in *Leaves of Narcissus*:

**Example 6.27 (ST, p. 87; TT, p. 69)**

لماذا تصررين على إلغائي هكذا؟ لماذا لا تسألني إذا كنت أود الذهاب معهم إلى الشاطئ؟
“Why are you so set on cancelling me out like this? Why don’t you ask me if I want to go with them to the beach?”

In the translation, the distinction between the linguistic choices Kimi and her mother has been homogenised, and Booth favours a more marked writing style procedure.

Two other examples occur in *Thieves in Retirement*:

**Example 6.28 (ST, p. 13; TT, p. 8)**

السلم ضيق فكيف أمرَ؟!

“The stairs are narrow, so how’m I supposed to get by?”

**Example 6.29 (ST, p. 13; TT, p. 8)**

السلم ضيق ومتداع أمرَ؟!

“The stairs are narrow and about to collapse if I’m not careful, and so how am I going to get by you?”

In these examples, the monologue is in MSA in the ST, but Booth renders it to marked style through the elision of the vowel in “am” and its replacement with an apostrophe, by using the phrasal verb “get by”, and by employing the contraction in “I’m”.

Another example of changing to marked style involves applying repetition in the translation in the same novel:

**Example 6.30 (ST, p. 39; TT, p. 36)**

على ما يرام.

“Fine, fine.”

This is Professor Ramadan’s response when his neighbour asks him about his work at the school. Professor Ramadan is almost the only character who uses MSA throughout most of
the novel. However, in the translation his clichéd MSA has been changed to using marked writing style which represented through the use of the repetition.

The textual analysis shows that colloquialisation occurs in a few cases in Calderbank’s translations, but that it is remarkably infrequent compared to Booth’s work.

6.4.3. Substitution

Both translators use substitution in all their translations to deal with expressions that contain dialectal cultural references, such as idioms, jokes, slang, words of pity or endearment, and insults. They apply it in their translations with variation. Most substitutes present only the function of such collocations or words.

![Substitution](image)

**Figure 6.5. Substitution (Calderbank)**
As Figures 6.5 and 6.6 indicate, substitution is a procedure that both translators rely on in all their translations when translating dialect. As an example, in Booth’s *Thieves in Retirement* translation, it is used to retain the general sense of slang and profanity in the characters’ speech. The characters in ST represent working class people that are struggling to fit into society, which the author tries to reflect in the LDD by using numerous slang expressions and insults. Booth tries to substitute the functions of the meaning by substituting the dialectal words or collocations with TT collocations that could give the meaning.

For a specific example for the procedure, consider the following from *Wolves of the Crescent Moon*:

**Example 6.31 (ST, p. 12; TT, p. 7)**

١اثور: له صوّت حين ظهيرة، ذات غاضباً أمامه القهوة قلب أن إلى أن قلب القهوة أمامه غاضباً ذات ظهيرة، حين صوّت له: يثور !!

“One day around noon, the man yelled at him, “You oaf”.

In this example, the word تور / thūr/, which is underlined in the example, literally means “bull”. This word has a denotative and connotative meaning. The denotative meaning of the word refers to the actual animal, whereas the connotative meaning of the word is usually
used as an insult meaning an unintelligent and clumsy person or someone who cannot comprehend what he has been told. The word could be translated literally as “bull”, since both share the function of an insult. However, the word “bull” is used more to describe a large aggressive person, which is not the intended meaning in this sentence. The word “oaf” that substitutes / thūr/ throughout the whole conversation has covered the intended meaning, namely a large, unintelligent and clumsy person. So, the effect of the insult in the ST has been reproduced by the use of the substituted word.

Another example of Calderbank’s employment of the substitution procedure is when he substitutes a ST idiomatic expression with a TT idiomatic expression, as in the following example from Zaat:

**Example 6.32 (ST, p. 160; TT, p. 150)**

 ياخبر. أيه اللي حصل؟

“Good grief. What happened?”

The expression ياخبر /ya khabar/ which literally means “what a news”, at the beginning of the sentence, is a dailectal exclamative that is used in Egypt to mean “what shocking news”. It usually implies surprise and a negative emotion. In the translation, this expression is substituted with an exclamative expression, “Good grief”, which is generally used to convey surprise, alarm, dismay, or any other negative emotion. Both the marked form and the surprise that triggers a negative emotion are created in the translation by the use of the TT exclamative.

Substitution in Booth’s translations is also used with expressions that contain dialectal cultural references, such as idioms and words of insult. For example, from *The Open Door*:
Example 6.33 (ST, p. 28; TT, p. 32)

يأخي بلا خيبة حازق نفسك أوى كده على ايه، تقولشي ووزير ولا أمير.

“Mahmud, honey, don’t get so worked up! Why are you letting it get your goat? Who do you think you are – a prince or a minister?”

The idiomatic expression حازق نفسك أوى كده على ايه /ḥaziq nafsak awī kidah ʿala īh/ literally means in the Egyptian context “why tighten yourself with something?”, but metaphorically it means “why you are so annoyed?”. These terms are rendered in the TT in two ways, both of which are English idiomatic expressions that serve the same purpose and give a close meaning to the ST. The first one is “don’t get so worked up”, which means “don’t be agitated” about something. The second idiomatic expression is “get your goat”, which is an American expression meaning “makes you annoyed or angry”. Also, the word يأخي /Yā akhī/, which means “oh brother”, is translated as “honey” in this example. Both the ST and TT expressions are being used outside their normal usage, and with a sarcastic tone.

Another example from The Open Door is the use of substitution to find a closer meaning for the ST cultural reference expressions that TT readers can relate to. In the following example, the character in the ST uses the cultural expression وحياة آبوك /wā ḥāyat abūk/, which in Egypt literally means “with your father’s life”. It is used for different purposes such as to swear, to validate the truth of what a speaker is talking about, or as in this example, to mock or to stop the other person’s statement:

Example 6.34 (ST, p. 11; TT, p. 12)

بلاش تريقة وحياة آبوك.

“Quit it, you! Enough nonsense, on your papa’s good name.”
Here, Issam says بالاش تريقة وحياة أبوك/balāsh tarīah wī ḥīa ʾbūk/ which he means to say “don’t mock me please”. Booth, however, also tries to reflect the cultural aspect of the conversation and the use of the father in a conversation to validate or to stop the other person from mocking him. In this case, she uses another cultural aspect from the TT culture that can show a closer meaning to both the cultural aspect of the phrase and a phrase that would be understood by the TT readers. The phrase “on your papa’s good name”, which replaces the ST phrase.. As can be seen Booth uses the word “Papa” instead of “father” to show the intimacy of the first part of the expression – “Papa” is the informal counterpart for “father” in American English. In the next part, Booth uses, instead of “life”, the phrase “good name”, which is used in English in some cases to mean the good opinion that people have of someone or something. This procedure reflects the order to stop, but it also brings the target readers to the source culture.

In Thieves in Retirement there are many curse words and insults used by the characters. In the translation, Booth recreates the offensive function of these words through using TT words. However, that sometimes affects the power relation these words create in the first place. As an example:

Example 6.35 (ST, p. 53; TT, p. 52)

جرى إيه ياخول.. إنت عملتي زي النسوان الي يتنبلهم .. دانا الدكتورة.

“what happened, you stinking pimp! You’ve been treating me just like the sleazy broads you’re always sweet-talking. Well I’m the Doktoora, and don’t you forget it!”

“Doktoora” means “female doctor” and here it is used as a nickname for the character who is renting an apartment in Abu Gamal building, since she used to be a nurse and in the story becomes a prostitute. Gamal, the older son of the building’s owner is trying to approach her as a customer. Here, she calls Gamal خول/khawal/, which is used as an insult to attack a
male’s sexuality and to indicate that he is passively gay. Considering both characters’
profiles, she might be intending to attack his masculinity and take the power with which he is
trying to intimidate her. The text after this sentence explains how these words have offended
not just Gamal but also his entire family, and how the Doktoora gets into a physical fight with
the family to revenge for her impugning Gamal’s masculinity.

In the TT, the word is substituted by “pimp”, which means, according to the
Cambridge dictionary, “a man who controls prostitutes, especially by finding customers for
them, and takes some of the money that they earn”. This word is used informally as an insult
to mean a despicable person. It seems that, by not translating the ST word as “gay” in the TT,
Booth might here be trying to use “risk mitigation” to avoid the negative connotations of the
ST word by not reflecting its homophobic undertones in the TT. At the same time, however,
she wants to substitute it with a curse word. The meaning of the TT substitution may align
with a few functions: it is an insult to a man, and it is offensive (though not to the same
degree as the ST word); however, the TT words have affected the power relation of the word.
In the ST, Doktoora tries to insult Gamal’s masculinity and to strip him of his reputation as a
Don Juan who is talented at attracting women, whereas the translation gives him power and
control and does not fully explain the chaos that follows the sentence.

6.4.4. Borrowing

Borrowing is an interesting case that might show an indication of stylistic choices between
the two translators. Both translators make use of borrowing in all their novels at fairly similar
rates, as can be seen in Figures 6. 7 and 6.8.
Neither translator exceeds a rate of 16% in the use of borrowing from the ST novels. Calderbank and Booth use borrowing to introduce terms for clothes, food, honorific titles, and religious phrases. However, there are a few distinct features in the borrowed terms in each translator’s practice. Most importantly, the in-depth analysis shows that both are markedly different in the way they explain the borrowed words to their TT readers. There is a tendency in Calderbank’s work to include a glossary either after or before the translation to
explain the words that he borrows in his translations. In contrast, borrowing in Booth’s translations is not accompanied by glossaries; rather, she consistently uses an in-text parallel concept that precedes or follows the borrowed word. The parallel concept either explains the meaning or it provides an English substitution phrase or expression that serves the same function. The use of italics for borrowed words is more consistent in Booth’s work than in Calderbank’s, where it is not used in Zaat and Munira’s Bottle. In both translators’ work there are words which are borrowed frequently in English and so are not in italics in the translation, such as Hajj, Sheikh, and Allah.

A deep analysis of Calderbank’s translations indicates that he uses the procedure of borrowing in all his translations to retain part of the ST in the TT. In his introduction to Zaat, he explains that one of the reasons behind borrowing is that “in many cases they are words that carry considerable sociocultural implications that would have been lost if an English word or phrase was chosen to represent them” (Ibrahim, 2004, p. vii). In the same introduction, he also compares his procedure with borrowing from English into Arabic, hoping that by doing this he can help enrich the readers’ vocabularies, “just as the Egyptians have been granted ample opportunity to enrich their own over the last thirty years” (Ibrahim, 2004, p. vii).

Some of the honorific dialectal words have been retained in the TT and then explained in the glossary that Calderbank includes at the beginning or the end of the novels. For example from Gazelle Tracks:

Example 6.36 (ST, p. 113; TT, p. 89)

"Ya Jidd."

and from Zaat:
As mentioned above, borrowing includes some of the well-known words that have a long-established presence in English translations from Arabic. In Calderbank’s work, although these terms are not necessarily dialectal and are used in MSA as well, they are used as a tool in the texts to add an “Arab flavour of a piece” (Büchler et al., 2011, p. 67) to the novel. This type of borrowing can be used as an element of compensation for not producing dialect in the TT. Consider the following examples from Munira’s Bottle:

Example 6.38 (ST, p. 40; TT, p. 24)

“The sheikhs.”

Example 6.39 (ST, p. 138; TT, p. 117)

“the souk.”

It is worth noting that Calderbank experiments in his translation approach when he leaves the particle ya before the names untranslated. Ya in Arabic is a vocative particle often used before someone’s name when addressing them, as in the following examples:

Example 6.40 (Gazelle Tracks: ST, p. 23; TT, p. 17)

“Ya Hajj.”
Example 6.41 (*Gazelle Tracks*: ST, p. 23; TT, p. 17)

"Ya Sheikh Al-Arab."

Example 6.42 (*Munira’s Bottle*: ST, p. 129; TT, p. 111)

"ya Munira?"

Example 6.43 (*The Tent*: ST, p. 14; TT, p. 6p)

"ya-Mama Sardoub.."

Example 6.44 (*Zaat*: ST, p. 68; TT, p. 60p)

"ya Sitti.."

Example 6.45 (*Wolves of the Crescent Moon*: ST, p. 96; TT, p. 137p)

"Ya Badawi."

Calderbank comments in his interview in Büchler et al. (2011, p. 68) about this untranslated *ya*, saying that it is his way “to let the reader come into the Arabic, make a bit of an effort, sense some strangeness”. In other words, he is trying to create an exotic flavour in the text to challenge the readers and take them out of their traditional environment. Surprisingly, the borrowing of the *ya* is used twelve times in *Gazelle Tracks* and thirteen times in *The Tent* and comes in different places before names, adjectives or honorific titles. The borrowing of the *ya*
in *The Tent*, which was the first novel translated by Calderbank, is accompanied by the dash (-) after the vocative particle, which has disappeared in his following translations.

In relation to borrowing in general, it is also noticeable that there are very few cases where the borrowing in the text is not from the ST, but from the culture itself. For example, in the following conversation from *Gazelle Tracks* the speaker is asking the boy about his father:

**Example 6.46 (ST, p. 114; TT, p. 89)**

وماذا يسوي أبوك ياولد مبارك؟

He refers to him as *ولد مبارك*/*walad Mubarak* which means “Mubarak’s son”. This is a custom belonging to Bedouin tribes to address people as their father’s or mother’s son or daughter. Calderbank translates it thus:

“And what is your father doing, Ya Bin Mubarak?”

Calderbank explains the word *بن*/*Bin* in the glossary as “son of”. *Bin*, which is also a synonym for the word *walad*, does not exist in ST, but it does exist in Bedouin culture and is used more often than *walad*.

Borrowing occurs not only at the lexical level, but also in a few cases in Calderbank’s works at the grammatical level. In particular, there are a few instances of syntactic calque, whereby the grammatical structure of a sentence in a TT is taken from the ST in the first place. Consider the following example from *Munira’s Bottle*:

**Example 6.47 (ST, p. 54; TT, p. 39)**

لابد من أن تقوده بنات نعش، والثوريا، وسهيل والمرزوم، ونجمة الصبح، التي يعرفها الرجال النشامي.

“*The daughters of Na'sh, the stars of Ursa would lead him, and the Pleiades, and Canopus and Bellatrix, and the morning star that all true desert dwellers know.*"
The lexical items in this example all belong to MSA, except for /النشامى alnashamā/, a word used in the Bedouin dialect to describe brave men. The word is paraphrased in English. However, there is a kind of compensation through the grammatical borrowing that is represented by the use of the conjunction letter in Arabic (و), which is used in Arabic to connect words and sentences. Unlike English, the conjunction letter (و) can be used before each word listed in a sentence. In this example, the translator does not follow the grammatical rules of the TL when listing a number of items in a series. Here, however, he uses the conjunction and before each noun in the sentence.

On the other hand, the analysis of Booth’s translations reveals that borrowing procedures challenge the readers of the TT and confront their linguistic norms by the translator’s decision to borrow not just words but also phrases from Arabic, whether from MSA or dialect. Booth uses, as noted previously, a parallel concept that precedes or follows the borrowed word to explain that word. Interestingly, there are a few cases of borrowing the vocative particle /ya/ that appear in Booth’s translation and which are mainly accompanied with another borrowed word such as sitt or sitti in Leaves of Narcissus and The Open Door. Consider the following example from Leaves of Narcissus where the ya is accompanied by sitt:

**Example 6.48 (ST, p. 19; TT, p. 15)**

أنا لو كنت اتعلمت كنت بقيت حاجة ثانية. أى والله ياست كيمي.

“I would have been something else indeed, madame-ya sitt Kimi.”

In this example, Booth provides the word “madame” as an explanation before the two borrowed words: ya sitt. However, the borrowing of the vocative particle /ya/ does not often appear in her translations.
In some cases, Booth uses repetition in the ST to demonstrate the meaning of the borrowed word, by first borrowing the word and then providing the parallel concept of the ST word instead of repeating the ST word again. In the following sentence from *Thieves in Retirement*, Booth explains the borrowing word *Haggg* by using repetition to help explain it:

**Example 6.49 (ST, p. 13; TT, p. 7)**

شكراً يا حاج، شكراً يا حاج.

“Thank you, *ya Haggg*, thank you, sir.”

In the Egyptian context, the word حاج *haggg* (or ḥajj) is a respectable term of address used for someone who is older or of higher status (whether they have performed the Ḥajj pilgrimage or not). The character is here expressing gratitude to the owner of the building for helping him; in the ST, he repeats the phrase twice. In her translation, Booth uses repetition by transliterating the dialectal phrase *ya haggg* in the first part, and, in the second part, translating it as “thank you, sir”, the word “sir” fulfilling the same function as a polite or respectful way of addressing a man of status or authority.

In the following example from *The Open Door*, Booth opts for a meaning that matches the function of the word rather than using an accurate translation of the word:

**Example 6.50 (ST, p. 16; TT, p. 18)**

أنا قلت أن دى مش بنت دى فتوة.

“I told you before that this one’s no ordinary girl! She’s *fittiwwa*, a real bull in a china shop.”

The word فتوة *fitiwwa* in an Egyptian context has negative connotations, as it refers to a gang member who tries to protect the neighbourhood from an outsider in exchange for money – a neighbourhood troublemaker. Here, فتوة *fitiwwa* is translated as “a real bull in a china shop”.
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Reflecting on her awareness of the representation of gender in translation, Booth may have made a conscious decision to avoid gender stereotyping.

Another example of combining the borrowing with substitution is from *Leaves of Narcissus*, in which Booth captures the sarcastic and negative tone in the ST by choosing a slang phrase that matches the ST’s tone and function. Consider the following:

**Example 6.51 (ST, p. 105; TT, p. 82)**

وأنا صعيدية من دبلن.

“And I’m a Sa’idi, a southern bumpkin from Dublin.”

The original phrase is intended as a joke by the character where she says “I’m a Sa’idi from Dublin”. *صعيدية/Sa’idi/* is a word that refers to an Egyptian who lives in Upper Egypt. Generally, it indicates deep rootedness in the land, heritage and civilisation. However, the word has a stigmatised usage that sarcastically implies someone is occasionally strong-headed, stubborn and naive. In the translation, Booth uses the phrase “southern bumpkin” to explain the borrowed word. “Country bumpkin” is a phrase that usually refers to people who live in a village or rural environment, and who are perceived to be naive and sometimes lacking education. The TT phrase matches the function of the original meaning and imparts the negative tone that is also intended in the text.

Like Calderbank, borrowed words not from the ST but from the SL have appered in Booth works. Consider the following example from *Leaves of Narcissus*:

**Example 6.52 (ST, p. 66; TT, p. 52)**

مات بصيش لروحك في المراية كثير. إلى ي بص لروحه في المراية كثير يتجن.

“Don’t look at your *nafs* in the mirror so much. A body who stares at its soul in the mirror is liable to go mad.”
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In the ST, the wordُ الروحُ /rūḥik/ is repeated twice; the dialectal usage of the word means “yourself” and suggests the external appearance of a person, specifically in this context referring to the face. The repetition in the sentence can have multiple interpretations. The character might be using both words here to refer to external appearance, since she has previously used the word “face” in a similar context at the beginning of the novel: ﻗﺎلَ ﻣَأْتِبِصِيْشُ لَوْاَشْكُ كَثِيرُ فِيِّ ﻣِرَاءِهِ /mā tbūsish lī wishīk katīr flmīraih/ which translates as “Don’t stare at your face in the mirror too much” (21). Alternatively, ST sentence could be a word play where the first الروحُ /rūḥ/ means “self” and the second is the literal meaning “soul”, which is also used in MSA. In her translation, however, Booth does not use the dialectal wordُ الروحُ /rūḥik/ from the ST but has instead replaced it with the word نفس/nafs/, which in MSA means “self”. It is also worth noting that the word نفس/nafs/ has a Sufi reference related to the seven levels of self. Borrowing the word نفس/nafs/ might give a religious connotation to the context of the sentence.

In Girls of Riyadh, the author was not satisfied with an “in-text explanation” and has provided further explanation in a footnote (Booth, 2008, p. 201). The following example from the published translation demonstrates the conflicting voices of the author and the translator on how to explain borrowed words in translation:

Example 6.53 (ST, p. 13; TT, p. 4)

“Yalla, *‘let’s go’.*

Footnote: * Yalla can mean ‘c’mon’ or ‘hurry up’ or ‘let’s go’. (4)

In the translation, the borrowing has been from the SL rather than the ST. Here, the Saudi colloquial Yalla has been borrowed instead of the Najdi dialect word سرينَا/sarînal, and, as demonstrated in the previous example, the borrowing from the SL is one of the techniques...
that appears in Booth’s translation. In Booth’s article, however, she mentions that this is one of the changes to the published text that affected her translation procedure, since the author tended towards “adding cultural information as footnotes rather than within the text” (2007, p. 201).

6.4.5. Paraphrasing

In this procedure, translators omit the dialectal denotative meaning of the word and replace it with the connotative meaning of the phrase.

![Paraphrasing Graph](Calderbank)

*Figure 6.9. Paraphrasing (Calderbank)*
As Figures 6.9 and 6.10 show, the use of paraphrase has a similar frequency in both translators’ work, with highest rates of 12.84% for Calderbank’s work and 11.36% for Booth’s work. This indicates few differences in stylistic preferences or choices about what to paraphrase. Paraphrase is mainly used to explain proverbs, religious and cultural references, idiomatic and metaphorical expressions.

The following example comes from Calderbank’s translation of *Gazelle Tracks*:

**Example 6.54 (ST, p. 65; TT, p. 49)**

أنفك منك ولو كان أجدع.

This proverb is in the Egyptian Bedouin dialect, and it literally means “your nose belongs to you even if it is crooked”. It is uttered by a father who has been trying to persuade his daughter to marry her cousin. He tries to imply that her relative belongs to her even if there are some negative things about him. This sentence is translated by Calderbank as follows:

“a girl will marry her cousin if it’s the last thing she wants.”

