

**Translation at the Interface of Identity and Nationalism:
An Epitextual Study of the Egyptian Arabic Retranslation
of Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and The Sea***

Dr. Sherihan Medhat Abo Ali

Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature,
Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University

Abstract:

Controversy tends to hover about the publication of translations in Egyptian Arabic. A case in point is the 2023 retranslation of Ernest Hemingway's novella *The Old Man and the Sea* into Egyptian Arabic by Magdy Abdelhadi under the aegis of Hunna/Elles publishing house. By using Egyptian Arabic, the translator and the publisher adopt an oppositional stance to the mainstream norm of using fusha in the translation of canonical literary texts, producing a target text that jars with the target audience's expectations. The present study is premised on the argument that the choice of Egyptian Arabic in the retranslation is not random but rather indexes the identity politics that inform it and the nationalist cause the translator and the publisher espouse, ultimately instrumentalizing the retranslation to empower the vernacular. The study also argues that the unfavorable reception of the retranslation stems from the negative indexes of Egyptian Arabic. The study sits at the intersection of translation studies (i.e., retranslation), sociolinguistics (i.e., diglossia, language ideology, and indexicality), and reception studies (i.e., horizon of expectations) as it aims to explore the motivations behind the Egyptian Arabic retranslation under scrutiny and to explain the source of censure and furor that accompanied its publication. To this end, Genette's (1987/1997) concept of epitext is employed as a methodological tool to unpack the warring language ideologies and to demonstrate how the use of Egyptian Arabic in retranslating a highbrow literary text can entangle the retranslation in question in the thorny terrain of identity and nationalism.

Keywords: Retranslation, Language Ideology, Identity, Nationalism, Reception, Epitexts.

الترجمة بين الهوية والقومية: دراسة عن النصوص الحاقّة بالترجمة المعادة للعجوز
والبحر لإرنست هيمنغواي إلى العربية المصرية

د. شريهان مدحت أبو علي

مدرس بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، كلية الآداب، جامعة الإسكندرية

ملخص البحث

يميل الجدل إلى أن يحوم حول نشر ترجمات بالعربية المصرية، ومثال على ذلك الترجمة المعادة للرواية القصيرة لإرنست هيمنغواي *العجوز والبحر* إلى العربية المصرية في عام ٢٠٢٣، وقد ترجمها مجدي عبد الهادي وصدرت عن دار نشر هنّ. لقد تبني المترجم والناشر موقفاً معارضاً للعرف السائد المتمثل في استخدام الفصحى في ترجمة النصوص الأدبية الرفيعة المستوى عن طريق استخدام العربية المصرية، منتجين نصّاً مستهدفاً يتعارض مع توقعات الجمهور المستهدف. تقوم الدراسة الحالية على فكرة أن اختيار العربية المصرية في الترجمة المعادة ليس اختياراً عشوائياً وإنما يشير إلى سياسات الهوية التي تتخلل الترجمة والقضية القومية التي يتبناها المترجم والناشر، مستخدمين الترجمة المعادة بشكل أساسي لتمكين اللهجة العامية. كما تفيد الدراسة بأن التلقي السلبي للترجمة المعادة نابع من المؤشرات السلبية للعربية المصرية. تقع الدراسة عند نقطة التقاء دراسات الترجمة (الترجمة المعادة) واللسانيات الاجتماعية (الازدواجية اللغوية والأيدولوجيا اللغوية والإشارية) ودراسات التلقي (أفق التوقع)، إذ تهدف الدراسة إلى استكشاف الدوافع وراء الترجمة المعادة بالعربية المصرية قيد الدراسة وإلى تفسير مصدر النقد والضجة المرافقين لنشرها. ومن أجل تحقيق هذه الأهداف، يُستخدم مفهوم جينيت (١٩٨٧/١٩٩٧) للنص الحاقّ بوصفه أداة منهجية لتحليل الأيدولوجيات اللغوية المتناحرة ولبيان كيف أن استخدام العربية المصرية في إعادة ترجمة نص أدبي رفيع المستوى من شأنه أن يزعج بالترجمة المعادة المعنية في القضية الشائكة الخاصة بالهوية والقومية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الترجمة المعادة، الأيدولوجيا اللغوية، الهوية، القومية، التلقي، النصوص الحاقّة.