Another example from Calderbank’s translation of *The Tent* shows how he deals with idiomatic expressions:

**Example 6.55 (ST, p. 81; TT, p. 66)**

المهرة نافرة ولازمها سياسات... أمها بنت عمي وعمك ماهي طريدة من الطرايد.

“The girl’s still a timid young filly. She needs careful handling … In any case, her mother is my cousin and yours too. She shouldn’t be treated like an outlaw.”
In this example, the character uses a number of idiomatic expressions. He uses the word سياسات/siasāt/, which means “politics”, to describe how they should treat the girl; however, this word has a metaphorical nature that indicates that strategic measures should be taken to handle the situation and to avoid conflict. This is reflected in the translation by the use of “she needs careful handling”. Another metaphorical expression in the conversation is the use of the phrase طريدة من الطرايد / tarīṭah mīn āltāraiṭah/, which is usually used in the context of hunting and means that she is not one of the prey to be hunted. In the translation, Calderbank humanises it: “She shouldn’t be treated like an outlaw”.

The following is an example from Munira’s Bottle:

**Example 6.56 (ST, p. 56; TT, p. 41)**

ثم أطلق النار على حشاشاشة قلبه.

“Then he shot her, the most important thing in his life.”

The concept of حشاشاشة قلبه in Najdi literally means “the soul of the heart”. The whole concept is that the “core of the heart” is so important that without it the heart will stop. The translator paraphrases the meaning of the expression and compensates for the loss of the gender marker in the word with the pronoun “her”.

Booth also uses paraphrasing to translate the religious and cultural references in the ST and to give the meaning instead of a substitution. The following example is from Leaves of Narcissus:

**Example 6.57 (ST, p. 22; TT, p. 18)**

والنبي انت فاضية ومقعدانى جنبيك ناك، أوعي كده باشيخة، وانت تعطلى المراكب السايرة، أنا ورايا شغل.

والنبي انت فاضية ومقعدانى جنبيك ناك، أوعي كده باشيخة، وانت تعطلى المراكب السايرة، أنا ورايا شغل.
“Look here, now! You’ve got nothing to do, you get me sitting here next to you telling you stories, and the next thing you know – you’d keep sailing ships from leaving harbor, you would. I’ve got work to do.”

In this example, the religious expression والنبي /wilnabi/, which means “to swear by the prophet’s life”, has been paraphrased to “look here, now!” The Cairene expression is usually found in the following contexts: either to swear to make another person believe you or, in an ironic way, when you doubt what the other person is saying, or perhaps to highlight the speaker’s anger at the situation. In this context, Amna means to say: “I swear you are wasting my time Kimi”. Her tone implies her anger over the amount of time she has wasted telling Kimi the same story, rather than spending her time doing her household chores. The translator paraphrases the expression to “look here, now”, which is generally used to add emphasis, especially when someone is angry at what has been done or said by another. By using this expression, the angry tone of the character has been reflected in the TT.

Another example of this technique is the paraphrasing of culturally idiomatic expressions. Consider the following example from Leaves of Narcissus:

**Example 6.58 (ST, p. 117; TT, p. 92)**

أنا اللى يمس شعرة من رأس بنتى أكله.

“No one touches a hair on my daughter’s head as long as I’m alive and breathing.”

This Cairene idiomatic expression أنا اللى يمس شعرة من رأس بنتي أكله /’anā allī yamas sha’ra mīn ras bīntī aklua/ which means “who touches a hair on my daughter’s head I’ll eat him” is used as a threat to demonstrate the speaker’s authority. The first part of the idiomatic expression is translated in semi-literal way to “No one touches a hair on my daughter’s head”, whereas the second section has been paraphrased. The second part literally means “I’ll eat him” and is used to show the mother’s anger and aggression towards anyone who would touch her
daughter. Booth translates the expression to “as long as I’m alive and breathing” to indicate the mother’s constant protection. As well as being a paraphrase, it may also be influenced by another cultural expression: طول ما أنا عايشة /fut m’na ’aîsha/, which means “as long as I’m alive”. This also occurs in the following example from the same novel:

Example 6.59 (ST, p. 22; TT, p. 18)

يومها وقعت في الترعة وأنا باهر منهم ولم أتي شاقتي خبئت على صدرها وصرخت فيهم. أنا ماهش بس شعرى من راس بنتي طول ماني عايشة.

I was trying to get away from them that day, and I fell smack into the canal. When my mama saw me she beat her fists against her chest and screamed at them. “No one touches a hair on my daughter’s head as long as I’m alive and breathing!”

Given that both expressions are used interchangeably in Cairene dialect, Booth provides the same translation for both.

Another example of paraphrasing is from Thieves in Retirement:

Example 6.60 (ST, p. 58; TT, p. 57)

ووقفني في مواجهة البيت رقم (36) وقال "و حراق شويه لكن حاجة تشرف".

… and stopped me as we faced No.36. “It’s a bit high” he said. “It’ll cost you. But it would do you proud.”

Here, the Egyptian expression حراق /haraq/, or the phonological pronunciation of the word as /hara’l/, literally means “burning”. In the Egyptian context, it is an adjective used metaphorically to describe expensive costs. It is followed by the adverb شويه /shoayyal/, which means “a little” and is used to describe quantity or time duration; /shoayyal/ appears in most Arabic dialects with slight differences in phonological pronunciation. The explanation of the idiomatic expression has been paraphrased in two sentences in the translation: the first refers
to the price – “it’s a little bit high” – and it is then followed by a referential colloquial expression about the price – “it’ll cost you”. The dialect aspects of the expression is retained by the contraction, the use of “a bit”, and the colloquial expression.

Finally, consider the following example from *The Open Door*:

**Example 6.61 (ST, p. 12; TT, p. 14)**

وشعرت ليلي أن مهمتها قد انتهت فنزلت من السرير وأتفرعت تجري، واستوقفها محمود عند الباب:

-ليلي
-افندم؟
-أولا انت كدايه...

Satisfied that she accomplished her mission, Layla sprang off the bed and hurried toward the door, but Mahmud stopped her.

“Layla”

“Yes?”

“First of all, you’re a liar.”

In this example, Mahmud has called Layla, who is in a hurry to leave the room; she stops and replies to him, saying افندم /afendim/. This is an honorific title with the Turkish origin لفندم /l fendim/, and it is used in the Egyptian context to address a man with a high education or social standing. However, this word also has multiple meanings that depend on the context and the intonation; for example, it can be used to answer a call, to ask for clarification, or to indicate anger. The tone is important for indicating whether the word is being used politely or aggressively. Although this is a written text, by considering the context of this sentence one possibility is that her tone here might be decoded as a sign of impatience and that she might
be saying “yes, what do you want?”. This has been paraphrased in the translation to the word “Yes”, which can also trigger different meanings depending on the intonation and context.

6.4.6. Semi-literal translation

Both translators use semi-literal translation as another way to translate dialectal proverbs and idiomatic expressions, as shown in Figures 6.11 and 6.12.
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![Figure 6.12. Semi-literal translation (Booth)](image2)
In Calderbank’s work, this procedure showed a high percentage in *Gazelle Tracks* and *The Tent*, due to the high usage of proverbs and Egyptian Bedouin expressions in these two novels. Consider the following example from *Gazelle Tracks*:

**Example 6.62 (ST, p. 56; TT, p. 42)**

`وبنت العرب مثل الناقة الطوع مطرح ماتعلقها تبرك، ومطرح ماتسيرها تسير.`

"An Arab girl's like an obedient she-camel: the place you tether her, that's where she kneels, the place you lead her, that, where she goes."

In this example Calderbank provide a semi-literal translation of proverbs. In this dialogue the father was lecturing his daughter on how she should be obedient and not be confrontational. The meaning in translation could come across in the translation through the semi-literal translation in TT.

Another example of a semi-literal translation of the idiomatic expression is from *The Tent*:

**Example 6.63 (ST, p. 84; TT, p. 70)**

`بيتك يا نور العين.`

"Get home, light of my eye."

The idiomatic expression نور العين /noor al-'aīn/ is used here as an affectionate expression to mean my love or lover. The expression, however, is translated in a literal way as ‘light of my eye’. The affectionate tone was kept through the literal translation.

In Booth’s work the semi-literal translation is used also with culturally specific expressions, such as idioms, proverbs and metaphorical phrases. Booth tries to reflect the
specific way the culture constructs its metaphorical language. Consider the following example from *Thieves in Retirement*:

**Example 6.64 (ST, p. 47; TT, p. 45)**

“That secret of yours – it'll stay deep in the well, fella! Even if this business of finding you a spot means I have to dissolve a contract, change rooms around … my man, I'll put you in two rooms and a sitting room facing north, and don’t worry about a thing in the world. From this day on consider yourself just like my children. ... What’s the world come to now – just keep in mind, now, your Lord is the Patient One when it comes to making a mistake, and He’s the Veiler of All Deeds, too.”

In this example, the Cairene metaphorical expression سرّك في بير ياجدع/sirrak fī bīr/ means “your secret is safe and will never be exposed to anyone”, but its literal meaning is, as Booth renders in the text, “that secret of yours – it’ll stay deep in the well”. The use of “the well” here indicates the depth of the promise to keep the secret. The expression has an obvious meaning that can be understood from the literal translation of the idiomatic expression.

Here is another example from *Leaves of Narcissus*:

**Example 6.65 (ST, p. 81; TT, p. 64)**

“so then why has she been crying since early morning? Will it be my father who made her cry?! Didn’t you scream and scream at her as if you were deaf? Your voice reaching the end of the street?”
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In this example, the character uses a sarcastic dialectal expression, أبوي يلي زعلها / abwīa illi za‘alhāl which means “will it be my father who made her sad”. The sarcastic question is used here by the maid to mock Kimi, who has denied that she got into a fight with her mother. The “father” figuratively in this expression implies the impossibility of the situation and that “there will be no one to blame for this but Kimi”. The denotative meaning of the sarcastic question has been translated as “Will it be my father who made her cry?”.

Finally, another example of semi-literal translation occurs in The Open Door:

**Example 6.66 (ST, p. 9; TT, p. 11)**

"come on, son. Sit up and wet your lips."

Here، بل ريقك / bīl rī 'akl, or its Egyptian phonological pronunciation as /bīl rī 'akl/, which means “wet your saliva” is used metaphorically to encourage someone to drink or eat after a long period of not drinking or eating anything. The idiomatic expression is translated semi-literal way as “wet your lips”. Here saliva has been changed to lips.

**6.4.7. Addition and Explicitation**

As discussed in the previous chapter, explicitation and addition are used in LDD when there is a need for extra information to clarify a sentence for the target readers. Usually this clarification is related to linguistic or cultural references in the original that would not be clear to the intended readership.
Figures 6.13 and 6.14 show that Calderbank uses significantly more addition in the translation of LDD than Booth. However, the frequency for Calderbank does not exceed 6%. Addition is present in only one of Booth’s translations, with a frequency below 2.5%.

An example from the work of Calderbank comes from *Wolves of the Crescent Moon*:

**Example 6.67 (ST, p. 28; TT, p. 33)**
“and walked around the women to examine them from front and behind.”

In this example, the Sudanese character is explaining to his Saudi friends how the man who abducts people into slavery examines the women to decide who is fit to be taken. He says يلف حولهن/yalīf ḥulīhn/ which means “he walked around them”. The actual act of examining is not described in the ST, probably because the character refuses to elaborate on the degrading act and instead just says they go around in a circle. However, Calderbank carries on with the description in his translation, describing what they do as “to examine them from front and behind”.

Another example of addition occurs in Munira’s Bottle:

Example 6.68 (ST, p. 92; TT, p. 76)

نعم ؟ خير يا ...!

“what do you want, you little refugee?”

It could be interpreted from this excerpt that Munira (the protagonist) is responding to the insult from one of the girls in the shelter. In the ST, Munira pauses after saying نعم ؟ خير يا /naʿm? khīr yā/ to mean “what do you want” and the curse word has not been included in the text, but is instead replaced by an ellipsis. Calderbank, however, adds the expression “you little refugee” to express Munira’s anger towards that character and to justify the harsh response that follows.

Calderbank also intervenes in other cases, adding extra information to a sentence that is curtailed or not openly voiced in the original. As an example from the same novel:

Example 6.69 (ST, p. 134; TT, p. 115)
“There’s only one explanation. You’re in my room. You’re sleeping with me.”

The word تضاجع which means “sleep with” is chopped in the middle and the letters ن and ی are omitted in the ST. Munira shortens the word, suddenly stopping before the end of the word before the possessive pronoun “me”, which could be a characterising tactic to present her self-censorship. In the translation, however, the sentence is written with no omission. This shows that there is a shift in characterisation in the translation as Munira’s hesitation does not appear in the dialogue.

From the rare cases of addition in Booth’s translation of The Open Door, consider the following example:

**Example 6.70 (ST, p. 22; TT, p. 25)**

"people, people. I’m sick of people. I don’t want to see anyone."

In the ST, the word الناس which means “people” is only used once by the character; however, in this conversation, Booth uses addition along with repetition to capture the character’s annoyance while she is speaking.
Explicitation is significantly low in both translators’ works: its frequency has a highest rate of 1.8% in Calderbank’s translations and 2.83% in Booth’s translations. However, despite its low frequency, explicitation is present in all Booth’s translations. Looking more deeply at the data reveals that it is manifested by including a syntactic clarification in some parts of the LDD to explain implicit information for the target readers. Usually, both translators use it to explicate a number of cultural references in the ST that are unlikely to be clear to the target readers.
The following is an example of Calderbank’s translation of Egyptian Bedouin from *Gazelle Tracks*:

**Example 6.71 (ST, p. 18; TT, p. 11)**

"Ya Mazzoun, “he’d say to her,” your grandfather Al Shafei’s mare was called Zad Al-Rakb, like Hatem Al Ta’i’s. She was blond, as yellow as the wheat in the field."

“Like Hatem Al Ta’i’s” in this example is an addition to the original text. Al Ta’i is an icon and highly respected person who is famous in the Arab world for his generosity. By naming the horse after Al Ta’i’s horse زاد الركب /`ad alrakb/, the implication is that she has noble blood. It could also be to show respect to Al Ta’i. Calderbank highlights this cultural reference by adding the phrase “like Hatem Al Ta’i’s” after the name of the horse.

Another example of explicitation to make the cultural references visible occurs in *The Tent*:

**Example 6.72 (ST, p. 14; TT, p. 14)**

"The Pharaohs, and the slaves of the cannibals of Namnam and Gog."

The sentence here الفراعين وعبيد نمنم ويأجوج / alfrāʿīn wīʿ bīd namnām wī yaʾjūj/ literally means “the pharaohs and the slave of river monster and Gog”. Namnam is referring to river monsters in tales about cannibals (Fernea, 2005). Gog and Magog are also cannibals, only half the height of a normal man, with claws instead of nails, hairy tails and huge hairy ears. For ST readers who are familiar with these cultural stories about cannibals, the cultural references are understood with no need to explicitly mention the nature of these creatures.
Calderbank in the TT adds an extra explanation, “the cannibals”, which might help TT readers understand the cultural references of these two names.

Booth uses explicitation in *Thieves in Retirement* to explain and clarify the meaning of one of the character’s names for TT readers. In the following example, the mentally unstable character keeps confusing the name of the other character with another person, repeatedly saying in Cairene dialect:

**Example 6.73 (ST, p. 28; TT, p. 23)**

(سيف يعني حسام.. إسمك أيه؟!)

“Sayf means sword. What is your name?”

The indication of the Egyptian dialect features in this sentence can be taken from the question marker /layh/, which means “what” and is used to ask for information. In the translation, Booth has used this synonymy situation in the ST to provide the meaning of the character’s name in TT. A literal translation of the previous example is “Sayf means Husam”.

/جهاين/ is an Arabic synonym for the word /Sayf/; in Arabic, both words mean “sword”. In the above translation, instead of translating the two names, Booth uses repetition to explain the hidden meaning of the word and to recreate the interchangeable meaning of the two words in ST, but without repeating the name in TT.

In *Leaves of Narcissus*, Booth also uses explicitation as a procedure to explain information that is implicit in the ST content and constitutes shared knowledge between the author and the ST readers.

**Example 6.74 (ST, p. 100; TT, p. 78)**

(وأيه دخل صلاح جاهين؟)

“The poet? What does Salah Jahin have to do with guiding ships through the Suez Canal?”
In this example, the character has said 

وايه دخل صلاح جاهين؟ / wih dakhl Salāh jāhīn?/ which means “what does Salah Jahin have to do with it?”. The name was mentioned without adding an explanation of the person’s identity. Who is this person? What did he do? The author may have assumed that the person is a famous figure and known by the readers; to her, this may be considered to be shared knowledge with the ST readers. In the translation, however, Booth provides the additional term “the poet”, to describe the character’s identity and character to TT readers who might not otherwise share the author’s knowledge:

6.4.8. Adaptation

The use of adaptation is mainly linked to the writing style of the ST. Adaptation here is usually used with religious expressions, poems and songs. Gazelle Tracks and The Tent include numerous Nabati poems, so adaptation has a high frequency rate in those works, reaching around 16% in Gazelle Tracks. The other three novels translated by Calderbank do not include much poetry or songs, so the frequency of adaptation is low in those translations (see Figure 6.17). Whereas in Booth’s figure, it shows low percentage that does not exceed %4.50 in Thieves in Retirement.

![Figure 6.17. Adaptation (Calderbank)](image)
Gazelle Tracks as mentioned contains a considerable amount of Bedouin poems, known as Nabati poetry in Egyptian Bedouin dialect. This is a dialectal poetry from the tribes in the Arabian Peninsula, of which there are branches in Syria and North Africa. Calderbank adopts rhyming couplets or the style of the rhyming in English poetry to translate these Nabati poems into English. As an example:

**Example 6.75 (ST, p. 39; TT, p. 29)**

عذرا منسوبة وتخيل تخف شباب والشبان
وعيونك جوز غداريات يهودي صابغهن بألوان.

"A ravishing maiden, noble born
She turns the heads of young and old
Like rich cloths in the Jewish quarter,
Dyed colours and bold."

---
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The poem is describing a beautiful and noble girl who attracts men of all ages. The translation captures more or less the meaning of the original poem; however, the girl’s eyes are described in the original as غدارية/ghadārīat, which is later explained by the author in a footnote as آنية مستديرة/anīh mūstadīra/ which means “circle containers”. Big eyes in Bedouin or Arab culture in general are considered a sign of beauty. In the translation, this is altered to relate more to her general beauty and how she turns heads like the colourful fabrics in the market. The reference to the eyes may not have been understood in the translation, whereas the image of the colourful fabrics would be more relevant.

*Munira’s Bottle* does not contain as many poems or songs as *Gazelle Tracks*, so this procedure is not quite as evident in the translation. However, one of the examples is:

**Example 6.76 (ST, p. 115; TT, p. 98)**

لو سمحت بشفتك وامهلتني.. أرتوي وأروي معي وردة شفاك!

“if you would allow me your lips and sometime,

I’ll be sated and I’ll sate the rose of your mouth.”

Calderbank gives a close meaning to the ST as the ST means “if you allow me your lips and give me sometimes, I am saturate and I saturate your lips with me”, he changes the tense of the verbs from the present to the future in the second part.

Calderbank tries in both novels to adapt the dialectical poems and songs similar to the English poetic rhyming style. *Gazelle Tracks* also includes a number of dialectal prayer expressions, where the characters either pray for each other or are praying to remember a loved one. On some occasions, Calderbank adapts this to the structure of praying in English by adding “May” at the beginning of the expression. For example from *Gazelle Tracks*:

**Example 6.77 (ST, p. 44; TT, p. 32)**
“May God have mercy on the souls of our dear ones.”

The character here says الله يرحم الغاليين /Allāh yrham alghālīn/ which literally means “Allah has Mercy on our dear ones”. Another example from Munira’s Bottle:

Example 6.78 (ST, p. 129; TT, p. 111)

“May God preserve you.”

The praying here الله يخليك لشبابك /Allāh ykhlīk lishabābk/ literally means “Allah preserves you for your youth”.

Using adaptation to translate dialectal prayer expressions also constitutes the majority of adaptation cases in Booth’s translations. The following is an example from Thieves in Retirement:

Example 6.79 (ST, p. 123; TT, p. 121)

“God be merciful, she was a good woman.”

The character prays to the dead women الله يرحمها كانت طيبة /Allāh yrhامha kanāt tāiba/ which he means to say “Allah has mercy on her, she was a kind soul” Another example occurs in The Open Door:

Example 6.80 (ST, p. 65; TT, p. 74)

“May you have the same luck soon, honey.”
The word عقبال عندك /’uqbāl ’andīk/ means here “I wish the same good fortune for you”. It is usually said in response to someone who congratulates the speaker on a happy event, but it does not have a strong religious connotation. However, here Booth opts for a prayer by starting the sentence with “May”.

6.4.9. Omission

![Figure 6.19. Omission (Calderbank)](image1)

![Figure 6.20. Omission (Booth)](image2)
Figures 6.19 and 6.20 show that omission is the least used procedure by Calderbank and Booth for translating LDD. Both use it very occasionally to omit a few offensive words or insignificant fillers in the sentences.

6.4.10. Peritextual interventions and LDD

6.4.10.1. Translator’s introduction

The first peritextual intervention that talks about the language of the text is the translator’s introduction. The analysis shows that Calderbank and Booth vary in their inclusion of an introduction. Introductions appear in only two of Calderbank’s translations, whereas they appear in all of Booth’s translations.

In relation to the language and LDD, Calderbank explains in the introduction his chosen procedures and the challenges that he faced while translating the text. In his introduction to *The Tent*, for example, he explains the challenge that he faced with the feminine gender in Arabic languages, that is, the indication that the word or form belongs to the feminine gender. He comments:

> [T]he English language lacks the grammatical and morphological devices to express the feminineness that the Arabic language enjoins upon this text. There is no “women’s n” (nun alniswa) in English, no feminine plural endings, no feminine nouns and adjective, and it is hard to recreate the scent of women that permeates the Arabic original of *The Tent*. (Al-Tahawy, (2000), p.viii)

Calderbank also uses the introduction as mentioned earlier in this chapter to justify the borrowing procedures in the translation. He explains that to minimise the violence done to the Arabic words in translating the text into English, he has tried to retain some strains of it in the English version. In the introduction to *Zaat*, he expresses hope that these borrowed words will give readers a chance to enrich their vocabularies.
However, even when Calderbank adds an introduction to explain his translation process, he does not use this procedure to bring the reader’s attention to the fact that there is diglossic switching in ST. He refers to the dialect in the text as “Arabic” without specifying the dialect that has been used for the dialogue in the text.

The inclusion of an introduction is the most consistent paratextual procedure in Booth’s works. Booth’s introductions also present a critical analysis of the linguistic aspects of the text. As mentioned in Chapter Five, she uses the introduction to *The Open Door* to highlight the debate within the Egyptian literary scene regarding the use of LDD in novels. She discusses how *The Open Door* has distinguished itself from the previous use of LDD through al-Zayyat’s employment of dialect in the dialogue. Booth comments on the role of dialect in the novel: “this dominance of the colloquial enhances al-Zayyat’s portrayal of the mundane, of the everyday as a political arena, more specifically of the interrelationships between the gendering of expectations and behaviour on the one hand, and the politics of national liberation on the other” (al-Zayyat, (2004), p. xxvi). In particular, al-Zayyat’s feminist approach to articulating the language of the text has helped to highlight everyday life without linguistic distance. The use of dialect in the female characters’ speech in the novel gives them a control over their language and allows them to express themselves freely. As the translator of the novel, Booth comments on her role in reflecting the LDD nuances: “the power of the vernacular in al-Zayyat’s hands is strength of the work that the translator can only imperfectly convey” (al-Zayyat, (2004), p. xxvii).

In the introduction to *Thieves in Retirement*, Booth draws the attention of the TT readers to the linguistic mixture of the ST. She highlights the political and social implications of the characters’ idiolect, and she discusses the role of the dialect, or “colloquial dialogue” as she terms it, in documenting collective and individual memory. This issue of the juxtaposition of different language levels in the text and the clashes between Professor
Ramadan’s MSA and Abu Gamal’s dialect – which concern authority and power relations – is discussed by Booth in the introduction, where she comments that “the novel offers a send-up of the diction of religiously sanctioned authority and of the language of traditional conventional literary expression, best presented in poetry. “Professor Ramadan’s” use of belletristic clichés to buttress his authority collides with Abu Gama’s very colloquial diatribes” (Abu Golayyal, (2009), p. xv).

This demonstrates Booth’s awareness of the implications of creating different voices in the text and of the importance of distinguishing them in the translation. Booth stresses how the language of this novel challenges and “satirizes the languages of ‘high’ literary production as well as those of Nasserist and post-Nasserist ideologies, partly by dwelling on marginalized population groups that have been simultaneously romanticized and excluded by those discourses” (Abu Golayyal, (2009), p. xvi). It seems that Booth’s acknowledgement of how this novel marks a new wave of writing that challenges literary production through its experimental approach is reflected not only in the translation of LDD but also in the translation of the narrating voice. Booth also shows her literary awareness of the distinction between the author’s and the narrator’s voice in the novel: “It is narrated by a young man who, like the author, is of Bedouin origin and from a family that was obliged by the government…” (Abu Golayyal, (2009), p. xv) and “Hamdi Abu Golayyel is of Bedouin origin, like his narrator…” (Abu Golayyal, (2009), p. xvii). This indicates her humanising approach to the analysis of the novel’s characters, whom she sees as independent entities from their author.

However, the introductions do not necessarily give detailed information about the dialects in the STs, which are referred to as “colloquial language” or “spoken Arabic of the urbanized middle class”.
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This procedure is also utilised in the translation of *Girls of Riyadh*, in which the author, Rajaa Alsanea, has included her own introduction in which she introduces herself as a translator without mentioning Marilyn Booth as a co-translator. As mentioned in Chapter Five Alsanea justified her omission of dialects as the translator of the texts.

### 6.4.10.2. Glossary

The use of the glossary in the translation is another procedure that shows an element of stylistic choice. In Calderbank’s work, glossaries are present in four of the five novels; the novel that does not have a glossary is *The Tent*, which was the first novel to be translated by Calderbank. In Booth’s translations, glossaries are not present except, as explained in Chapter Five, in *Girls of Riyadh*, which seems to have been a choice of the author rather than the translator.

Calderbank, as stated in the discussion above about his borrowing procedure, retains some dialectal and MSA words in his translations which could be unfamiliar to target readers. He uses a glossary to provide short definitions of these words in the text. As stated these words are not necessarily dialectal words, but it could be argued that they are used in the dialogue to add Arabic elements to the TT. Examples of dialectal words that he includes in the translation of the LDD are shown in these excerpts from *Gazelle Tracks*:

**Example 6.81 (Gazelle Tracks, p. 90)**

“they’re Kuwaitis Ya Jidd.”

The words Ya and Jidd have been retained from the ST, and they appear in the English translation repeatedly. These words have been explained in the glossary thus:

*Jidd*: Grandfather, used as a title for tribal elders and ancestors.

*Ya*: said before a person’s name when addressing them.
It seems that Calderbank does not establish a fixed glossary that he can rely on if the word keeps appearing in different translations. Consider the following sentences that have been extracted from a dialogue between the grandfather and one of the kids in the neighbourhood:

**Example 6.82 (Gazelle Tracks, p. 90)**

“Do they wear igals, boy, or are they city folk?”

The word *igals* has been explained in the glossary to *Gazelle Tracks* as follows:

Igal: black band of cord worn over the kufiya, used metaphorically to refer to Gulf Arabs.

The same word is retained in the translation of *Munira’s Bottle* and explained in the following way:

i’gal: black rings of cord worn on top of the ghutra or shmagh. Some Saudi men wear the shmagh or ghutra without the i’gal. This is seen as a sign of piety.

It can be seen from this example that the way he defines the word varies. As the word appears in *Gazelle Tracks*, the letter (ع) is not transliterated in the text, whereas the letter is retained in *Munira’s Bottle*, where it is represented by this mark after the letter i (i’).

**6.4.10.3. Footnotes**

Footnotes are the least frequent peritextual procedures in the two translators’ work. They are not used at all in Calderbank’s translations.

Similarly, Booth rarely uses footnotes in her Egyptian translations: among the three novels, the procedure occurs only in *Thieves in Retirement* where they are used only twice to explain the religious reference of two texts that are uttered in the dialogue in the ST.

However, this procedure is excessively used in the published translation of *Girls of Riyadh*. As with the borrowing technique, the footnote system has been used to provide
explanations of borrowed words and dialectal expressions in the LDD. Alsanea (2007) has justified the use of footnotes and explanations in the TT as a way of helping “the western readers” to understand the text (p. vii). Booth has written a letter, which published in *Times Literary Supplement*, to defend her own style, and to express her disappointment at the unnecessary use of footnotes:

> When I submitted the translation to Penguin, complete except for Saudi vernacular terms with which the author had promised to help me, I was informed that the author intended to rewrite it, and thereafter I was kept entirely out of the process. The resulting text, with its clichéd language, erasures of Arabic idioms I had translated, and unnecessary footnotes, does not reflect the care that I took to produce a lively, idiomatic translation conveying the novel’s tone and language. (Complete review, 2016)

The three Egyptian novels and Booth’s original examples in her article demonstrate that footnotes are the least used technique in the translation of LDD; whereas *Girls of Riyadh* shows that any intervention in the translator’s style could affect her translation procedures in the TT and especially to the borrowed ST words in LDD.

### 6.4.11. Translator’s procedures to create marked dialogue

This section sheds light on the way the translators create a marked dialogue in the translations that is not a direct translation of dialect in the text. These procedures are argued to be a compensatory procedure to translating LDD, in order to add an informal conversational style to the dialogue of the novel.

#### 6.4.11.1. Narrative changed into dialogue

This procedure is mainly present in Calderbank’s translations. In the STs, there are few cases where characters’ speech is narrated through a third-person narrator – that is, someone else explains the conversation through her/his own words. However, Calderbank changes this style of narration in the translation to allow the characters to speak directly to the readers. Consider the following example from *Gazelle Tracks*:
Example 6.83 (ST, p. 70; TT, p. 53)

وأقسمت أنها ستعيش خادمة في بيت أبيها فقط إلا يردوها إليه، وأنها ربما تموت لو أصروا على عودتها.

“Please don’t send me back to him” she pleaded. “I’ll die if you send me back.”

The narrator is talking about her aunt, who ran away from her husband’s house back to her family home and begged them not to send her back to him. In ST, it is not a conversation between the grandmother and the aunt; rather, it is part of the narrative. The sentence could be translated as “she swore she will live in her father’s house as a maid just they do not return her to him, and she may die if they insisted on her return”. It could be interpreted from this translation that the character has been given a voice through the direct speech and that she is directly talking and pleading with her mother. Calderbank has not just changed the narrative to dialogue, for he has also changed the MSA in the ST to the marked writing style in the TT.

Another example occurs in Munira’s Bottle:

Example 6.84 (ST, p. 57; TT, p. 42)

و أنطلق أخي سارداً عدداً من الآيات والأحاديث والمواعظ قبل أن يذكر لنا ابن أخت غسل الموتى، الذي صحبهم إلى الصلاة والدفن، وكيف أن في خدّه الأيسر، بل في كامل وجهه الأيسر، ندبا طويلا، كأنه شرخ سكين حادّة، أو سيف هوى بغة على وجهه.

He began to explain, reciting verses from the Quran and traditions of the prophet before reminding us of the corpse washer’s nephew, who had accompanied the men to the prayer and the burial. “Didn’t you notice the long scar on his left cheek, on the entire left side of his face in fact, that looked like it had been made by a sharp knife or a sword that had fallen suddenly across his face?”

In this example, Munira is talking about what happened after her grandmother’s funeral and how her brother was devastated after the event. She is talking about him in the third person,
saying “before he mentioned to us who had accompanied the men to the prayer and the burial, and how he had this long scar on his left cheek”

This has been changed in the translation, however. The character is brought to the attention of the reader through the question tag “didn’t you”, making it seem like the character is talking to the narrator and that there is a real conversation occurring here.

In these examples, dialogue has been changed to mimic real conversation, with the translator using a lexical and grammatical marked writing style in the translation.

6.4.11.2. Transliteration and rendition of Arabic phonetics

Some of the characters in Zaat, Girls of Riyadh, and Leaves of Narcissus use code-switching in their conversation when they switch between Arabic and English, and sometimes they insert an English word in their conversation. A further analysis for Calderbank’s translations shows that the transliteration and rendition of Arabic phonetics procedure is only present in the translation of Zaat. For example, this is through the translation of the phrase ‘of course’ as “oov Koors” (79) in Abdulmajeed’s speech.

However, it was present in Booth’s work in multiple forms. Booth deals with this linguistic situation by applying one of two solutions. One solution is to recreate the idea of code-switching in the ST, where Booth translates the English term back to its actual spelling, alongside an additional explanation highlighting that this conversation is in a different code. This procedure occurs when the speaker is an educated person who knows English or is an English native. However, Booth tries to reflect the LDD effect on the pronunciation of English words for characters who speak dialect, such as Amna in Leaves of Narcissus:

Example 6.85 (ST, p. 18; TT, p. 14)
“Your father’s asleep. Besides, jumping rope in the house brings bad luck. Don’t you have any hoomwoork?”

Amna is an uneducated girl from Upper Egypt who works for Kimi’s family. She speaks a mix of Sa’idi and Cairene dialects in the novel, and she has picked up English and French words from the family. Booth reflects these multilingualistic features in Amna’s speech by changing the spelling of the word “homework” to “hoomwoork”. This alteration shows that her pronunciation of this word highlights that she does not know English very well, and, by doubling the vowels in the word “homework”, it also shows that she has a distinct accent. Booth similarly changes the spelling when Amna uses French words she knows to shout at Kimi:

Example 6.86 (ST, p. 19; TT, p. 15)

يابارسوز، ياميشانط.

“you parasseuse! Méchant! Imbécile.”

The spelling of the word “paresseuse”, which means “lazy girl” in French, has been changed here to “parasseuse” to reflect Amna’s accent.

This procedure, however, apart from few cases, has mostly been neutralised in Girls of Riyadh. Booth (2007) has mentioned in her article that, due to the nature of the text, which showed signs of “spoken Arabisation of English”, she tried to use a procedure that did not involve simply translating the words back into English, but rather involved writing them phonetically according to the Arabic pronunciation. Her justification for using this procedure was that, first, she wanted the TT readers to consider English as a second language in the translation, and, second, she wished to reflect the interlingual flavour of the girls’ conversation, giving an insight into the social fabric in Saudi Arabia, including the
consumption of language. She claims that these aspects would otherwise be difficult to recognise and could be lost by naturalising the language. For example:

**Example 6.87 (ST, p. 16)**

In her article on translating *Girls of Riyadh*, Booth states that she transliterated this sentence to “ewww- soo falguur”, which has been changed in the published version to “Ewww... so vulgar” (8). In another case, the Arabic شيز سو كيرفي (17) and Booth’s transcription “sheez soo kiyirvy” (she’s so curvy) have been omitted from the published version.

### 6.4.11.3. Emphasis and emphatic devices in LDD

Calderbank and Booth frequently use emphasis and emphatic devices to translate LDD. They use non-orthographic features that might help to highlight conversational style in translation, such as italics, uppercase, exclamation, ellipsis, and dashes.

Calderbank’s translations sometimes manage to recreate the use of exclamation marks, that are used in some of the STs, especially in *Munira’s Bottle*. However, in general Calderbank often removes them from the translation. Strangely, there are cases in *Gazelle Tracks* and *The Tent* where an ellipsis in the original has been replaced by exclamation in the translation.

Booth to some extent recreates the ellipses or double dots present in the STs in her translations. There is also an interesting use of the dash in most of her translations of LDD. Dashes occasionally replace ellipses, but they are usually an addition to the translation.

A final case of emphatic devices is the use of italics. Calderbank uses italics in a traditional way to highlight borrowed words in some novels or to highlight quoted speech and letters or internal monologues, such as in *Munira’s Bottle* and *The Wolves of the Crescent Moon*. Booth, on the other hand, besides using italics for borrowed words, also uses them
frequently in the translation of LDD sentences as an emphatic device. Consider the following example from *The Open Door*:

**Example 6.88 (ST, p. 83; TT, p. 90)**

البنت ضروري تحب وتتجوز على حب. كل بنت، أي بنت، بس مش أختي ولاأختتك. أخوات الناس الثانيين. مش كده؟

“The girl *must* fall in love, and *must* get married out of love. Every girl. Any girl. But not my sister, and not yours. Other people's sisters. Right?”

The use of italics for emphasis in the dialogue is present in all her translations.

6.5. **The style and voice of Calderbank and Booth**

The question to be asked here in relation to the data and based on the previous descriptive analysis of LDD is what the translatorial voice (Munday, 2008a) is telling us about Calderbank and Booth through their stylistic choices for translating LDD and their translation practices.

To answer this question, it is necessary to consider again the modification of the narratological representation that I proposed earlier in Chapter Two (Figure 2.4) in relation to the comparative descriptive analysis in this chapter. This section aims to see how the characters speech constructed in the translations and to examine the relation between the translation procedures and the voice and the style of the two translators. The discussion will draw on both meta-style and the style of translating LDD in both translators’ works.

My modification of the narratological representation model suggested by Schiavi (1996) and modified by Mundy (2008a) is illustrated as follows:

**For ST**

Author - implied author - narrator - characters - narratee - implied reader - reader
For TT

ST reader/real translator - implied translator - TT narrator - TT characters - TT narratee - TT implied reader - TT reader

**Figure 2.4. My modified version of the narratological representation in translation.**

In light of the model and based on the previous descriptive analysis, it seems that TT characters’ LDD in Calderbank’s and Booth’s translations have been rewritten in the translation accordingly. The findings of Chapter Five suggested that the translators establish a set of presuppositions to translate LDD that might affect the behaviour that governs their translations. These regularities of behaviour (Toury, 1995) might possibly relate to the poetics and discourse (Lefevere, 1992b) of the language of the TT’s implied readers, which is undoubtedly different from those of the implied readers of the ST. These regularities of behaviour that operate as the macro strategy of translating LDD comprise rewriting the LDD into LID, abstaining from using TL dialect, and applying the same procedures on the different dialects across or within novels.

The analysis of further texts by Calderbank and Booth has reinforced these findings about translators’ macro strategies. Both Calderbank and Booth translate the LDD in their text to LID. Further analysis of the two translators’ works shows that LDD is in general recreated in the translation through various procedures. In Calderbank’s and Booth’s work, and as also observed with the corpus discussed in Chapter Five, there is systematic neglect in the English translations and homogeneity of the different dialects of the STs to some extent. This is the case whether the dialects co-exist in the same novel, as in *Munira’s Bottle* where Najdi, Yemeni, Kuwaiti, and Jadawi dialects are used by different characters, or if the different dialects represent the majority of each novel, as Cairene (Egyptian) does in *Zaat*, Najdi (Saudi) does in *Munira’s Bottle*, or different Egyptian dialects in the Egyptian novels
translated by Booth. The same procedures are applied to tackle the linguistic representations regardless of the differences of the dialects. There is an intense reliance on a conversational literary informal style to reflect the ST’s LDD. The comparative analysis of Calderbank’s and Booth’s work in relation to character LDD also suggests that there are elements of translation procedures at the micro level that can be attributed to the translators’ stylistic choices.

With regard to the implied translators in the model, both Calderbank and Booth show a visible discursive presence that is apparent from reading the TTs (Hermans, 1996) and from their use of paratextual procedures. The consistent use of glossaries in Calderbank’s translation and the introductions in Booth’s work indicate a visible discursive presence in the translation that can be spotted by the readers. Other elements that reveal the general translator’s presence in the translations of LDD are the consistent use of borrowed words from Arabic varieties in the translation. Interestingly, the borrowing procedure has allowed them both in the translated text to choose which cultural aspects should be shown to the readers (and by default, which of them should not), and which are accordingly explained through the text or glossaries. In addition, both use explicitation, even though the quantitative analysis reveals that the frequency of explicitation in the translation of LDD is somewhat low in both translators’ work. This does not, however, undermine the fact that it is present also in the narrative as discussed in the meta-style. Offering readers additional information to explain the implicit information in the STs may indicate a conscious choice on the part of the translators.

Furthermore, the comparison of the ST and TT in the work of Calderbank and Booth helps to unpack a number of features that relate to their specific translatorial voices (Munday, 2008a), as well as to see the effect of this voice on the author and characters. In general, the tendency to change the ST is higher in the work of Calderbank than in that of Booth. This is
evident from the changes he makes at the different levels of the novel either in meta-style or the style in relation to dialect such as titles, narrative modes, dialogue writing style, additions to sentences, and alteration of narrative to dialogue. By analysing the five novels translated by him, it is obvious that he has developed a style that aims at more direct and less complex presentations. This becomes clear when studying his translations of the two novels written by al-Tahawy. In both, he tends to change her writing style and adapt her work to some extent to his style in his translations of the other two authors in the study by changing the writing style in both narrative and dialogue. Al-Tahawy uses stream of consciousness as a narrative mode in her novels, as well as ambiguous pronouns. She uses these techniques as part of her characterisation to reflect the rapid shift of the characters’ thoughts and spontaneity, creating the effect of jumping between ideas or conversation. These techniques create an intimate relationship between the characters and readers in the ST. The reader is exposed to the flow of the characters’ thoughts with no censorship of them. This relationship is affected in the translation, however, through changes to the main features of Al-Tahawy’s writing style of long sentences, dialogues and pronoun ambiguity. Calderbank seems to translate Al-Tahawy’s works to a style similar to the other two authors that he has translated, which consequently all represent his own style. Moreover, his tendency to create a smooth and flowing writing is evident from his insistence on completing curtailed or not openly voiced sentences, as well as practice of changing narrative into dialogue.

Unlike Calderbank, Booth tends to keep close to the text by less omission and addition, retention of repetition, ellipses and incomplete sentences, and an attempt to reflect the author’s dialogue. However, there is also a tendency towards informality and markedness in all her translations. Booth seems interested in the power relations that are created through languages and dialects, an interest related to her research in her early PhD studies on vernacularism. This becomes obvious from the low frequency percentage of standerisation in
her translations, beside her applied changes on unmarked dialogue to become marked writing style.

In relation to specific procedures to deal with characters’ speech is the tendency to indicate clearly that the text is a translation from a different language. This is clear from the translators’ decisions to retain some of the cultural and linguistic aspects of the original texts in the translation, which challenges the readers and brings them closer to the ST. Borrowing is an interesting case of highlighting an important characteristic of individual translators. Although quantitative analysis shows a fairly similar frequency in their application of borrowing, the personal stylistic choices are evident in the way they apply this procedure. It seems that Calderbank, in keeping with his direct and less complex translation, chooses not to explain the translation in the text but to make use of glossaries so as not to interrupt the text. Interestingly, his borrowing procedure also indicates characteristics of individual style through his constant retention of the vocative particle ya in all his translations, mainly in LDD. This repetition is an indicator of his own “mark” on all his translations.

Booth believes that a translation is co-authored by the translator and the author, which likely informs her tendency to be willing to challenge the expected norms of the TL and to provide an immediate explanation of the context without relying on any form of peritext, such as footnotes or a glossary. This indicates her decision to treat borrowed words as part of the text that should be explained within the text and not outside the novel’s frame. There is also an element of creativity in this approach, which is shown by her use of repetition to borrow words and explain them at the same time.

There is no doubt that both translators manage to retain the spoken patterns of the characters’ speech in LDD through using LID and mimicking oral speech. To some extent, this indicates that ST LDD is written in a conversational informal style. However, the sociocultural patterns of characters’ speech and the function of diglossic shifting in the
Individual character’s speech are not fully reproduced. Both translators’ practices seem fairly similar in the way attention is given to sociolects and how characters are recreated through linguistic patterns in translation. Booth manages to capture the sociolect of the characters in her translation, which is clear from the way she imitates and retains the general sense of slang and profanity in *Thieves in Retirement* and the Cairene middle class colloquialism in *The Open Door*. However, and due to her tendency to use marked writing form as shown in the analysis, the shifting in the Individual character’s speech is not totally recognised in the translations. This is apparent from how she creates the social tension between characters such as Professor Ramadan, who is presented through MSA, and Abu Gamal, who is presented through Egyptian dialect, in her translation of *Thieves of Retirement*. The linguistic choices for the characters of Ramadan and Abu Gamal portray the tension of the sociopolitical situation in Egyptian society. In relation to the themes of the novel, Ramadan’s MSA is filled with clichés that might reflect the empty clichés repeated occasionally by politicians and authorities to manipulate the public, whereas Abu Gamal’s use of Cairene dialect presents an angry tone that might represent public frustration with the ignorance of the authorities. Abu Gamal resists accommodating Ramadan’s use of MSA, seemingly to take a stand on behalf of marginalised groups in the face of authority. The language here hints at the power relations between the two characters; however, Booth’s tendency to use the marked writing form and her use of borrowing slightly affect the tension of idiolect between the two.

A similar case occurs in *Leaves of Narcissus*. The mother’s use of MSA and Kimi’s use of dialect create a tension and detachment between the two characters, but this is not recreated in the TT. Translating MSA in the TT as marked writing style has made the boundaries between the characters fluid, with the result that the marked writing style fails to capture the tension and distance between them. Interestingly, in her representation of Layla’s idiolect in *The Open Door*, Booth is careful to keep the feminine voice in the translation. The
marked speech of Layla and the gendered language are present in the translation. This reflects Booth’s conscious feminist effort to make gender visible through the language of the translation.

Calderbank, on the other hand, focuses on the macro level in recreating the markedness of the text; however, at the micro level, his translations subvert idiolect, and especially the feminine and child’s idiolect, in Munira’s Bottle and The Tent. This is apparent, for example, in the changes made to Munira’s speech in translation. In the ST, Munira makes linguistic choices to situate herself in the discussion. She uses MSA in her work to show authority, but her MSA dialogues have been changed to marked style in the translation. On the other hand, she uses the Najdi dialect with her religious brother who mainly uses MSA, which is probably to indicate their differences and her refusal to accommodate to his rhetoric. The linguistic tension and the representation of power relations have been neutralised mainly to marked writing style in translation. The shy conservative girl in Munira’s Bottle and the child in The Tent use marked style in the translation that is either not present or is not openly voiced in the ST. On the other hand, sociolect has not been completely erased in the translation, which is indicated by the way Calderbank pays attention to creating the working class sociolect in Zaat. Calderbank seems keen to keep the nuances of the speech of characters, as discussed in the previous section. This indicates that translator is more focused on a character’s LDD as a general pattern and ignores the micro level when it comes to idiolect.

Finally in relation to the stylistic choices and translatorial voices of Calderbank and Booth, the use of compensatory procedure such as emphatic devices in the translations shows a significant stylistic element, particularly in Booth’s practice. The analysis of Calderbank’s translations does not reveal a significant use of emphasis, apart from the traditional use of italics and a few recreations or additions to exclamation markers. However, in Booth’s
translation there is a distinct use of emphatic devices; in particular, she makes constant use of the dash and italics in all her translations of LDD, which again indicates her tendency towards informality and markedness in her translation practice. More precisely, the use of italics points to her stylistic choices; as Saldanha (2005, p. 88) argues, “is one of the few extralinguistic devices that can call the reader’s attention to particular forms, and also one of the few that the text’s originator (author/translator), rather than the text producer (typesetter) has control over”. The frequent appearance of italics in Booth’s translations seems to be her way of drawing readers’ attention to particular words or part of the dialogue; her use of this procedure is an individual stylistic choice by the translator.

6.6. Conclusion

In this chapter I have conducted a comparative study of the practices of the two translators, Calderbank and Booth. The chapter began with background information about the translators. Then I presented an overview of the two translators’ meta-styles. After that, the chapter presented a comparative analysis of the two translators’ work. Finally, I have discussed the stylistic choices and voices in relation to the recreation of characters according to my proposed modified narratological representation model.
Chapter Seven

Translators’ reflections and source of explanations

7.0 Introduction

Chapter Six presented an in-depth and comparative descriptive analysis of the translator’s practices of Anthony Calderbank and Marilyn Booth. This chapter is mainly explanatory, and it focuses, in the first part, on the outcome from the interviews with the two translators, which will be analysed regarding their input on the translation procedures for LDD and their literary translation style in general. The second part, and in light of the findings from descriptive analysis and the interviews, will be dedicated to provide a source of explanation (Brownlie, 2003) for the translational phenomena of LDD.

7.1. Translators’ reflection on their style and voice: Calderbank and Booth

Semi-structured interviews were conducted where I mainly interviewed Calderbank and Booth to discuss the results and findings that have been shown in the in-depth descriptive study. As stated in Chapter Four, I chose to interview only these two translators whom I focused on with regard to style because I am mainly interested in explanation at the level of the individual translator. Thus, interview questions were structured to draw on the in-depth studies in the previous chapter. The interviews were divided into three sections. In the first section, the translators were asked questions about their own background in learning Arabic and becoming translators; however, as mentioned before, due to time limitation and
technical issues Booth was not asked these questions, but the information were collected from previous interviews and her university page. The second section concerns their own translation approach in general and particularly in relation to their choice of novels and their themes. The third section was data-driven and each translator was asked questions in relation to the examples that were discussed in Chapter Six. Each translator touched on various topics related to how they see their role as a translator, their relationship with authors and publishing houses, their implied readers, and their techniques to deal with LDD and the TL constraints.

As mentioned in Chapter Four, the interviews were transcribed in separate Word documents. Due to the difficulty in managing the length of the two interviews, I used NVivo as a management tool to analyse the similarities and differences in the two translators’ practices. The two interviews were coded by selecting the answer or translators’ comments and putting them under certain ‘nodes’. In the analysis, I followed both the themes that emerged from the data analysis and the themes that emerged from the discussion with the two translators. This helped me to analyse the two practices and compare them; this analysis will be outlined in the following discussion.

7.1.1. Translator’s style, visibility and the concept of co-authoring
The general approach to the texts and the ideas of recognition, visibility, and translator co-authoring were discussed with both translators. They reveal slightly different approaches in their perspectives on these concepts while translating. Calderbank made a distinction between the idea of the translator’s recognition and visibility in relation to his experience. He thinks that the translator should be recognised and that it is part of her/his intellectual property to have her/his name on the cover and to be recognised by literary critics when reference is made to the English translation. However, in relation to the text itself, he does
not think it is a major problem if the translator remains invisible. In his view, if people read the English translation and think that it is ‘a fantastic story’, then the translator has been successful and there is no need for the reader to know about her/his presence. He reflected on his experience as a reader of international literature translated into English (for example, Russian and Chinese literature) and he felt for him as a reader the translator is not important and he is not interested to know who the translator was. I suggested to him that his reader might already know about his presence through his paratextual procedures. He justified these procedures by saying that he wanted the reader to know the words, not to make them aware that he translated it. So, for Calderbank his main focus is on the text and the readers, even when he uses these procedures.

Booth, on the other hand, said that she definitely confirms that she sees her role as a co-author and her translation as a different book. This emerges when there is an indirect translation, where somebody translates the English translation instead of the ST. She pointed out that when somebody translates a book, the author of that book gets ‘some royalty fame’; however, she felt that in her case there are a number of translations that were not made from the original book but rather from her English translation of the book. Although she quite respects the fact that the book has a first author, she also felt that ‘it’s completely wrong’ that she gets no recognition for that. She expressed her disapproval of the way the translator is represented on the printed cover of a novel in English, and also of the whole culture of the literary critics and how some of them discuss the translation as if it were the ST and comment on specific issues like linguistic choices, assuming it is the author’s style. However, she was critical about how she views her translation as she felt that her works are time-bound. There were times when she had to read and teach her translations in her literary classes and she described it as a painful experience. Sometimes she felt that if she were to retranslate a book she would do it in a different way.
Both translators agreed on their intention to help promote Arabic literature to English readers.

### 7.1.2 Author/translator relation

Being in contact with authors while translating, in order to clarify certain aspects of the ST, and especially matters related to LDD, seems to be an important aspect for both translators. Calderbank maintains a constant relationship with authors during the translation process. He works closely with them to explain the ST cultural references and concepts. He thinks that it is really helpful to know their motivation for using certain words in the ST. Authors were involved at translation stages and were given the chance to discuss the text, as well as other things, such as the translation of the book titles. However, in his case authors did not affect his translation procedures since they maintained a distant relationship with the translation, and there was no power conflict between author and translator. Calderbank felt that both Al-Tahawy and Al-Mohammeed had helped him by explaining the context of their novels, especially in relation to Bedouin terms in Al-Tahawy’s case. Occasionally, changes in the TT were driven by consulting with the author. For example, in relation to the case discussed in Chapter six, when Munira suddenly shouts to the Kuwaiti lady “you little refugee”, Calderbank stated that he changed it after consulting with Al-Mohammeed. However, in the example in the same chapter where there was change that related to completing Munira’s originally chopped sentence (Example 6.69), he thought that it would probably not be comprehended by the readers if he just wrote half of the word, for example just ‘sl…’, so he took the liberty to complete it.

Interestingly, Calderbank also went further and changed certain titles and events in the original. Reflecting back to Chapter Six, the general textual analysis of the narrative shows that the title of a novel the character was reading was changed in *Naqarāt al-Dhibā’*;
Calderbank justified this change on the grounds that the title that “Miral used wasn’t the actual title of the novel … so the novel is called The Lady of the Camellias not Majdolian”. He also mentioned another instance of a change in the same novel: there is a scene describing a helicopter landing in a garden, but Calderbank decided that, because they would not have had helicopters at the time when the novel was set, this should not be mentioned in the translation. He discussed this with Al-Tahawy and both agreed to change it in the translation. He felt that these changes are justified so that English readers will not question the credibility of the text.

Booth felt that her contact and dealings with authors vary. She said that there were cases of authors, even when they had access to the TT language, who respected her boundaries and were sensitive to her ‘autonomy as a translator’; Abu Golayyal, for example, was helpful and answered her questions. However, there were also a number of interventions in her works, either in translating LDD or in her work in general. Among the novels considered in this research, the most notable case was *Girls of Riyadh*, which has already been discussed in Chapter Six and about which Booth has written an article (Booth, 2008). Surprisingly, the interview revealed a different case of intervention in Booth’s style, when Ramadan, the author of *Leaves of Narcissus*, made changes to Booth’s translation that had an impact on the translation of LDD and other aspects of the novel. Booth, however, thinks that this was a different experience, as Ramadan was a literary translator herself with an understanding of what literary translation usually involves; moreover, she would answer Booth’s questions during the translation process and she was a close friend. Nevertheless, Booth said:

> At the end when I sent her the translation […] she was very complimentary, she said it really was excellent the editor also really liked it, you know […] she was very happy with it as an artistic rendering of her novel. However, she felt uncomfortable with it as an author because she felt […] that the work in English is just needed to be a different book, […]
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and so we talked at length about that and I was […] I was a bit upset at first, […] but we talked about it and everything she wanted to do she asked me about and we worked together on it. We had some very funny afternoons […] I think it’s very important that one mark of respect she started calling it our book.

Booth states the changes that were made to *Leaves of Narcissus* which involved changing the characters’ names (as mentioned in the previous chapter). Booth felt that the reason for this change was because Ramadan got worried about the names of the characters and that people may recognise themselves and their own stories in English, where this had not been an issue in the ST in the first place. Booth said that there were changes to the dialogue of the novel and some paragraphs were omitted. She believes that those changes were “tricky” for her because, regarding her style, she commented:

> I stay closer to the Arabic than a lot of translators do. I do that because frankly through experience I have found that I tend to get the best result that way and I tend to feel that I really […] actually get the voice that I wanna get more often when I stay close to the Arabic […] obviously it varies […] it varies a lot […] and so she actually made a lot of changes that took it further away from the Arabic.

According to Booth, Ramadan felt after reading Booth’s draft translation that it was a bit emotional and close to reality, which is why she believed the changes were necessary. Returning to the case of *Girls of Riyadh*, Booth states that translation is an intimate act to her, which is why she felt violated and crushed when Alsanea interfered in her work. Specifically, she states that the fact the author ignored her and did not acknowledge her efforts in the introduction was unacceptable. The addition of footnotes to the translation, which went against Booth’s practice of adding a parallel meaning in the translation itself, was something with which Booth was definitely not happy.
7.1.3. Conceptualisation of characters and reading the ST

Different voices in the novel were recognised by both translators in the discussion, and they distinguished between the voices of authors, narrators, and characters. The translators talked about the preparatory stages of the translation concerning the voice of each character, and they emphasised the need to create an English voice for the characters. Calderbank highlighted the importance of sensory memory in his case and hearing the character’s voice before even beginning the translation. He reflected on his experience in translating *Zaat*, saying:

> so when I translated, even before I translated it, I read it in Arabic [...] I could see Zaat and Abdulmajed completely [...] how they look like and it’s like when you read any novel in your own language [...] you create the image of the characters in your head, don’t you?

He also gave an example in the interview from his translation of *Fikhākh al-rā’iha* of the importance of building an image of the character, commenting that he could visualise Turad in his mind and see the Saudi Bedouin man. Calderbank attributes this partly to the familiarity with the context of the novel:

> it’s one of the reasons why I did it is you know translating literature from the countries in which I was living in [...] and even I’ve done things like you know [...] ahhh you know something from Yemen some small things and some [...] but I have been to Yemen so I know what it’s like [...] I have been to Gulf countries and I know what it’s like, so I think [...] it’s help me [...] I can’t imagine what it would be like to translate from some kind a language or a context which I didn’t fully understand.

Booth commented on the question related to humanisation and getting into character, saying that her general approach is to humanise the characters, and that she manages to do this even if it is a male character, such as in her translation for Hassan Daud. However, sometimes the relationship with the character is affected by the tone of the text; for example, she felt that the satirical and ironic distance of *Thieves in Retirement* prevented her from getting into
character. There were other works that she initially hesitated to accept, thinking “I shouldn’t have done this, or once where I don’t feel, where I might feel kind of estranged from the character, like the characters don’t really speak to me”. By contrast, for Calderbank the humanisation and dehumanisation process of his translation is mainly a linguistic process, turning the Arabic text into English without involving much literary criticism: “if I like the novel… and I accepted to translate it then that’s enough after that I have to then to bring it into an English version, I don’t kind of philosophise too much about it”.

7.1.4. Translating LDD to LID: Recreating the effect rather than the source text’s LDD

As can be seen from Chapter Six, both Calderbank and Booth relied mainly on the informal conversational writing style to recreate the LDD in their translations. The interviews confirmed that they consciously used the informal writing style as their general translation strategy. The most important aspect for them is to create the informal conversational style in English, although they would leave traces of Arabic words to remind readers that the novel had been translated from Arabic. Both translators agreed that English novels were used as measuring criteria to translate the LDD novels. They also both reflected on the role of their readers when thinking about creating LDD in English.

Calderbank showed an understanding of LDD as he mentioned that dialogue in the ST, from his point of view, is not completely in dialect when authors are just using elements of the dialect to create their characters’ speech. So, to reflect that in English, he tries to create the conversational function these dialects have played in ST. He commented:

I find that if we look at an English novel, you know we can find some writers using a dialect, some writers are writing the dialogue in normal English and the reader when they read, you know they read the text, they read the narrative, they read the dialogue. When we take an Egyptian
novel, it’s not possible to do an Egyptian dialect in English, because it’s in English it’s not in Arabic anymore. So all we need to think about is how we construct a dialogue in English that reflects the dialogue that the people are having in Arabic [...] if you see what I mean. It wouldn’t make sense for me to take a dialogue [...] from an Egyptian novel, a dialogue which is in Egyptian Arabic and write it out in a Lancashire or a Scottish English. [...] I just feel [...] what we can say is colloquial informal English.

For Calderbank, therefore, the informal element of the communication between characters in the ST has to be reproduced in English through creating elements of informal conversational English style. As can be seen from Chapter Six, this has been presented through the use of informal elements, such as phrasal verbs, collocation, colloquial and slang words, and repetition. Calderbank is aware that character voices in the ST are representing a different cultural, social and educational background, and that he has to think about “how to express the voice in English”. However, he thinks carefully when he “reproduces”, because he needs to ensure that his implied reader will accept it and reflect on it. He expressed this by saying: “I have to write a text that the English reader will accept, if the English reader refuses to accept the text it’s a wasted effort, isn’t it”. In addition, he believes that “how the English sounds is more important sometimes than the meaning coming [...] you know because it’s not always necessary to get exactly the same meaning but to reflect [...] to reflect the flow and rhythm of the original”. He recalled his experience of translating Zaat, explaining how he had tried to make the dialogue sound like that of ordinary people:

So for me… I could hear they speaking I know what she’s saying, I know what Abdulalmagid is saying, so all I want is to put that in nice simple, especially the dialogue. I want to translate the dialogue like ordinary people speak.

For Calderbank, his approach of translating dialect and the dialogue in general is “instinctive” and “spontaneous”.
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Booth thinks that translating LDD is hard in general because it is text-bound. She believes that “every situation, every author and every novel is different and so I think different texts call for different strategies...”. She emphasised that she is conscious of LDD and its importance in the text, and she tries in the translation to work with it, but at the same time she is aiming to reflect something that TT readers are familiar with:

what would be typical of most novels that are originally written in English, in other words you know they wouldn’t use a more formal language in the dialogue and so, in that sense I’m trying to make it very much equivalent to what readers would be accustomed to but I also try to signal yeah this is also going in the Arabic.

Booth, like Calderbank, also tries to translate LDD into an English dialogue that reflects the informality and the conversation style of the ST, while at the same time following the literary norms of the novel in English. She felt that the real question for her is what she would do if the dialogue was written in MSA rather than LDD. How would that formality of the ST be reflected in the translation?

The translators were also asked about the code-switching in the characters’ speech in the ST. The discussions at the ends of Chapter Six revealed slightly inconsistent ways of dealing with idiolect and code-switching in a character’s speech between MSA and the dialects. In theory, both translators agreed that it is important to reflect the different levels in the text. Calderbank believes that it is the basic role of the translator to reflect the different levels of formality in the ST. He argues saying “if the Arabic is reflecting different social or cultural, educational things then ..and this is clear in the Arabic , then also it should be clear in the English also in a way”. Booth also commented that in general she usually preserves these differences in the text. However, reflecting on the case of code-switching between Kimi and her mother (discussed in the previous chapter), she commented:

I don’t really remember if that was me or whether that was Somaya [...] because I think I did try to preserve that difference [...] I mean her
relationship with her mother was clearly very different [...] but I do remember that in general Somaya made it a bit the whole thing more informal.

Both translators agreed on the importance of the borrowing procedure as a way of reflecting part of the cultural specificity of the STs. They agreed also on the need to explain the meaning to English readers; however, they have confirmed the findings from the previous chapter and express their different approaches on how to explain borrowed words in the text. Calderbank said that he prefers to leave Arabic words in the text and to leave a sense of the ST in the translation, and that he explains the meaning in a glossary so that it does not interrupt the text. The decision about which words to keep and which to translate is usually made in his case while reading the ST. Interestingly, when I asked him about the borrowing of the vocative particle ‘ya’ in all his translations (discussed in Chapter Six), he confirmed that he had made a conscious effort to leave it in his translation. He believed that this began when he first translated *al-Khibā*’ (*The Tent*) for American University Press (AUC), as he “wanted to keep a sniff or a smell or a sense of the Arabic”. Calderbank said that he discussed it with the publisher and editor, and that they too thought it was a good idea. So, he kept it, commenting that in the 1990s “we were in the mood of keeping those things, ideologically maybe”. He thought that the vocative particle ‘ya’ is not hard to understand or to pronounce, and, besides, that it is common in Arabic – so he continued using it in his translations. However, he argued that he was not trying “consciously to leave a fingerprint” as the translator, because he thought of it as part of his technique and because he believes that some Arabic element should be left for the readers. He argues that this “allows the English person to somehow learn a little bit about the Arabic”.

Booth has stated her preference, especially in translating dialogue, to leave a number of Arabic words, as she hopes that this will “liven it up”. The analysis of her borrowing procedures in the previous chapter shows that Booth makes a conscious effort to explain the
borrowed word in the text; in relation to this, she commented: “I try really hard and very consciously to try to phrase it, so that when I have the Arabic text there, either right before or right after, I’m gonna somehow make it clear what it is”. However, she hopes that she does not make the English sound awkward, as she has tried to make the dialogue sound perfect in the translation, but basically to her the ST dialogue, when being turned into English, words come with different registers and other associations. So, one way for her to reproduce the register and the association of the dialogue is to have ST words in the TT. By applying this procedure:

what I am setting out to do is […] to give the reader a voice that I think […] is my imagination of what the voice in the novel should be […] it’s almost like a piece of music that is in harmony, you know, so that you got in a sense the top layer is the English but you always got that kind of harmony underneath which is the Arabic and so occasionally I want that to sort of erupt and be there. So I think for me it’s, it’s about producing this specific text and feeling like that is the best way I can do it.

I asked her whether, by implying this in the translation, she is trying to resist the TL linguistic and literary norms. She answered that what she is doing is simply trying to reflect the literary work, and that she is not trying to do anything beyond that. In fact, she said that she used to italicise the Arabic words in the TT, but she had decided to ask the editor not to italicise the borrowed words in English, commenting: “I just wanna make it part of regular language I don’t want to set it out”.

The authors’ interventions in her translation have affected her borrowing procedures. As has been discussed in Chapter Six, Alsanea added footnotes to explain the borrowed words in Girls of Riyadh. Booth commented on this issue again, believing that the footnote to explain the borrowed words was unnecessary and has been overused in the translation. In her view, Alsanea probably “didn’t trust English language readers to actually be able to go beyond, they are just superficial”. In discussing the borrowing from the SL rather than the ST (as discussed in Chapter Six), Booth emphasised that this was definitely Ramadan’s
decision and her interpretation of what is in the ST. She said that she would not go so far as to borrow a word that is not in ST, and that all her borrowing is from words in the ST. She also thinks that, from her experience while working with Ramadan in translating the novel, Ramadan may have felt that there are things that she could express in English which she could not express in Arabic. So in Booth opinion it was not that Ramadan felt it needed to be a different book, but rather that she wanted to express herself and go further in the English translation.

In relation to the explication procedure, both translators agreed that they did this consciously in the TTs. Seeing the text as a reader rather than a translator was one of the elements that the translators relied on to translate the implicit information for the TT. Booth explained that, as a reader, from her first reading of the text she was aware of that implicit information in the text, but that as a translator “I’m also very conscious that’s not something that my readers are going to have”. She commented that for Arabic readers this information is in their head as if it is written in the text, but that is not the case for English readers. She thinks it is justifiable, therefore, to have these explanations in the translation, but that one has to be careful in using these procedures because it may weigh down the TT and lead to a clunky text. Calderbank, on the other hand, said that explicating the implied information in the TT is not a spontaneous act as it is with translating the dialogue. He might translate the dialogue as usual, but then he would need to explain this information to readers who might not know it.

Both translators also offered their input on other individual procedures that emerged from the data analysis. Calderbank commented on the procedures for translating narrative into dialogue, saying that he is not sure why he did that, and that it is not necessarily that he did so consciously: “I might just do that because it sounds better [...] or for whatever, for a style reason, or a reading reason”.
Booth, on the other hand, discussed her tendency to use literal translation, saying that she likes to translate cultural expressions, and especially proverbs, literally, if she felt that the meaning could come through in English; she was also motivated by wanting to remind the readers that it is from somewhere else. She is aware that some may criticise her on the grounds that it is too foreignising, and that might be true at times, yet she felt that sometimes it works and the phrase could be acceptable in the English, and if it enriches the text and the readers’ metaphorical language that would be great. She is, however, conscious that literal translation might sometimes sound “clunky” in the TT.

7.1.5. The paratextual preferences

The paratextual procedures were a point of difference in the individual stylistic choices of the two translators. Both Booth and Calderbank vocally expressed their own preferences and why they have at least one regular procedure in their translations. In the case of Calderbank’s translations, the inconsistency in the introductions to the translation was attributed to the involvement of the publishing house in the translation procedures. Calderbank said that introductions are usually the publisher’s procedure in his translations, especially for the books that he has translated with AUC, because “it’s a kind of style of the AUC press”. Given a choice whether to write an introduction or not, he answered that he would not write one because authors do not normally write an introduction to a novel, so why should he do that for the translation? For him, the introductions prepare the readers for the text, but to what extent should they be ready for the text? It seems that he is more concerned about recreating the element of suspense that readers of the original experienced. However, the existence of the introduction is simply a stylistic choice for the publishing houses, and there were no instructions from them regarding the length and the content for those he wrote for Zaat and The Tent. The content and structure of his introductions were
left to him to decide, so it was his decision not to mention the fact that the ST dialogue was written in a specific dialect and was not homogeneously ‘Arabic’.

Booth, on the other hand, felt that the translator’s note is an important part of her style. It gives her a chance to situate the text in its historical and social space. However, she would prefer to present this as an afterword, but because of the publisher’s involvement she usually has it at the beginning. She emphasised that she has full control over the content of her introductions, but that the case may differ depending on the kind of publishing house she is working with. Academic publishing houses, for example, require specific type of content, but small or commercial publishing houses may not require her to provide an introduction. She mentioned that with *The Open Door*, the publishing house decided to republish it again in a special series, but they inform her that they are going to remove the introduction from the new version. Booth rejected their request because she felt that the introduction put the text in its historical context, so she tried to negotiate to have it as an afterword, which is what the publishing house agreed to do in the end.

As for the glossary, this is one of Calderbank’s preferred paratextual procedures, and he stated that he usually likes to include it in his translation. For him, the process of constructing the glossary is accompanied by the borrowing procedures that he uses from the beginning of the translation of the text. Having a glossary in the translation, in his opinion, allows him to keep a number of Arabic words in his translations. In terms of the content of the glossary, he thinks that it is important that he writes and constructs the glossary based on the culture and setting of the novel. So, if he borrowed the same words in two different contexts (see 6.4.10.2), the words should be explained according to the cultural context of the novel, and not just according to the linguistic meaning of the words:

yeah, and imagine so we don’t have an English word for Abaya therefore as a translator, I’ve chosen to include the word Abaya in the translation and brought the word Abaya into the sphere of the English reader. So, the
English reader is now seeing the word Abaya, but [...] then I have another choice to make, I have to decide do I want to tell the reader ‘what Abaya is?’ or not? Now if I don’t say what Abaya is? You know that’s a different question isn’t it. I have taken the decision that I choose to explain Abaya. This way of writing the glossary gives his glossary a vibrant meaning: it is not written as a fixed list, but as one that follows the cultural and social dynamics of each individual ST.

Booth, in the contrary, said that publishers have always objected to her borrowing procedure where she offers a parallel explanation before or after the borrowing words, and that they usually insist that she includes a glossary but that she refuses to have one. She said that she used glossaries in her first one or two translations, but since then she had abandoned the idea. She listed many reasons why she is not in favour of a glossary in translated text. First, she believes that a glossary interrupts the reading process, like a footnote does, but that a glossary more precisely interrupts what she calls “the literary reading process”, since readers have to flip back and forth to know the meaning. Second, she feels that having a glossary with the Arabic words and explanations is an act of exoticisation. Although she would like the reader to keep in mind that this is a text written in Arabic, she feels that having a glossary treats Arabic texts as an exception. She commented that in this age of digital technology and the internet, if anyone needs to know a word they could look it up. She further argued that when reading a Chinese novel in translation or even an English novel that contains difficult concepts, readers are expected to look words up, so why would a translator need to do this in Arabic? Calderbank argued, however, that for him a glossary is a way to not interrupt the reader’s experience with footnotes. He did not understand why a glossary could be considered an act of exoticisation in the translation.

Despite their disagreements about their stylistic choices regarding introductions and glossaries, both translators agreed that footnotes are their least favoured procedures. Booth, as mentioned previously, felt that footnotes interrupt the flow and distract the readers. As for
omitting the footnotes from the ST, Calderbank cannot recall why he made this decision at the time, stating that he thought he had probably done so because “it’s a bit neater… to have the text flowing like that”.

7.1.6. Publishing houses and translators’ negotiations

Both translators reflected on the role of the publishing houses in their translations. In relation to the language chosen, the idea of translating dialect to literary conversational style was the translator’s choice rather than that of the publishing house. They said that there were no requirements except the publisher house style, or editorial requirements, such as American spelling if the publishing house is American. The requirements from most publishing houses were more in relation to the paratextual procedures and titles. Calderbank drew attention to the role of the publisher when he commented on changing the titles of his novels. The idea of adding the word ‘Munira’ to al- Yousef Al-Mohaiemeed’s *al-Qārūra* was because the publishing house felt ‘the bottle’ alone has an association with alcohol and drinking. Calderbank thought the word ‘bottle’ is fine and he reflected on how his experience of living for a long time in the region has changed his reaction to words, since for him the Arabic language is as normal as English. In the case of changing the title completely for *Wolves of the Crescent Moon*, he commented that he originally tried to translate the title to different possibilities like ‘The Lure of the Scent’ or ‘Trapped in Smell’ or ‘The Scent Trap’, but “we couldn’t find a way to express it in English that was working well, the publishers weren’t comfortable with it at all”. So both he and Penguin started to look for themes in the novel and chose the moon and the wolf, since the wolf, as he states, has a significant role in the novel itself and in Arabic literature more generally, especially in the pre-Islamic work of Imru’ al-Qais. Al-Mohaiemeed was consulted on the new title.

Booth drew attention to the role of the editor in the academic and independent press with whom she has published most of her translations. She said that most of the time editors
in these presses are sensitive and respectful to her “boundaries as a translator”, and they only ask for a few changes that have “a literary rationale”, and that even if they feel that they want to make a change they do not force it. She felt that these boundaries might be crossed when dealing with “a star author”, such as was the case when she worked with Alsanea and Penguin, because, as Booth put it, for the publishing house the author in this case “is a commodity” and the translator is just “hard labour”. She also thinks that it is not necessarily the author who demands changes; more often it depends on whether one comes across an unknowledgeable editor or not. Booth has negotiated with publishers regarding the explanation and the representation of her borrowing procedures. Besides what was mentioned above regarding the arguments with publishers on having a glossary, she also said that her recent decision not to italicise Arabic words in the translation and to treat them as part of the regular language of the text is not very welcome by editors.

7.1.7 ST quality and prize culture in Arabic region

During the discussion with the translators, they commented briefly on the quality of ST novels and the whole idea of prize culture that authors in the region. Calderbank states that, of course, there is a sizeable risk that translations might affect what the author has written; the text might be well written in Arabic but the translation could be awful. However, he hints that it is sometimes the opposite; that is, the text could be poorly written in the ST but, when it is translated into English, its quality attract the approval of its readers. He talks about his translations of Al-Tahawy’s work, saying that “no-one in Egypt could read it” and that, when he has a conversation with Arabic speakers in order to clarify a point in the ST, people find the text really difficult to follow. He added that there are cases where the criticisms of the TT are unjustified, as “the review is critical of the translation and blames the translation when the problem might be the original”.
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Booth, however, in a discussion about Ramadan’s attempts to follow the English writing style in her writing, mentioned the idea of writing world literature for an international audience. She criticised it, saying, “I’ve seen now in some of the Arabic novels that the author actually seems to be writing almost for a translated audience”. This notion hit her while reading the ST; the wordy style upset her and she felt that “…there are bits and pieces in that novel you don’t need, because your Arabic readers are gonna know that it’s redundant… but you’re actually writing for the English readers…” She partially blames the prize culture in the region for this and states that it is affecting the writing of some ST authors.

7.1.8 Theories and practices of translation

At the beginning of Chapter Six, I stated that one of the reasons why the two translators were selected was for their academic backgrounds; these, it was assumed, may show that they are reflective and aware of their translation practice. Both translators agreed in their interview about the minor role that translation theories play in their practices. Calderbank reflected on his time teaching at the University of Salford and the course that was focusing on translation modules and theories, which he said was helpful. However, when it comes to actual translation, his belief is that “I’m not thinking consciously of the module of translations or following a particular theory of translation. I’m just working with the text and the two languages”. The style comes to him through the interaction with the ST; as he states, “because I can live in Cairo and I listen… then I know how Egyptians speak… when I read Zaat it makes sense to me”.

Booth also confirmed that translation theories have little influence on her practice. She said:
I’ve taught literary translation a few times and I always say to my students, like, ok, we can read various translation theories, we can read sort of business about sort of translation strategy, and I say what I feel about this kind of material. It can really open up your mind to possibility but I say when I’m actually translating, that is the last thing I’m thinking about.

The last thing she thinks about while she is translating is Toury’s or any other scholar’s theory. To her, this is a positive side to her confidence as she is able “to liberate myself a little bit more from the text”.

7.2 Recreation of characters’ LDD between a translator’s individual style and target literary norms

Based on the descriptive analysis chapters and interview with the two translators, I will sum up in the following sections sources of explanation about the translation of LDD in the Egyptian and Saudi novels and the translator’s style. This explanatory part is organised based on the four possible sources of explanation for translational phenomena proposed by Brownlie (2003) explained in the methodology chapter which are as follows: the individual situations, textuality, translators’ norms, target culture field. In light of the outcome from the interview with each of the translators, I will add a fifth possible source of explanation related to authors’ input. Brownlie (2003) states that these sources do not operate separately; however, for the purpose of such explanations, they will be discussed separately. Brownlie (2003, p. 115) clarifies that “some repetition in the discussion of phenomena and the proposal of several explanations even at the same level indicate multiple conditioning of a single type of phenomenon”.
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7.2.1 Individual situations

7.2.1.1 Individual translator’s different preferences and attitudes

It can be seen from the analysis of the practice of Booth and Calderbank that there are variations in comparable phenomena between the two translators that could be attributed to the individual stylistic choices of the translator. The extensive comparable descriptive analysis and the interviews both provided evidence for this claim. The statements given by the two translators confirmed their conscious attitude towards what is stated in the descriptive chapter regarding the visible discursive presence of both of them in the TT (Hermans, 1996) and translatorial voice and stylistic choices (Munday, 2008a). First, the translators confirmed that they were reorienting the text towards their readers through the implications of the paratextual procedures that are shown in the text, i.e. the glossary in Calderbank’s works and the introduction in Booth’s works. Furthermore, there was a similar use of borrowing in TTs with the intention of hinting that this text is a translation and providing the reader with new words. Moreover, they both interrupt the context of text with an explanation of it, is providing implicit information. However, adopting a similar understanding to that of Munday’s (2008a) notion of style and voice (where the latter is the abstract concept of translatorial presence and the former is the linguistic manifestation of that presence) has helped to unpack further features. The translators’ statements confirm that these features are their own stylistic choice. The analysis of the translation of characters’ LDD in the modified narratological representation model display that translators not only show their existence in the text, but also their individuality in their style in the way they have applied borrowing and paratextual procedures. The findings of the textual analysis showed that the borrowing in all of Calderbank’s translations has been accompanied by a glossary. This was confirmed by Calderbank in the interview to be his way of providing the reader with new words while, at the same time, not interrupting the reading experience. This
confirmed again his tendency to provide syntactic simplification and less-complex texts in his translations. Conversely, Booth’s statement confirmed her intention to consciously provide parallel phrasing for borrowed words in the text. She justified this by saying that it is for the readers to always be conscious that they are reading a foreign text. The fact that this is still a point of negotiation with the publisher, as stated in Booth’s interview, emphasises the fact that there might be an element of confronting norms in her translations. An interesting point that should be highlighted here is that the statement and the preferences of the two translators definitely involve decision making. It also indicates an element of spontaneity when dealing with texts that are not regulated by scholarly theories.

There were differences between the translators’ statements and what they did in their translation. The two translators vary in their view of their own style and their role in the translation. In his interview, Calderbank justified his borrowing and glossary procedures by saying that applying these procedures is not about him as a translator, but rather the procedures are a way to help his readers understand the text. However, this does not deny his presence in the TT; this is especially evident through the fact that he makes a conscious decision to keep the vocative particle “ya” in each translation. In Booth’s case, she stated that she would like to keep this distinction between the marked and unmarked in the text. However, the textual analysis of her work showed an increased tendency to use a marked writing style across the three novels, even in the narrative part where most of the text is written in MSA. That is also hinted at in Booth’s interview, where she said that, regarding the dialogue, maybe the question is more about what to do when the dialogue is not in dialect; this could be taken as an indication of her tendency to see the dialogue as a marked form. Brownlie (2003, p. 120) attributed this division between the statement and the actual practice partially to “the status of the statements as expressing ideals which are unlikely to be attained in an absolute manner in practice and given the practical conditions in which
translations are undertaken”. In other words, translators might tend to be idealistic in the way they talk about their practices.

Gentzler (2002, p. 216) states that translators are more conscious of the world view and how that may affect the translation, as well as how their work is used to recreate the exotic and the ideological significance of that. Through the variation in both the applied procedures and the process of the translation, both translators are somehow positioning themselves in a way that might serve their own ideology and their views about the translation. For example, Booth seems conscious of her role as a feminist translator; this is seen in the way that the text undergoes change under her scrutiny, falling into alignment with her own beliefs about feminist translation, specifically her attempt of making the gender markers visible in the translation. At the same time, the way she was careful about approaching the translation and not making extensive changes (in order to be, as she described, close to the text) shows her cautious approach to authors’ writing styles. Conversely, Calderbank showed different approach to the text; he takes the liberty of changing the mode of narrative, titles, ambiguous pronouns, and dialogues. This might confirm his attitude towards or his opinion on the role of literary translators, as he stated in a previous interview with Büchler et al. (2011), that they should be creative and confident when making translation decisions.

Interestingly, the changes in stylistic choices over time (as seen in Calderbank’s act of either changing “ya-” to just “ya” in the text or in Booth’s act of changing italics for the borrowed words in translations, as she stated) shows that translators do change their own preferences over time. This may be due to stylistic choices, or it may be a result of the translator’s awareness of the power conflict between the two languages involved in the process. Tracking their style by analysing a few novels would help (but not necessarily guarantee) the continuity of the idea regarding their own style, as translators shift their
perspective over time, just as authors or readers do. Talking to the translator, however, would help to understand the motives behind their decisions.

7.2.2 Textuality

7.2.2.1 Language resources/limitations

According to the descriptive analysis conducted in Chapters Five and Six, it can be seen that the translators’ approach reflecting LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels in TT was by translating it into informal conversational style in English. The interviews confirmed partially the analysis as both translators agreed that they did not consider the option of translating the Arabic dialect into English dialect, as this may confuse the TT readers. In addition, using an English dialect in an Arabic context potentially may raise questions regarding cultural and contextual appropriacy. Looking to the TT as a TL text produced for a TC audience, it could be said that the linguistic resources available for translators in the TL limit translators’ choices. What they did, therefore, was to use the available linguistic options to apply a mixture of procedures to recreate the conversational function and style of the LDD. The style applied in the TT matched the markedness of the ST, but it differs in terms of regionalism.

As discussed in Chapter Three in relation to the formality continuum (Trudgill, 2000), it can be seen that the situational switching in the diglossic ST novels between different dialects has been altered with the changing of the language community, where the stylistic switching in the TT occurs between marked and unmarked writing within the same variety and is not regionally specific. So it seems that the translator has used style and register rather than structure in translating LDD. Due to the changes of the language community, it could be finally confirmed that the LDD in the data has been changed in the translation to become LID (literary informal dialogue).
Looking again now to the modification to the narratological representation that I proposed, it could be seen that characters’ LDD in the ST have been rewritten in the translation and the characters’ dialogue switched to become LID in both data analysis stages. The descriptive analysis shows that the mix of compensation procedures to translate LDD in the translations have altered the character LDD in the novel and homogenised the different dialects that occur either across the whole corpus (i.e. different Saudi and Egyptian dialects) or within the same novel (e.g. central Najdi and Yemeni or Kuwaiti). The different identities that the multiglossic switching play in the characters’ speech have to some extent become fluid and does not quite reflect the switching. In the bigger picture, the authors’ heterolingual manipulation has not been fully reflected in the translations. Lastly, the use of the standard set of procedures to deal with different dialects does not show the contrast between the literary systems in the two countries of Saudi Arabia and Egypt, nor the contrast in the status of dialect in both countries as was assumed in the beginning of the research. These novels are already challenged in the source context as discussed before. The ST authors made a statement to draw attention to the linguistic diversity in the community that is usually challenged by the dominant variety. These decisions might also be loaded with socio-political and ideological reasons and are therefore not purely stylistic choices.

It is absolutely challenging to translate LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels into English due to the language and literary limitations in the TT. However, it could be stated here that at the micro-level, and when the translators have the possible means such as introductions, they have not fully referred to the name and nature of the certain dialects in the text. Also, when there are different dialects within the text they are most of the time not highlighted that by, for example, adding a sentence or explanation that signals that there is a switching or a different dialect in the novel.
There is undoubtedly difficulty when recreating the sociolinguistic dialects of the ST; loss, in this case, is unavoidable. This confirms Määttä’s (2004) suggestion that a potential solution used by translators, as the descriptive analysis and interviews show, is to focus on the authors’ intentions regarding dialect representations as a whole. This is achieved partially through LID, rather than by focusing on the translation of each dialectal word. However, it is noticed that idiolects are affected in the process, especially when characters are using code switching to position themselves in the context. Translators need to study each individual character’s linguistic choices in the process in detail. In other words, before treating the whole novel dialogue as an LID, studying the motivation behind the individual dialogues is recommended to determine what the character’s linguistic choices represent.

7.2.3 Translators’ norms

7.2.3.1 Social and literary norms

Both translators have shown an understanding of the individuality of author, narrator and characters’ voices and the heteroglossia situation in the novels (Bakhtin, 1981). They acknowledge the need to recreate these voices in the translation to something that helps the characters have an English voice. Literary norms and the poetics (Lefevere, 1992b) of English have restricted the way they translated the LDD into English, as both Calderbank and Booth reflected that before and when translating they were considering the TL novel as measuring criteria. They also reflected on the need to have a style that TT readers are accustomed to so as to secure the readability and the accessibility of the novels. However, their borrowing procedures that were accompanied by either a glossary or an explanation were considered to be procedures that still indicate that the novels are in fact translations.
As stressed in multiple places the findings from the descriptive analysis in Chapters Five and Six show that there is evidence of all translators following preferred patterns i.e. LID to replace LDD in the translations. Moreover, none of them used existing TT dialects to replace ST dialects. Furthermore, translators rely little or not at all on using footnotes, which indicates that this is the least-preferred paratextual procedure among the group of translators in the study.

These regularities across the behaviour of all the translators and translations could indicate evidence of translational norms (Toury, 1995) that relate to the act of translating Saudi and Egyptian LDD novels, which would lead to arguments that translators are manifesting certain norms (Chesterman, 2017). A textual analysis is not sufficient to confirm this; all the translators of all the texts should be interviewed to talk about their preferences, as, while regularities are important conditions when establishing norms, they are not enough by themselves (Chesterman, 2017). However, based on the textual regularities, translational norms (Toury, 1995) could be proposed as a hypothetical explanation for the whole group’s behaviour. This hypothesis could be tested later by triangulating the data; this is what has been done partially here but on a smaller scale, using sources of data, textual analysis and interviews, to investigate norms (Brownlie, 2002; Toury, 1995).

Therefore, it could be argued at the end of the discussion that regularities of behaviour were controlling the macro level of the translations, whereas, on the micro level, both translators enjoy the freedom of making choices that reflect a certain style used by them.
7.2.4 Target culture field

7.2.4.1 Publishing house requirements

Linking to the discussion about Lefevere’s (1992b) ‘the outside regulatory forces’, it can be seen that it is represented here by the publisher and editor, whose influence has varied in each translator’s case. Contrary to relying on the idea of the influence and control of patrons (Lefevere, 1992b) and in terms of translating LDD, publishers in most of the cases did not impose a certain requirement on translators. The translation procedures were chosen by the translators themselves, as both translators stated that, in terms of the language of the text, the publisher and editor did not require any specific style except editorial ones. There were some interventions in the translator’s style regarding the presentation of novels and paratext such as titles in Calderbank’s works and the way the paratextual procedures were presented in the English translation such as in Booth’s works. However, both translators had negotiated and resisted in ways that show their individuality in the process. The interview analysis showed that they insisted, especially in the case of Booth, on specific stylistic choices and managed to show these choices in their translation, although sometimes with the publisher’s initial disapproval. The relationship shows an element of negotiation between publishing houses and translators.

Another element that was raised from the discussion with the translators is the status of the publishing house itself. It seems that commercial publishing houses, represented in this study by Penguin Random House, have more interest in involving themselves in the translator’s role than do academic publishers, represented here by AUC. It could be argued here and from an observation of the two publishing houses that the academic publishers are more concerned to promote Arabic literature from different countries to English readers with the mission to expose Arabic novels and authors to a larger audience. In the case of the commercial publishers, however, and especially in Booth’s case with Alsanea and the in
Calderbank case changing of the title of *Fikhākh al-Ｒā‘iha* to bring out exotic themes such as wolves and crescents, there is more concern with marketing Arabic novels as exotic literature and revives certain images that brought up in previous historical writing and poems such as *One Thousends and One Night*.

### 7.2.4.2 Readers’ expectations

Significantly, the interviews with the translators clarify the importance attributed to readers’ preferences and how that guides the translation process. Drawing on Nord (2002) and the concept of translators’ loyalty and the function of TT, it seems that Calderbank and Booth, are translating with the purpose of introducing Arabic literature to English readers. The TT implied readers (Schiavi, 1996) have played a crucial role in rewriting the ST to fit these readers’ expectations regarding what a literary novel should look like in English. Both translators have insisted on recreating the LDD in a way that TT readers are already accustomed to. Translators said that translating ST dialect to TT dialect will not appeal to the readers. So, the purpose of creating LID styles in the translations was to guarantee the accessibility and readability of the text to TT readers. The borrowing of words from the ST was driven also by the purpose of introducing the TT readers to the Arabic language at the same time as making them realise that the text is a translation. Thus, it seems that the translation has been motivated by a number of reasons that mostly attributed to the implied target readers’ expectations of the texts.

Specifically, this occurs through the use of the explication by both translators that was motivated by the need to give more information to the target readers and designed according to their expectation of the text. In other words, as Saldanha (2008) argues, explication should be considered within audience design where it is not necessary to explicate the implicit information but it is motivated by audience expectation. She argues
that explication is “a translation strategy whereby translators spell out optional interpersonal, ideational or textual meanings in the target text” (Saldanha, 2008, p.32).

Lastly, a quick check of the readers’ feedback in website that sells the work of the translator such as Goodreads and Amazon indicates that readers become more aware of the presence of the translators through the paratextual procedures (Hermans, 1996). In particular, this was the case in relation to borrowing accompanied by a glossary, which the feedback suggests is still something preferred by general readers. The quick check shows also that an introduction helps readers of the TT understand the linguistic nuances and cultural information. Contrary to the discussion concerning the translator’s input about introductions, some readers show interest in reading the introduction and found it a useful procedure. The changes undertaken to retranslate Girls of Riyadh affected some readers’ understanding of the text. The analysis reveals dynamically different reader preferences when approaching the TTs. This, however, is limited and should be expanded to investigate the readers’ reception of the texts in a proper manner.

7.2.5 Author’s input

In most cases where the two translators approached authors it seemed that it contributed positively to the translators’ understanding of the ST. The collaboration between authors and translators could help in the translation of the TT if the boundaries of the translator were respected. Collaboration also makes it easier for translators to understand authors’ “communicative intentions” (Nord, 2002) and work to align them with expectations of the TT readers.

However, another aspect that should be considered is the access of the author to the language of the translation and how authorial intervention affects the translator’s style. The argument that an author’s access to the language of translation might help to retain the
original style is not necessarily valid. The two cases of authorial intervention in Booth’s translations were not to retain the style of their ST, but rather to control how their image and text would look in the translation. In Rajaa Alsanea’s case, she did have access to the translation language, but she reflected in her introduction to the novel that she wanted her translation to show the “western readers” (as she refers to them) that Saudis are similar to them. This might situate it in what al-Ghadeer (2017, p. 407) has described as “internalized orientalising discourse” or what Edward Said’s (1978) describe it as the participation “[of the modern Orient] in its own Orientalizing” (p. 325). Alsanea was trying in her introduction to explain to the readers of the translation that a number of stereotypes about Saudis are not correct. However, in the translation she projected this stereotype onto the readers by weighing down the text with unnecessary stereotypical information.

Ramadan, on the other hand, wanted to create a different book from the Arabic original. So the changes were not justified by what was in the ST, but by what the author thought the book should be like in English. As explained previously, this may have been because Ramadan felt more freedom to express herself in English than in Arabic. That could be an interesting aspect of the space that the language offers to the author. However, her intervention and that of Alsanea have consequently affected Booth’s stylistic approach.

Authors’ suggestions in general helped the translators to understand the ST, yet there were still some excessive and unjustified interventions from authors which shows that this intervention does not work in the favour of the translator’s style and can cross her/his boundaries. It seems here that some authors might take advantage of their absence in the text, taking it to mean that they do not need to worry about the consequence of changing. Authors hide behind the translators of TTs; if something occurs in the translation, it will mostly be attributed to the linguistic incompetence of the translators, who did not manage to accurately reflect the ST.
Interestingly, from the discussion with Booth, other two aspects emerge that are worth exploring. The first aspect is the nature of the relationship between translator and author; how the former judges the latter’s intervention and how the author’s status affects the translator’s judgement. Booth mentioned in the interview that Ramadan is an almost-native speaker of English, as well as being a friend and a literary translator. The natives in the language and the status of the author, either professional or personal, influence the translator and somehow might make them think that this intervention is justified. Specifically, Booth did not resist Ramadan’s changes as much as she did Alsanea’s.

The second aspect to be considered is the intervention and conflict that has occurred between Booth and her authors. Booth confirms in her interview that conflict with authors or intervention has occurred three times; two mentioned in the research data and one mentioned in the interview related to the work of Nawal El Saadawi. The question was why Booth ignored the other two cases, focusing mostly on the Alsanea case, about which she wrote two articles. It seems that there was no difference between the case of El Saadawi and that of Alsanea, in fact (the former seems worse because the translation was published without her name). Does dealing with a star author or friend play a role in accepting the changes without much controversy about what happened in the process? Does the star author also influence the translator in a way that means they do not speak up about the conflict behind the scenes? Indeed, a study on style that focuses on those author–translator relationships where conflict is present is needed.

7.3 Conclusion

This chapter presented the explanatory side of the data analysis. In the first section, both translators reflected on their translation style in general, and how they look at the concept of visibility and co-authoring. Then the discussion moved to elaborate on topics such as the
translator’s relationship with ST authors, translating LDD, paratextual procedures, role of publishing houses and editors, quality and prize culture in Arab region and finally the theories and practice in translation. The discussion moved in the second part of the chapter to give a thorough discussion of sources of explanations for the translation of LDD phenomena in Egyptian and Saudi novels.
Chapter Eight

Final conclusion

This research has aimed to identify the procedures that have been carried out by translators in dealing with the translation of LDD. It has also explored if different translators have a particular style or preferred procedures when translating LDD by focusing on the work of Calderbank and Booth. In this final chapter I will first summarise the findings and implications of this thesis by answering the research questions that were proposed in the first chapters. Then I will evaluate and discuss the limitations of the methodology. In the final section I will suggest topics for further research.

8.1. Summary of findings and implications

In this thesis, I first shed light at the beginning of Chapter Two on the interdisciplinary approach to the concept of dialect across the three disciplines of sociolinguistics, literature and translation studies. The sociolinguistic outline shows that language variations do not start and stop at a certain point, but rather that they move along a continuum horizontally and vertically. There are social, cultural, and political factors that should be considered when trying to understand the language varieties in a community. In the second part of Chapter Two I focused on the definition of LDD and the possible function of LDD in writing a novel, by drawing attention to the fact that LDD is a signifier of a spoken regional or social variety, probably in the author’s community, and that it is not by any means an attempt to transliterate the spoken dialect.
The sections on translation at the end of Chapter Two focus on dialect from the point of view of translation, and how the previous studies discussed it in literary translation studies. I discussed general approaches to translating literary dialect and concluded with a short summary of some of the common procedures that have been suggested by translation scholars. Then I tried to conceptualise how the translator’s style has been approached by discussing the works that have been written on translator’s style and voice in translation studies. I was mainly interested in tracing the narratological representation of the narrative process model that was first proposed by Schiavi (1996). Following on this narratological representation of the narrative process proposed by Schiavi (1996) and then modified by Munday (2008a), I suggested a modification that separates narrative from characters and which could help in the analysis of LDD in the novels and in the translations and to be of use in text that exhibit a diglossic/multiglossic nature.

Chapter Three provided the background for understanding the linguistic issues and novels that are the focus of the thesis. The sociolinguistic analyses of the formality continuum in English and the diglossic/multiglossic switching in Arabic have shown the effect of institutions on how people consume the language variations in these communities. In my discussion of the linguistic tradition in Arabic and the phenomenon of diglossic switching, I analysed the pretexts that have been used to promote classical Arabic and MSA as a pure form of language, and I responded to them by considering ibn Ḥāzm’s reflection on the Arabic languages, Ibn Kathir’s interpretation and Al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya. In the contemporary setting I have analysed the socio-political dimension of attitudes towards language variations in the Arab region, and how the situation has improved in recent years in terms of using dialect as a written medium. This semi-relaxing of attitude is attributed to the expansion of the usage of technology and specifically to the creation of social media platforms. The reason for this detailed discussion was not to criticise the use of MSA, but to
criticise the limited or sometimes lack of options for individuals to express themselves in the linguistic means that they prefer, especially in creative writing. In the Arab region there have been great steps in recent decades to allow more space for creative work written in dialects. This analysis is more an addition to the discussion regarding the available linguistic choices in order to allow more space for multiple and diverse contributors to knowledge production.

In the second part of this chapter I presented some background discussion on the history of the novel in the Arabic region and the use of dialect in the region’s novels. I discussed the debate about using LDD in the English and Arabic contexts. Then I narrowed the focus to talk specifically about Saudi Arabian and Egyptian LDD novels. This part has highlighted the increasing production of dialect novels and a progression towards accepting dialect as a writing medium, especially in the Saudi context; this has been attributed to the technologies and social media platforms.

Chapter Four focused on presenting the methodology and the data of the research. In the first part of this chapter I presented the methodologies that I used to analyse the data. On the macro level, a descriptive-explanatory approach was used as the general approach to analyse the data, whereas on the micro level I used textual comparison and interviews with translators. Using this combination of methods in studying the translator’s style gave a depth to the study and guided the thesis to create hypotheses for explanations of why these individual translators have used certain procedures.

In the second section I presented the data where first I presented the rationale of choosing these LDD novels. Drawing on the analysis of ST, I talked about what I call the authors’ ‘heterolingual manipulation’, which refers to how authors position themselves in a middle ground where they comply with institutional impositions by writing the narrative in MSA, but at the same time try to create their own identity outside these institutional linguistic
norms by writing their dialogue in dialects. In the end of the chapter, I presented the data that will be the focus of the research.

In Chapter Five with the help of quantitative and qualitative descriptive analysis I mapped the translation procedures used by the translators to deal with LDD in a corpus of Saudi and Egyptian novels. This chapter showed that none of the translators in the examined data used TT dialect to translate LDD in ST. Moreover, translators opted for a variety of procedures to compensate for the dialect in ST. There were no distinctions in the applied procedures in terms of whether the ST dialect is one of the Saudi or Egyptian dialects.

Chapters Six is a comparative descriptive chapter dedicated to the analysis of the stylistic choices of the two translators, Anthony Calderbank and Marilyn Booth. The descriptive analysis in this chapter showed that at the macro level both translators used similar patterns to the ones that discussed in Chapter Five, that is, they used a variety of procedures to translate LDD and did not translate the ST dialect to a TT dialect. However, in the micro analysis of the translations, differences in the stylistic choices emerged in the way the two translators deal with borrowing and paratextual procedures.

Chapter Seven was the explanatory part of the research where I analysed the translator interviews and tried to establish the relationship between the findings of the descriptive analysis and the translators’ input. The interviews showed the many complex layers of the process and the negotiations the translators have gone through to produce the translations. The interviews have given extra depth to the analysis, which would not have been possible if the study just applied a textual analysis; for example, it enabled consideration of the translator-implied readers’ relationship, translator-author relationship and translator-editor relationship. Most importantly, it showed how the author’s input could be also used as a source of explanation to the translational phenomena.
At the end of Chapter Seven, and based on the descriptive analysis chapters and translators’ interviews, I provided sources of explanation for the translation of LDD in the Egyptian and Saudi novels. In the following part I will rephrase these sources of explanation to answer the research questions that I stated in the first chapter. The questions were:

1. What are the procedures that translators have employed to translate LDD in the corpus? Are there frequent procedures that translators have applied more than others?

It could be concluded from the quantitative and qualitative analysis conducted in this study that regularities of behaviour exist across the translators’ works in the study. The translators in this study used a variety of procedures to translate LDD. These procedures, which appeared in the descriptive analysis, are as follows: using a marked writing style, standardisation, substitution, borrowing, paraphrasing, literal translation, omission, addition, explication, adaptation, peritextual interventions (introduction, glossary, footnotes), and speech and sound representation. The LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels was replaced by an informal writing style in English (LID). The data also reveals that, in practice, none of the translators rendered the source dialect into a target dialect, nor was the dialect generally standardised and naturalised in the translation. It was recognised that there were conversational aspects of the dialects that, through a mix of procedures, were reproduced and compensated in the translation. The quantitative analysis at both stages indicated that there are procedures that are more frequent than others that appear in almost all of the novels. These most frequent procedures are using a marked writing style, standardisation, substitution, borrowing, and paraphrasing. The quantitative analysis also showed that, in the two analysis stages, footnote was the least frequent peritextual interventions that have been applied by translators.
It is assumed that the rewriting of the LDD in the TT is influenced by the poetics and the universe of discourse of the TT (Lefevere, 1992b). Specifically, the language and literary constraints of the TT presented translators with limitations.

2. Do different translators have a particular style or preferred procedures in translating dialect?

The study shows that both translators were following the previous regularities of behaviour showed at the first stage of analysis. The examination of TT characters’ category that has been added to the narratological representation model showed that both translators translate LDD into LID in their novels. This is manifested through the use of a mix of procedures to create the conversational element of LDD in the translation. However, an in-depth analysis of the characters’ LDD in the works of Calderbank and Booth showed the emergence of individual stylistic preferences when dealing with translating LDD and the text in general. Both translators consciously use explication in the TT to explain the implicit information in the ST in a way that redirects the text towards their TT readers. Their styles diverge in relation to the borrowing procedure, including their explanation of the borrowed words and paratextual procedures. They claim agency over these two procedures and show some evidence of negotiation regarding publishing houses’ preference.

In Calderbank’s case, the most significant aspect of his constant style in the LDD translations is the retention of the vocative particle /ya/ in the texts and the presence of the glossary in most of the translations. His voice is manifested through his tendency to use syntactic simplification in his translation and to avoid a complex style even if it emerges from the ST. In Booth’s case, she showed significant use of borrowing procedures, since she chose to borrow words and give an immediate explanation in the context without relying on any form of paratext, such as footnotes or a glossary. Another indication of her consistent stylistic choices is her insistence on having an introduction or afterword accompanying her
translations. Her voice is manifested through the general informality and markedness of her texts, as well as in her feminist voice that cares about the small gendered details.

3. What are the effects of translators’ choice of procedures on LDD?
There is no doubt that LDD loses its sociocultural association in the process of translation, which is unavoidable loss. Due to the language and literary constraints in the TT, the whole process of writing the LDD in TT was a compensation procedure. Changing the communities has changed the dynamic of the dialect and, as stated previously, the LDD in the Saudi and Egyptian novels changed in the process to become a literary informal dialogue (LID). LID replicated the conversational style of LDD, however, at the same time as homogenising the characters’ speech in the dialogue. Translating LDD into LID has affected the representation of characters in the translation, for although it reflects their informality, it reduces their locality, especially when the translator has used the same procedures to translate different dialects across all texts. Moreover, little attention has been paid by translators to the idiolect of the character where diglossic switching is taking place. The motivation behind this switching was not fully considered in the TT.

4. What hypotheses can be offered to explain why translators adopt particular procedures?
In general, translators’ preferred patterns that emerged from the quantitative and qualitative descriptive textual analysis showed that there are regularities in the behaviour of the translators. Based on the textual regularities, the translational norms could be considered as a hypothetical explanation for the whole group’s behaviour. To confirm this hypothetical explanation, the corpus needs to be expanded and all the translators in the designed corpus should be interviewed, as suggested by Toury (1995) and Brownlie (2003). As shown in the in-depth studies and interviews with Calderbank and Booth, readers are the control factors of
what translator produce. The stylistic choices that are used by translators in their works to the considerations of implied readers’ expectations were central to the decision making. A broader focus on reader design studies in relation to LDD will help to test this hypothesis.

Regarding the translators’ style I believe that the study of the works of Calderbank and Booth has shown that differences in borrowing and paratextual procedures are ultimately the result of each translator’s individual style and conscious preferences.

8.2 Limitations and evaluation of the methodology

There were a number of constraints regulating the study of translators’ styles in relation to LDD; work still needs to be done on the methodological analysis of style. Possibly the main issue affecting this thesis is the lack of a well-established ST database that is related to written LDD, as this makes it difficult to compare the data against a large corpus. This is shown in the analysis of the data and the challenges faced when decoding the significance of the LDD in the novels. The challenges arose from the absence of diacritic markers in the STs, which sometimes made it difficult to decide if a word should be pronounced according to MSA or a dialect. To overcome this obstacle, I considered the character’s background and speech that took place around the sentence that I was analysing. Finding a large written database for LDD from novels or dialect in general would help to reduce the bias.

Another issue was related to the representativeness of the data. The selection of and the comparative data acquired by analysing the works of the two translators have been used to provide an understanding of both the regularities of behaviour and the translators’ styles. However, that does not guarantee representativeness, and the limited availability of the translations and the differences in the size of the corpora still means that there is a need for improvement. An element of subjectivity was inevitable in the layers of research, especially as relates to the classification of the categories. As a result, the findings of this research
should be treated as probabilistic and cannot be generalised. The detailed description of the mixed methods in the data analysis will hopefully open the door to further investigation and an alternative interpretation of the study of the style.

In relation to the conceptualising framework, the model that proposed to adapt a similar understanding to that of Munday (2008a), relating to style and voice helped to confirm a number of patterns that related to the translator, regardless of other variables such as ST author style and ST context. However, from the interview findings, it appears that there is still a lack of understanding of the different style preferences and voices that falls between the implied translators and the target readers that highlight the consequence of the decisions made by other players, such as the publisher, editor, and copy editor.

The comparison analysis of *Girls of Riyadh* in Chapters Five and Six, and the analysis of *Leaves of Narcissus* in Chapter Six, as well as what was said in the interviews, presented an interesting example of how textual analysis is not sufficient when studying the style of the translator. Textual analysis should be combined with other methods to obtain satisfactory and unbiased results. The mixed-methods textual analysis, used here in conjunction with interviews, helped to explore the multiple layers of the translation process. However, an interview with authors could have enhanced the analysis of the ST, providing a more in-depth analysis of the reasons behind LDD in the first place, as well as showing the other side of the author–translator relationship. Moreover, such an interview would have helped to understand the modifications that are proposed regarding the narratological representation in relation to ST characters.

### 8.3. Suggestions for further research

The present study has proposed translational norms as a hypothetical explanation for translators’ behaviour in translating LDD in Saudi and Egyptian novels. Further expansion of
the comparative study to cover the practice of translating LDD novels in other dialects in the
Arab region (for example, dialectal novels in other Gulf countries, Levant dialects and North
African dialects) might add interesting insights to the study. It might help to indicate whether
or not this is a translational norm for translating Arabic dialectical novels into English in
general.

The study has focused on the translation production from Arabic into English. It
would be really interesting to study the situation when a text is taken to a diglossic
community. For example, how would an English LDD novel, such as *Trainspotting*, be
translated into Arabic? The phenomena could also be studied from different angles to see
what the situation is when there are two diglossic communities involved in the process. For
example, it would be interesting to examine how Arabic LDD novels are translated into
another language, such as Spanish. What options would be proposed by translators in these
communities?

Another aspect that emerged from this study was the function of diglossic switching
in one character’s speech and the different identities or stances that the characters take in
each dialogue. Further expansion of this study could focus on mapping the character’s
dialogue across the entire novel to observe how the character uses multiglossic switching and
what triggers this switching. It could then be observed if these stances have been considered
in the translation and what options are available to translators to reflect these different stances
in the TT.

The relationship between translator and author, the author’s access to the TT
language, and how these issues affected the production of the TT has been one of the major
issues discussed in this study. In particular, the case of Ramadan and Booth has offered an
interesting case of the space the language offers to the author to develop or explore aspects in
the translation that remained hidden in the ST. This idea could be developed more in the self-
translation field, with an examination of how language expands or shrinks the space of freedom of expression, and an assessment of the ideological implications for authors in dealing with these languages.

A further expansion to the topic of authors could be to study the Arab authors’ attitudes, and specifically when their books have been translated into different languages. Research could explore how these authors see the role of the translators in taking their novels to different contexts. To what extent are they willing to collaborate with translators while at the same time respecting the boundaries of the translators? How do they see their authorship over the TT?

Lastly, two methodological suggestions. First is to use an approach inspired by forensic linguistics to study the style of the translators. Such a methodological approach could be designed in a way to not just cover the translation works by the translators but also to examine other written material that the translators have produced, such as articles or original books. The three criteria for forensic investigation, namely lexis, grammar and punctuation, could be used to create an authorship description for the translators which could give more in-depth understanding of a translator’s style from a linguistic point of view.

The second suggestion is to conduct a corpus methodology study based on a comparison of translations of LDD texts and monolingual literary texts in the TL. The aim would be to investigate the literary norms in the TL and to empirically determine whether there are any relationships between them. It would be helpful to track the frequencies of the features in each corpus to ascertain whether there are systematic differences between them.
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### Appendix 1
English Translations by Calderbank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source text title and date of publication</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Target text title and date of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## English Translations by Booth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source text title and date of publication</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Target text title and date of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<sup>13</sup> Published as co-translated work by Booth and the author Raja‘ al-Sani’
Appendix 2
Procedures Frequencies Chapter Five

Procedures Frequencies Chapter Six : Calderbank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arabic phonetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. Masha's bottle</td>
<td>45.192131</td>
<td>19.41473473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2. Gasoline Tracks</td>
<td>33.38472341</td>
<td>12.87905634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3. Wolves of the Crescent Moon</td>
<td>12.71986441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4. The Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5. Zaat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6. Adaptation</td>
<td>2.403846</td>
<td>17.47572816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7. Sans/literal translation</td>
<td>5.679196565</td>
<td>12.67905634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8. Addition</td>
<td>1.442308</td>
<td>5.82524718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9. change</td>
<td>1.442308</td>
<td>19.41473473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10. Narrative to dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11. Explanation</td>
<td>0.480795</td>
<td>0.97087738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12. Borrowing:grammar</td>
<td>0.480795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13. Generic term</td>
<td>0.480795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14. omission</td>
<td>0.480795</td>
<td>0.97087738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15. collocation</td>
<td>2.403846</td>
<td>17.47572816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16. Arabic phonetics</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Procedures Frequencies Chapter Six: Booth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>1. Leaves of Narcissus</th>
<th>2. Thieves in Retirement</th>
<th>3. The Open Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Using marked form</td>
<td>39.9626413</td>
<td>40.1511515</td>
<td>58.0096525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Standardization</td>
<td>4.71068132</td>
<td>5.8790296</td>
<td>5.6790296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Substitution</td>
<td>2.43018679</td>
<td>18.39393394</td>
<td>15.6268348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adaptation</td>
<td>0.944396226</td>
<td>4.564804845</td>
<td>0.419587212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Same/literal translation</td>
<td>12.26415094</td>
<td>3.787878788</td>
<td>3.773584906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Distinctive translation</td>
<td>2.535723727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. change the register</td>
<td>24.52830169</td>
<td>2.272272272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Borrowing from E and Arabic Phonetics</td>
<td>6.603775305</td>
<td>0.757575758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Elaboration</td>
<td>2.43018679</td>
<td>0.757575758</td>
<td>0.838574423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. omission</td>
<td>0.944396226</td>
<td>3.30030030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Borrowing from French</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All sentences for all novels: 715

Booth + Calderbank sentences: 1324
Appendix 3

Excerpts from Calderbank’s Interview

Time: First interview 07/12/2016 duration: 01:41:18 h

Second interview: 17/02/2017 duration: 01:08:26 h

E: Eman C: Calderbank

E: yeah the process when you choose a book, do you choose it based on themes or like

C: yeah yea good question, but you know for me, in most of the cases [it is] the books that have come to me

E: Ok

C: So for example, all the books that you talks about, the books by Miral and Sanallah, the Tent and Zaat, I translated those while I was working in the American University in Cairo and they were published by the American university in Cairo press, and you know so the university press the AUC press suggested those titles to me and I read the books, so for example, the first one I did was The Tent, it’s by Miral altahawy.. and because I was an Arabic speaker and could read Arabic the press asked me to read the novel and weather I thought it would be worth translating, weather I thought the novel would be a good novel to translate. So when I read it I said yes I think it’s a good novel to translate and I’d like to translate it myself. So they let me translate it. and then after I translated The Tent then they would give me novels from time to time to translate. So, that’s how I translated Zaat

E: so do they try to change it according for example, like for American University Press change it to American English, does it work like that?

C: if they want yeah.. in most cases doesn’t really matter ... because the language normally used is not really English or American, is just regular English language, and in most cases because the novel is regarding the Arab culture, it rarely happened that there were any issues. I mean if it is been published by American press then obviously the spelling and all of these things will be done according to the American style and vice versa, if it’s an English press they will do it according to an English style. So you find most publishers have that kind of house style if you like. But for me I translated for AUC press sometimes penguin in New York did one of them with Yusuf for the ... فخاخ الرائحة ... what is the word they republished it .. so normally it is not an issue I find weather there English is American or British you know.
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E: but while you translating, do you consider like for example, you said that you translate for general readers, English readers, or..

C: because for me, it’s something that I quite like, it’s something that I find is.. It’s intellectually challenging and it’s good for me to read Arabic literature, and then I think it’s good also to offer English readers the opportunity to read Arabic literature in English, if they can’t read Arabic. So, You know, that’s quite simple reason to do it really, so when people read about a culture or a history you know you could read journalism and you can read the Arab world, you can read the history of the Arab world. But if you read literature, literature offers you a chance to understand the Arab culture in a deeper way than history of journalism it feel.. if you wish to do so. It’s like looking at the dreams of a person rather than just their daily activity. So what are the issues that interest people, how do the characters, behave, so through this we could learn quite a lot about the culture of this society. So, for example, when we read… we can read فخاخ الرائحة we can read القارورة it allows us an (inaudible), we can learn a bit about Saudi society, you see.

E: in Cairene Arabic yeah

C: it’s not a problem that for me, I find that if we look at an English novel, you know we can find some writers using a dialect, some writer are writing the dialogue in normal English and the reader when they read, you know they read the text, they read the narrative, they read the dialogue. Also when we take an Egyptian novel, it’s not possible to do an Egyptian dialect in English, because it’s in English it’s not in Arabic anymore. So all we need to think about is how we construct a dialogue in English that reflects the dialogue that the people are having in Arabic.. if you see what I mean.. it wouldn’t make sense for me to take a dialogue from Egyptian, from an Egyptian novel, a dialogue which is in Egyptian Arabic and write it out in a Lancashire or a Scottish English.. so you try.. you see what I mean ... I just feel ... what we can say is colloquial informal English.. Do you remember or do you pay attention when you look at Zaat, there is some dialogue between the guys in the office، الموظفين في المكتب، and the way that Sanallah writes the dialogue is I think he just says قال الموظف الأول، قال الثاني you can’t do that in English... so if you look at that dialogue you will see that I changed some of the framework of the dialogue.. so if we think Arabic you can say ‘He said’ dom dom ‘ He said, he said, he said,” it’s not easy , you can’t really said that easily in English, you see.

E: yeah, so you’re just make it according for example to the English narrative system, for example..

C: yeah, I’ve to do .. I have to write a text that the English reader will accept, if the English reader refuses to accept the text, it’s a wasted effort, isn’t it.

E: ...The paratextual procedure, I have noticed from all your translation there are kind of like inconsistency in paratexts application in your novels, ... most frequent one is the glossary, but sometimes you put an introduction and sometimes you do not...I just would like to know why? Why sometimes you put an introduction and why not?
C: right because the publisher ask for an introduction, if the introduction generally where for the ones by the American university in Cairo press, and the AUC press always ask for an introduction, and they always have translator’s introduction. So, that’s why I write an introduction for them. were I think the one for Penguin and may be the one from نقرات الظباء I did’t it can remember..

E: نقرات الظباء was by Garnet publisher.

C: yes Garnet so there was no introduction right.

E: but also Yusuf Alomhamied’s Munira’s Bottle there was no introduction, it’s published by AUC..

C: Ah well may be.. it might be a different addition just can you give me one minute [ he went to check the book] so the version I have here there is no introduction.. so I don’t know why that is, I can’t remember why that’s is but normally, the AUC asks for an introduction

E: so if it is up to you do you like to write an introduction or not

C: not really, I don’t think it’s necessary, you wouldn’t write an introduction generally speaking to a regular novel, would you just do the novel and the Arabic text doesn’t have an introduction, if it did we would translate it as the introduction. So, it’s a kind of style of the AUC press really.

E: Okay [for the one that have introductions], who control the content, do they ask you for a length or a certain kind of content for the introduction or it’s just up to you to put any information in [it]?

C: No, no … that’s up to me .. I think this a good question isn’t it, generally that would be up to me, so they say that could you do a translator’s introduction and then I would think about that , and I would do the introduction, maybe I don’t know what you feel, you can think about them as well, but are they all the introductions the same .. Are some of the introductions about the text .. I think when I introduced the الخباء.. maybe I said something about the Bedouin.. and how they got there? Why they are there? And things like that. So maybe the introductions are different from time to time.

E: You have used the glossary in most of .. it’s just missed from The Tent.. but in all other translations there were glossaries. Did you choose [to add] a glossary? Is it your choice? or again it’s just a publishing house.. ?

C: so right will so the originally when we begin doing this things . People used to put. You can either put a glossary or a footnote or something like that.. then you know if you put the glossary it doesn’t interrupt the page or anything like that .. Then you just have the word in the back and the reader can have a look at the words and see what they mean and look at the Arabic words and so on and so on.. so it gives the reader who wishes to do so an opportunity and if you use a glossary you can keep in some Arabic words you see.

E: yeah, so you do choose always to have a glossary in your translations

C: yeah it’s nice that I think, but it’s not necessary, however it depends weather you want or not. It’s ... an explanation of some things so if I look up at the glossary for Munira. It just means you can use the word Abaya all the time and you don’t have to use an English word. Because when we live in
Saudi Arabia everyone uses the word Abaya even the foreigners use the word Abaya. So it’s a word that is almost coming into English but it won’t be meaning anything for a British of course they have never been to Saudi Arabia… so rather than translate it, it’s better to use the Arabic word and then just keep .. just explain it in the glossary, you see.

E: Ok, so do you write your own glossary or someone write it, for example the editor

C: yeah I write it, I write the glossary

E: OK, because I did notice as you said about Abaya, for example you change the explanation from one [novel to the other].. I think Abaya also in one of Miral’s novels and you did change it slightly according to the culture of the text for example.. do you usually consider the novel [context] when you explain it .. or it’s kind of you have.. a list [of words] with explanation and you just add it?

C: So yes as you go through the novel, you start to think of the words which you want to keep. For me anyway this my idea.. I decide when I’m translating.. whether I’m going to keep the word in Arabic or translate it and I make that decision as I’m going through the Arabic.. So now I’m looking the Munira for example and I can see .. So let’s look at it, so when you got things like burka’ it looks like burka but its برقع السماح or you might have Hijab or you might have حجاب or you might have Jihad or you might have Majlis .. you see what I mean .. and some ways you keep those words, but in other words you can change them and translate them into English.. And it’s all about the idea whether you.. are you.. you must be thinking about this idea of ….. let me think about it .. people use different words don’t they, so there is a foreignization and domestication.. and this whole argument in Germany ( terms in German) and it’s about whether I want to contain or I want my translation to contain Arabic words or not and whether I want my translation to have an Arabic feel or not .. or to have a link to the Arabic culture or not. So I can do that and leave Arabic words in the translation or I can make an effort to put all the Arabic words into an English version.

E:.. let’s move now to the titles, because I’ve noticed in فخاخ الرائحة it was published as ‘wolves of the crescent moon’ by penguin 2007 C: yeah the titles. E: but then published by the American university in Cairo as ‘a lure of scent’ also القارورة was published as Munira’s bottle’, so why these changes in the title.. why you added Munira to the bottle, because it’s القارورة in Arabic..

C: … that’s a big argument... this is a long, long discussion with the publishers. So I translated it as ‘the bottle’ and I didn’t have a problem with the bottle and I thought that was fine for me ‘the bottle’ القارورة, and I think the publisher wanted to add munira’ Bottle because they felt apparently , and it’s not my feeling, but the word bottle kinda have an association with alcohol and drinking. Because in English we have an expression like ‘on the bottle’ ‘ of the bottle’ and so on so on, you know what I mean which refer to drinking, but for me I didn’t find that, because you see because I lived, I lived in Egypt for 15 years, I lived in Saudi Arabia for 11 years, so for me in many respects Eman, the Arabic language is completely normal, for me to hear, I don’t feel anything about this whole exotics business about something being exotics, for me it’s not exotic it just normal Arabic, so when I hear an Arabic word I don’t think oh that’s different or that’s unusual or.. I just think its normal like an English word, do you see what I mean. So for me when القارورة .. is a lovely word and of course it’s
also used, I mean it makes you think of women doesn’t it in Saudi. So you have this idea of رفقة القوارورة just like that, so for me I just thought the bottle is a nice word to use.. sometimes with the title you have a long discussion with the publisher about the title..

E: why you didn’t transliterate it for example as ‘al Qaroura’ and explain it for example?

C: No, because that wouldn’t have as been successful, wouldn’t it be possible. That the person would have to know what is the explanation was. Any reader in Saudi Arabia when they see the word القوارورة they know it’s a bottle don’t they. So, then an English reader in a way you want them to know the same for the title..

E: what about فخاخ الرائحة

C: that was really interesting, fantastic, so فخاخ الرائحة, so we tried, I tried so many ways to translate that expression ‘ the lure of the scent’ ‘trapped in smell’ ‘the scent trap’ many many different ways to say it, but none of it explains it, none of it works in English..

E: so why ‘wolves of the crescent moon’ .. because فخاخ الرائحة explains part of the story about عم توفيق when he ...

C: it does, it does indeed . so the reader .. the whole point of the title in Arabic is that each of those guys in the story.. have experience with الرائحة and scent and is that.. you know it brings them to their destruction or nemesis or whatever it’s, so it’s quite important. However, it just doesn’t work, we couldn’t find a way to express it in English phrase that was working well, the publishers weren’t comfortable with it at all. So, we have to think of other things, now another good.. Something that appears in the book is of course is the wolf and the wolf appears many times, right! And so the wolf has a significant role in the novel and also is you think about Arabic literature and specially I’m thinking about pre-Islamic poetry امرؤ القيس things like that, so the wolf is a nice and an important character there. So when we couldn’t have anything about smell or scent .. scent in English tends to mean a perfume ….  

E: but I mean like it’s a different than the original, because scent in the original was different things like الشواء and فخ the trap

C: exactly, it’s the smell of the meat, isn’t it.. the cooking and things like that. So it just didn’t work but.. then we look for other themes in the novel, so the wolves is very nice because it was in the novel and there is also the moon.. and the wolves of the crescent moon has a nice rhythm in English, nice ring so we choose it out of various possibilities.

E: did you also ask the author when you try to translate the title into English? ..

C: yeah, yeah, I remembered we talked about it with Yusuf for a long time, and there was a French translation right... and I don't know if he told you this but the one.. the French translation was called ( title in French) and I can’t pronounce it very well, it means بعيد عن هذا الجحيم

E: also it’s a different title

C: so the French one was different, because they also have trouble with فخاخ الرائحة
E: OK..

C: and Zaat, you know Zaat right, (E: yeah), so one of the problem with Zaat is the pronunciation of the name, so I wrote.. did I wrote about it ..

E: yeah you did explain it in the introduction in the beginning ..

C: So, one of the problem is that vowel, that long vowel alaf is ‘a’ we don’t have that vowel in English, we don’t say that in English, there’s no English word which contains that sound.. right

C: Egyptians pronounce Zaat, that’s how Egyptians pronounce it as ‘Z’... so they can say it 

E: only if they study Quran or ترتيل or something like that, but most Egyptian would say Zaat right.. it’s there natural pron.. so they would say زهده and زهب and things like that..

...so this name.. so how you could you pronounce it. How could you write the name? we had a big discussion about how to spell her name? it comes through I think .. is it Zaat double aa T .. so we have to use double ‘a’ . I wanted to use an ‘e’ with two dots after it (e:)

E: is it for the title?

C: yes ‘Ze:t ‘ because it’s like ‘?’ but it’s long ‘؟’ so it’s ‘aa’ do you see. But they didn’t like that, they say this a bit unorthodox and it was not possible.

...........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

E: so you use kinda of colloquial or informal style in English

C: yeah yeah that’s right, yeah I know I do that

E: Is it that procedure to reflect the dialect rather than just using another dialect for it ..

C: no that’s right. One of.. but you know I’m not necessary doing this in any kind of .. it’s quite instinctive if I may say or spontaneous .. there’s a dialogue when I was reading Zaat in Arabic , one of the things I liked about the novel was its explain Egypt. Zaat explain the history of modern Egypt and because of Sanallah his graet sympathy for the people of Egypt the character of Zaat explains the story of a women but also she represents Egypt that in a way we see how much the Egyptian people have been treated in the last 30 years.... So what we have to say is we had to translate.. I had to translate the novel in this way. So for me I was.. I could hear they speaking I know what she’s saying , I know what Abdulalmagid is saying, so all I want is to put that in nice simple, especially the dialogue. I want to translate the dialogue like ordinary people speak ..

...........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

E: ... I have noticed from the borrowing procedure that you usually or in all of the novels, that you have borrowed the vocative particle ‘Ya’ so is this kind of a fingerprint you leave in the..

C: do I do that in everyone, or not. I made a conscious effort to do that (E: I found it in the all translation ) C: in ..

E: I found it in the all translations
C: are you sure, I mean even in Zaat

E: yeah, it was I think in Zaat, let me check zaat ... yeah I think you leave it in Zaat it’s even in the glossary you wrote it ( C: in Zaat) E: yeah

C: yeah ok yeah I know I like that

E: so what is the reason behind that, it’s kind of conscious as you said, is it kind of leaving your fingerprint in the translation.. yeah it’s in Zaat .. I’ll read the example for you :

إلا أنني ياستي من غير عربية يا شدي حيلك

and you did translate it into ‘ only you without a car now ya sitti’ so ‘ Ya Sitti’

C: oh, that’s the amid isn’t it

E:... no.. I think he was saying this to Zaat

C: yeah, the that’s right, and did I keep ‘ Ya Sitti’ in English .... Yeah, yeah.. and because that’s right. And that’s quite nice isn’t it.. and that’s how the speaking. So now I may say that I remember keep.. when I translated I wanted to keep a sniff or a smell or a sense of the Arabic .. so I made a conscious effort to keep ‘ya’ and we talked about it and the editor and the publisher both of them thought that’s good and we kept it and I think kept it... might have been at that time in the 90s and the AUC various people doing various things. We was in the mood of keeping those things, ideologically maybe.. I don’t know, but it was good I felt I wanted to bring some elements of the Arabic into the English

C: yeah but I don’t.. I didn’t do it consciously as my own fingerprints on the novel.. I did it thinking maybe it’s part of my techniques with thinking that I wanted some elements of the Arabic into the English because it’s not difficult to understand what it means.. it’s not difficult to say it, it’s not difficult to pronounce it or anything like that.. and it’s very very common in the Arabic.... So it allows the English person to somehow learn a little bit about the Arabic..

E: yeah: that’s bring me to another question.. when you look to the character do you humanise them ? or you just see them within the text ?

C: well really the process of the translation is more of the linguistic process, so mainly I’m interested in taking the Arabic and turning it into English... that’s the job, that’s the style or the grip .. not so much literary criticism if you know what I mean... if I like the novel, for me if I like the novel and I accepted to translate it then that’s enough after that I have to then to bring it into an English version , I don’t kind of philosophise too much about it ...

C:well

I think this interesting, so for me you see, I’ve been reasonably looking, I’ve been able to translate. And it’s one of the reasons why I did it is you know translating literature from the countries in which I was living and I can totally, and I even have done things like you know.. you know something from
Yemen some small things and some.. but I have been to Yemen so I know what it’s like.. I have been to gulf countries and I know what it’s like, so I think it’s, it’s, it helps me.. I can’t imagine what it would be like to translate from some kind a language or a context which I didn’t fully understand for me I’ve been in the Arab world and translating the literature or the country where people

E: Borrowing procedure?

C: if I’m translating a text about Saudi context I want to have some sense of Saudi there. And the other thing we could do as to make the English readers use the word Abaya or read it or know about it or understand it .. it’s not a problem

E: talking about the visibility of the translator , do you think translator need to show their visibility in their own translation?

C: how?

E: like for example as you did using paratext introduction, borrowing for example inside the text

C: well I would use a glossary in a way more because it is nice for the reader to understand the word not because I want the reader to know that I translated it..

E: ok so it just because..

C: I’m happy no introduction you know we discuss this idea of the introduction before .. I may be more interested in the introduction when I started but now I’m not as .. it doesn’t matter as much to me .. to have an introduction.. I don’t see that you need to have an introduction .. in fact the idea is .. there is nobody need to know about the translator .. if people read the novel or the story in English and enjoy it.. and think wow that’s fantastic story .. That’s good translation isn’t it .. you don’t think about the translator at all.

E: so you don’t think of a translator as a co-author

C: not really.. it’s ok for the translator to be completely invisible, isn’t it .. like I said I just read Dostoevsky’s novel of the .. I mean in fact that there is a translator’s introduction and he talks about it and I think he’s married to a Russian and may be collaborating together  but for me .. as a reader I’m not interested really (E: ok) C: and I just read Márquez the One Hundred Years of Solitude and there were no mention of the translator at all .. and I just read the novel ...

E: I would like to ask you about the dialect itself in the novel .. I have noticed that you sometimes you did homogenised .. or you that dialect in translation.. you didn’t make that much distinction .. so you use the same procedures when you translate Zaat and when you translate for example the Egyptian Cairene in Zaat and Najdi in Saudi in Munira and also within the same text for example in Munira there where Najdi Kuwaiti Yamin Jiddawy dialects but you used the same procedures..
C: so .. how .. give me an example of a Yemeni word of Munira ... so it’s properly two or three words isn’t it (E: I give the example) C: ok ok so it’s a kind of .. There’s no way for me to indicate.. the only way we could do is through .. that’s man sounds like a Yemeni to you doesn’t he .. and he’s a Yemini no in the translation in the novel isn’t not clear that he’s a Yemeni .. (E: it was clear he’s a Yemeni from the dialect ) C: he’s like a shop seller or the .. so we know he’s Yemeni .. now I’m not going to be .. because Yemen is not speaking English.. you can’t have a Yemeni dialect in English can you .. it can’t be done.. what can be done.. I don’t think you can give him a Newcastle or Scottish or Irish it doesn’t work all you can say is the Yemeni guys said xyz

E: but even in the translation it says alyamani so it wasn’t sure if that his family name or nationality or language

C: there’s not a lot can be done about it .. I don’t think it’s a good idea to get a Yemeni shopkeeper in Riyadh using the Scottish accent.. the only way you can explain it.. is to say .. the guy speaks with a very strong Yemeni accent or he speak Yamani accent .. or he using Yamani swear words n.. that’s is the only way I think

E: what about the two dialects between for example Zaat and Munira like there is a Najdi dialect here and there is for example Cairene dialect .. They are two different in the whole text .. but you use the same procedures

C: Same.. There are some nice dialogue in Zaat and they are funny and evocative of Cairo and there were is very nice Cairene .. so I know these guys in the ministry speaking but I can’t .. The English readers can’t.. You can’t distinguish all you can do is translate it as a nice dialogue ..

E: so you are more in focusing on the feature of dialect .. like why the author use the dialect ..

C: yeah and I’ll try to make it sound like a spoken conversation .. I’ll try to make it be .. it’s a conversation it’s not formal it’s colloquial its informal whatever .. so I’ll do it like that .. but I can’t reproduce the dialect of Cairo or Yemen in English .. The reader doesn’t know that anyway.
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E: Eman                                            M: Marilyn

M: so do you want me to say this again ...

E: yeah that Somaya..

M: so som.. so the translation of Somaya Ramadn’s novel was completely different than the experience with Raja Alsana.. mm Somaya you know, she, First of all she’s would answer questions during the process and she was .. she’s very ..I mean she’s .. we are actually good friends but sometimes that could be a problem you know.... but anyway mm and Somaya herself has done a lot of literary translation.. She understand I think . she has an understanding of what it involves, and she is very respectful about it and everything. So, she would answers questions and at the end when I sent her the translation, mm she.. she was very complementary, she said it really ... was excellent the editor also really liked it, you know and it was very, she was very happy with it as an artistic rendering of her novel. However, she felt uncomfortable with it as an author because she felt, as somebody who is.. Somaya is truly bilingual, I mean she, English is as almost like a native language for her, and so ..as a writer.. because she spent so much time in the UK and Ireland also, so she’s kind of bicultural in a way, and so she felt that the work in English is just needed to be a different book, mm and so we talked at length about that and I was, I was surprised in .. I was a bit upset at first, but, but we talked about it and everything she wanted to do she asked me about and we worked together on it. We had some very funny afternoons, I remember just going.. working with certain things. She wanted to change names.

E: do you know how much exactly did she change in [the translation], I know that there is like , you don’t remember details but..

M: I don’t remember to be honest I mean..

E: .. what exactly, besides the names, [what] did she change..

M: she changed some of the dialogue, she changed.. I mean... there is time when .. ironically.. it seems ironic in a way... I don’t know what you would say about this , but I think i’m a fairly conservative translator in the sense that I stay closer to the Arabic than a lot of translators do. I do that because frankly through experience I have found that I tend to get the best result that way, and I tend to feel that I really actually get the voice that I wanna get more often when I stay close to the Arabic obviously it varies, it varies a lot , and so she actually made a lot of changes that took it
Further away from the Arabic, I think there were even.. there were paragraphs I think she took out, yeah there where.. there definitely were, I'm sorry that I don't remember more specifically..

E: how do you think like the relation.. your relation with .. an author who is a translator and an author who is not a translator?
M: yeah ..mmm
E: is it a different relationship? Are they more curious about what you do? Or are they the same?
M: I think it’s more depending on the individuals! On the person and who they are... because also frankly other writers I have translated who are not themselves translators are also.. often. I mean they are very respectful they are curious.. they probably are a bit less curious but I don't know.. if not... the most intense and sort of ongoing experience I've had of that is it actually one of my best friend Sahar Tawfiq is one I've translated.. she is a novelist and a short story writer in Egypt and she has translated me ... so we did translate each other which is an incre.. I think translation is such an intimate thing to do and so .. its really it’s a very .. this is why I think for me it’s really crushing when something like this happen with Alsana .. because to me by deciding to translate something, I’m showing incredible.. well enormous at least respect for somebody for their work and I’m leaving with it and it’s .. there is a sort of closeness there, and some writers understand that and some don’t an that’s fine but I don’t know weather.. it’s a good question is there a difference.. mm , they are probably a little bit curious in a sense, in a sense I think somebody who are a translators is going to even worry more about interfering because they are gonna be more sensitive to.. you know.. to my autonomy as a translator..
E: so they do understand your boundaries as a translator? Especially if they are literary translator ..
M: definitely, definitely in the case of both Somaya and Sahar they do, but that's also you have to keep in mind that.. they are both women that I’m very close to.. though one of thing that absolutely beautiful about both relationship is that I got to know them through translation , I got to know them because.. I find their works and I wanna translate them, so translation was the heart of our relationship from the beginning so..
E: really interesting, how about dealing with Hamdi abu Golayyel, is it a different kind of.. ?
M: wow that’s different..
E: you said in a previous interview I think that you are more comfortable translating women voices than like..
M: you know that has changed.. again I would say I don’t... did I actually say that ...
E: I think yeah that was..
M: I think that was true at a certain point, I feel like now.. and I think in a way that's still true in the sense that, I feel it’s very important to do that.. but also it feels important to translate just really good work, however write them .. and may be I’m more comfortable.. just, I don’t know with it
feeling that this is .. you know that I’m … you know thinking through sort of feminine experience but I have to say.. I really love translating Hamdi’s novel and I also actually for somebody I’ve translated two by him recently , whom I just think fabulous is Hassan Daoud, and to me Hassan ah I don’t know, do I dare say this, I don’t know if I exactly what I mean by this but.. well I do I think Hassan has in a sense a sensibility an a language that ( hesitation).... Brings him near to some of the female writers I’ve translated it (E: ok, yeah), you know, mm I really just love his work and I’m very comfortable translating him, although, although, I would say there is a times where I get a bit .. yeah this interesting I’ve never thought about this. There’re time where I get a bit uncomfortable because it’s really this.. I’m translating this very, very sort of male experience but .. it’s not that I’m uncomfortable with what Hassan is doing because actually these are moments when he’s not writing this as something he’s comfortable with necessarily, these are difficult moment in the novel ..you know.. and .. and in both of the cases .. I have done recently these are just... these are really, really painful scenes.. you know, in a sense it not so much about the gender of the character.. and It’s definitely not about the gender of the author.. I don’t think.. and it’s..

E: again I’ll come back to the question [about relation with author] ... when you start to translate a book ... do you feel it is important to contact [the author]?

M: yeah, you know it depends.. I’ve been in different situations.. I’ve been in situations where I really had no or very little contact with the author ,I’ve been in another situations where I was a bit an easy about contacting the author because I didn’t .. I was worried about too much interference...and then I’ve been in another situation where.. for me the best situations people that are like Sahar, well Somaya was a different case, like Sahar, like Hamdi, like Hassan, like Huda Barakat, who are willing to help but also respect my boundaries and don’t try to interfere .. so, to me that’s the best .. you know I do hesitate about situations where people want to see the entire text because that is .. it’s not that I mind them seeing it but that becomes a must an invitation to them really to change things..

E: do you show it , like after you finish.. do you show the draft?

M: not necessarily unless .. well there two cases in which I show the whole draft.. one would be, you know if the writer really wants to see it and I trust the writer enough to know that this ok, or if there is some kind of problem that I feel needs a bigger reading , you know, of the text.. where I’m saying to the author listen there is this.. here is this issue I’m grappling with.. with your novel.. you know what you think and then we discuss it .. and at some point this happen with Hassan actually, at some point I say look, I’m gonna send you the text, could you at least read this certain bits and if you wanna read the whole thing then I’m.. because there was .. in his case there was some real issues around what tense to use in English of course that’s often a real problem.. because tenses are so different in Arabic an English, that’s often a problem I found in his novel.. just because the narrative this the one that isn’t out yet , the narrative voice .... so you know .. it’s ..I didn’t not entirely I did change some of the things but I didn’t make as many .. he well. Yeah.. I mean he just read certain bits and said I think that well-read.. works better .. I don’t know .. I went back.. Im still not sure that I did the right thing.. but anyway.. I think it just really depend on the author .. I have a very. ....
E: ok! that brings me to another issue which is the publishing houses and their role in all this kind of [relation] between the translator and the author, it seems that from all of that you said .. they always with the authors and they don’t give kind of support to the translator?

M: they are generally, especially if it’s .. and I talked about this in the article, the first article I talked about [Chapter] because you know especially if the author is a star .. because this is a commodity for the publisher frankly where is the translator is the piece worker .. we’re the labour , we’re the hard labour. So, I think one could put it in a very, very stark capitalist terms and that’s what happens .. but again I would wanna say that most of the situation I’ve been in, the publisher has been , you know, has been very good and very sensitive and were.. in some cases making almost the editor make no changes, in other cases they may wanna make more changes but they don’t force anything and it’s not about the author demanding changes it’s about with you know literary editor .ah

E: are they ... independent publisher or kind of commercial one. Because I think you worked mostly with independent...

M: yeah with independent and academic presses yeah, I mean I’ve done very little with commercial presses, I mean I don’t know where you put it yeah I would say independent because I mean I... actually I really love working for the small literary presses so you know City Lights, Archipelago you know they have been just great , sometimes they do ask for quite few changes but they have literary rational for doing so and they are very respectful for my role as a translator I don’t have.. I can’t think of any problem I have had.

E: from the changes they asked you to do, do they , how I say, do they for example ask you [to go for a certain] language choices like if they are American publishing houses do they ask you to write in American (M:yeah..) or do they like give you the choice to do whatever..

M: No they usually want one of the other, whether American or English,

E: so it is a publisher choice!

M: yeah... and there is one thing I should.. it might interest you I don’t know weather in the ones you looked at you know this .. but I’m also as a translator I tend to leave, especially in dialogue , I tend to leave quite a lot of Arabic in because I think as long as you can.. mm.. what I tried to do and I don’t know if I’m always successful but I try really hard and very consciously to try to phrase it, so that when I have the Arabic text there, either right before or right after, I’m gonna somehow make it clear what its but I just think it’s good to leave Arabic in .. You know you have to be careful how you do it and when you do it .. so sometimes publishers have not been very happy about that,. although generally more recently, they’ve been fine , so I don’t know what that said about the way things are going but I have had some arguments with publishers about leaving Arabic in or they have said you have to have glossary and I’m like no I’m not... I refused to have a glossary..

E: I was about to ask you about the glossary because I didn’t notice that you have a glossary in the novels you have translated?

M: No I think, I think in like my earliest one or two I might have had a glossary but since then I’m actually.. I refused.. [E: the ones I’m looking at there is no glossary] so what I do I try to work it in , in the Arabic, or I have like either a forward or an afterword that might explain something.
E: ... is it kind of like teaching the readers? I did find readers I think in Goodreads that really did appreciate this...

M: exactly, but at the same time what I hope is, especially when it’s in the dialogue, at also kind of lives it in up and it gives it more.. I’m somebody I actually... I want the readers to always be conscious that it’s a foreign text not hopefully because... I hope the English is not awkward, I want the English to be... you know to be perfect as perfect as it can be, but because it’s just coming, it’s got other registers to it and it’s got other things there that coming into it, so obviously one way to do that is to have the Arabic..

E: I just would like also to ask you about the code-switching, when you encounter a novel with code-switching, for example MSA and dialect, do you have a kind of a systematic decision making that guide you [in the translation] or you just go with the flow?

M: I can’t you know , it’s so hard because for one thing, every situation and every author and every novel is different and so I think different texts call for different strategies and it also really.. I mean I’m conscious of it in a sense that you know I’ll try to work with it and try to .. but I think also that’s kind of I mean basically what I aiming for is what would be .. what would be typical of most novels that are originally written in English, in other words you know they wouldn’t use a more formal language in the dialogue and so, in that sense I’m trying to make it very much equivalent to what readers would be accustomed to but I also try to signal yeah this is also going in the Arabic. So, maybe the question is more what do I do when I’m translating a novel where the dialogue is not in Ammaya, you see what I mean?..

E: it did happen sometimes and we’ll discuss it later... I just would like if you don’t mind to discuss each procedure, give you few questions about that one.First, I would like to discuss is the use of paratext, you use introduction in most of your translation, was that your choice or that a choice by..

M: that usually my choice, actually what I prefer is having it after the text, so the reader doesn’t feel .. to have an afterword rather than a preface, so sometimes I’ll say I would rather be an afterword and the publisher would say no.. and actually I just had a discussion about that with the editor at the AUC press because they are putting out my translation of albab almaftoh (The Open Door) in a new addition Hoopoe addition which is meant to be as a kind of more popular thing, so Neil wrote to me and say I’m really happy to tell you that we’re gonna publish this .. but we’re gonna and he just sort of saying we gonna take out the introduction, so I wrote back and I said I’m very disturb that you’re gonna put it in the .. I said, however I’m very disturb that you’re taking out the introduction, because I said, it actually, I think it’s really crucial because it’s really sets the novel historically and that novel for reader now, that’s novel really needs to be set historically for you know as a work of its time and I really think that introduction is important, and I said what about putting it as an afterward , I said it doesn’t have to be in front , in fact I think it would be better if we have it in the end, but I really think, or could we even shorten it I mean just Nail please I just thinks it needs to be there. So, he wrote back a week later and he said yeah we decided to keep it as an afterward..

E: yes, which is good,... that one what I’m going to ask you about, the content or the length of the introduction, ... because I noticed with the Open Door, it was like a long introduction ..., so do you control this kind of length or the content of it
M: yeah, I do so far, I mean this have to do also with the fact, I think it’s much easier to do that for an academic press than it’s for whether a small literary press or certainly for commercial one. So I think the introduction or afterwards that I have done have tended to be for novels that I published with academic presses, I’m trying to remember now, I don’t think there is one I’ve done with sort of independent literary press, I’ve done, I don’t think I’ve done an introduction for any of those. So, so I think that has to do with the very specific kind of publishing context. I mean I also felt with Hamdi’s novel I felt it was really, really important to have a paratext because both to explain the specific usages and the whole .. but really also put of this sorta of.. the way he closely echoes Nasserist slogans and Nasserist vocabulary I just thought it’s really, really crucial to try to points it out..

E: so, what about Girls of Riyadh, because I did notice that she did her own introduction and talked about herself as a translator rather than bringing ..

M: yeah, she said something about ‘ so glad that nothing lost in translation’ she very pointedly did not mention.. I

E: when you did submit the draft , did you write intro.. (M: No), o because it’s a draft .

M: yeah, I didn’t really feel.. you know I submitted, I think if you want an introduction, they would ask me..... and I didn’t think it really needed an introduction particularly, so you know , but I mean she also.. and again see when I translated it, I know that she puts footnote I’m not gonna..

E: I did notice ..from the studying of the four novels, the Egyptian novels showed that you don’t like to use footnote (M: No, I never use footnote ), although I did notice in Hamdi’ novel that you put two footnote (M: did I , may be, oh yea ) to explain qur’anic [examples] which kind of religious

M: oh yeah, exactly.. that the one thing if you have to do as a reference especially for Quran I think that is just a viable to have a footnote but otherwise really not ? because also just , it reference it and also tell the reader that this is a qur’anic passage and it would be really, really hard to do that in the text so I, I did I remember kind of agonising about that but deciding to do it, but I absolutely I don’t put footnote ..

E: about also the glossary, you said that you don’t like [to add] glossary (M: no), why ?

M: because for me the main reason is two things: first of all it interrupts the reading process like the footnote does too, but a glossary if you have to flip back and forth that’s interrupt the literary reading process, that’s the first things. The second thing is that to me that exoticize the work in a way that I don’t want to do, so as I said earlier I do think it’s important for the readers to always have in mind that this is a text form somewhere else and leaves the Arabic in so forth, but at the same time try hard not to exoticize it and to me setting of these words and explaining them, to me that’s kind of an act of exoticization that I don’t like. Third and this would be true more recently another kind of aspects of exoticisation is that this kind .. in these days of the internet if somebody really wants to find something out they could look it up, why should, you know, why if we don’t .. if we publish say .. so also I think there is this also a thing with the matter .. the other reason is that I don’t want to see Arabic literature and Arabs and people of the region exceptionised, and you know
all the horrible stuff there is out there in a way that’s already bad enough the world we live in and to me it makes it worse if you kind of exceptionised it.. as sort of saying implicitly like ‘oh well if you reading a Chinese novel in translation we don’t necessarily expect that we have to explain something’ or if you reading an English language novel but it’s may be you know there are difficult things in it you might not understand, you expected to go and looked them up , why should we do this for you in Arabic...

M: so I basically don’t wanna exoticize and I also don’t want to interrupt the reading process ...

E:.... the writer when he/she written the novel they know exactly that the reader will understand this kind of information, there is a share knowledge between them but when you take that text into another language, I think when the translator do that...

M: ... but I see what you getting at, you know Yeah and just for me.. I was about to say for me it’s something is sort of in the text but that’s actually not really true, it’s in the reading and obviously any translation is a reading of a text, so for me it’s something that is an eye as a reader who sort of between the two worlds... I know that piece of information but I’m also very conscious that’s not something that my readers are going to have so that’s where I become the interpreter I suppose yeah..

E: ... when we discussed borrowing, you said that you try to explain and give a parallel concept of the borrowed words that you give, so mmm why did you choose to resist for example the TT literary and linguistics norms...

M: oh no I don’t think my ambitious are that grand, I mean if it does change things.. great.. but I don’t think, I’m not setting out to change things what I’m setting out is to do, to give the reader a voice that I think ..is my imagination of what the voice in the novel should be and that part of that voice is this.. it’s almost like a piece of music that is in harmony so that you got in a sense the top layer is the English but you also got that kind of harmony underneath which is the Arabic and so occasionally want that to erupt and be there, so I think for me it’s, it’s about producing this specific text and feeling like that is the best way I can do it, the way I feel comfortable doing it, I think, I think it’s true that, you know, translation is, especially , may be .. I don’t know especially Arabic literature, any literature.. giving the politics right now in the world, it’s a very political act, you know and I’m always very conscious that .. of the way that one does or might affect meanings in the world but I think when I’m actually working on a particular work, I really just trying to make that work as a literary work I’m not really trying to do anything beyond that .. yeah..

E: so another thing [is] using the literal translation... with cultural specific expression you just give the literal meaning

So, what is the reason behind this (M: behind the literalness) is it to bring the reader to a different level of metaphorical expressions..
M: yeah, I think in that case it’s .. I think I like to translate , especially proverbs literally when I feel like the message, the meaning is gonna get through in the English, because I think , it just shows... it’s gonna remind the reader that this is, you know from elsewhere, and some translator would disagree and say should have not been done, precisely because it’s too, foreignising .. I don’t think it’s, I mean sometimes it would be and again there is anyone right answer but I feel like there are times when I feel it works to translate literally, and so when I feel like it works and when it kind of .. and when it’s enriches the text and hopefully enriches the readers then it’s a good thing to do but there’s time when it doesn’t work and it’s just comes out sounding clunky..

E: another thing I would like to ask you about is your relation with the characters, do you look at them like, do you humanize them, do you kind of like listen to [what] they are trying [to say] ... or is it kind of they are just within the text, so you are just dealing with a text not a character..

M: that’s really an interesting question.. I think in general I really humanize them, but again it depends on the book and on the character, so in some cases I would more than others, like the protagonist of the novel that I’ve just translated for Hassan Daoud, I think I really got into the character and it’s a male character, I mean I really just kind of, and I think in my best translations I do really sort of get in the character but then something else, like Hamdi’s book, that doesn’t lend itself to get inside the characters because there all these .. because of that satirical historical ironic distance, so they are not the same kind of characters.. but I think in a book like Somaya’s and like some others I would, and actually the translation that I’ve most troubled, kind of hesitated to do and then during while doing them thinking, yeah I shouldn’t done this or once where I don’t feel, where I might feel kind of estranged from the character, like the character don’t speak to me, yeah..

E: what about the Open Door what...?

M: oh yeah, I’ve definitely entered into Layla, the character Layla, although at the same time, I find it a little hard to translate because it’s quite a dated book and in somehow, it’s a very kind of sixties romantic. There are a sort of cliché romantic stuff in there and I did at time ahh you know that has been one of my most successful translations, I mean I have quite a few colleagues who teach it and say the students love it, you know so I just never..

E:.... how about the decision making..

M: no.. and you know I’ve taught literary translation a few times and I always say to my students, like ok we can read various translation theory we can read sort of business about sort of translation strategy, and I say what I feel about this kind of material it can really open up your mind to possibility but I say when I’m actually translating, that is the last thing I’m thinking about, you know I’m not thinking about what Gideon Toury says or what so and so says.. you know it just not.. hopefully it just.. hopefully some of that just gives more like... confidence to maybe you know to liberate myself a little bit more from the text ..
E: ... Do you see your translation as ... a different book...? as co-authoring ..

M: well I do, I do see it as a different book and I .. frankly, when .. sort of materialist aspect to that.. one issue and I don’t know how one well take it on that’s you can’t really do anything about it, but is secondary translation, I mean it’s really wrong that, you know like ok if somebody translate a book, the author gets some of royalty fame well a lot of translations are actually done not from the original but from the English translation, from my translation, and it’s like they are translating my book and I mean there is also first author book but you know it’s.. it’s like you know completely wrong that I don’t get something for that ..

... so yeah, I mean yeah it’s co-authoring and it’s also I think, it’s very time bound like I have, I find it very difficult to read my own translations after I published them, because I will always find things that I think oh why did I do that way, right if I translate it I’ll do it in a different way and I have just to recognise that you know that what I did, a few times I’ve taught my own translations and it can be really painful because you know , the students will ask why did you translate it and I just like ‘I don’t know’... so I think that also important to you to keep in mind , because these are all things I did at a certain time and it’s .. you know I might do them differently .
Appendix 4

Response from Penguin group regarding the draft for *Girls of Riyadh*