**Translation at the Interface of Identity and Nationalism:
An Epitextual Study of the Egyptian Arabic Retranslation
of Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and The Sea*
Dr. Sherihan Medhat Abo Ali**

Introduction

The scope of translation studies has expanded beyond the confines of linguistic-oriented approaches and has extended to the exploration of translation from the prism of the social, historical, political, cultural, and ideological contexts. The study of translation cannot be carried out without considering the conditions surrounding its production; translation is the product of “certain willed circumstances” (Vandepitte, 2008, p. 570). Given its communicative nature, intentionality and agency lie at the core of translation. It comprises “a network of active social agents, who may be individuals or groups, each with certain preconceptions and interests” (Hermans, 1996, p. 26). The translator or publisher's choice of a particular language or dialect in translation can have various implications. The question of language choice in translation can be explored from a sociolinguistic lens. Sociolinguistics appertains to “the social meaning of language in use, particularly in relation to social identity and social differentiation” (Angermeyer, 2020, p. 535). The rapport that exists between translation studies and sociolinguistics rests on accruing importance to the contexts related to how translated texts are created, circulated, and received (Pinto, 2012). Among the core issues studied within the ambit of sociolinguistics are language ideologies. Adopting a sociolinguistic perspective to the study of translation can shed light on the language ideologies that inform the translator's choices. The significant effect imparted by sociolinguistics on translation studies is conducive to allocating considerable attention to language varieties and how utterances in translation can have social and political implications (Cronin, 2020). The symbolic function of language comes into play when discussing the purposeful choice of translating into a minority language, with non-standard varieties being one of the strands of research on the issue of linguistic minoritization. In this context, translation assumes a vital role in forging identity or

expressing resistance against the dominant language (Cronin, 2020). With respect to the issue of minority languages in translation, the latter contributes to safeguarding minority languages, boosting national literatures, and reinforcing culture-based identities (Woodsworth, 1996). It can function as a route for the elevation of non-standard varieties to the status of legitimate literary languages (Popa, 2018) and the establishment of national literary canons (Gupta, 1998). Ergo, translation can be conceived as a politically motivated act that is conducive to nurturing a sense of national identity “or a new vision of ‘nationhood’” (Woodsworth, 1996, p. 235). That is why marginality no longer befits translation considering its significant role in literature, culture, and nationalist projects. It has garnered new qualities, such as “subversive, innovatory or radical” (Bassnett, 1996, p. 13), and such qualities entail adoption of a position. Viewing translation from the vantage point of positioning “casts translation emphatically as a form of social interaction” where translations are imbued with certain ideologies (Hermans, 2020, p. 424). A manifold connection exists between translation and ideology; ideology has a bearing on translation in the very selection of a text to undergo translation and the purpose it is set to serve in the target culture (Schäffner, 2014). Pérez (2014) argues that “all language use is ... ideological ... translation itself is always a site of ideological encounters” (p. 2). Because of such ideological contours, translation becomes a site of contestation and controversy. This aspect of controversy often comes forth with the production of various target texts of the same source text. Retranslations are a fecund object of study as they can afford insights into the ideological, social, cultural, and political conditions that underpin their creation. In the light of this, the present study adopts the argument that Magdy Abdelhadi’s use of Egyptian Arabic in the retranslation *العجوز والبحر* of Ernest Hemingway’s 1952 novella *The Old Man and the Sea* is deployed as an index of oppositional ideological stance that is inextricably intertwined with the question of identity and nationalism. The unpalatable reception of this retranslation arises from the fact that it does not align with the readers’ horizon of expectations that is saturated with negative indexes of the vernacular. The study attempts to address the following research questions:

1. How can the use of Egyptian Arabic in the retranslation of Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and The Sea* serve as an index of an oppositional ideological stance that is intrinsically fused with the dyadic issue of identity and nationalism?
2. How can the backlash triggered by the publication of the Egyptian Arabic retranslation of Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and The Sea* be interpreted in reference to the readers' horizon of expectations?

1. Literature Review

1.1. Diglossia

Diglossia is a linguistic phenomenon that hallmarks the Egyptian society. It signifies "a situation with coexistence of two related varieties considered to belong to the same language, with one variety having exclusively formal uses" (Mejdell, 2018, p. 332). It reflects a hierarchical organization of language varieties and thus constitutes "a state of affairs pertinent to social status and power" (Theodoropoulou, 2018, p. 378). The diglossic situation in Egypt is characterized by the existence of two varieties: Modern Standard Arabic or fusha and Egyptian Arabic or ammiyya. Unlike fusha, which is widely used in official circles and the print media, Egyptian Arabic lies within the scope of daily communication and popular culture (Hanna, 2016). Linguistic conflict is a cardinal integrant of diglossia (Walters, 2018). The latter is traditionally viewed in a negative light in the Arab world; the diction used by intellectuals in describing this phenomenon usually resonates with tensions, conflicts, and crises (Boussofara-Omar, 2006). The relation between fusha and ammiyya is hierarchically marked, where fusha is the "high" variety and regarded as "a clear (pure) and eloquent language with a Qur'anic and classical pedigree" in contrast to the "low" variety of ammiyya which is "the common language of the masses and everyday life" (Fahmy, 2011, p. 5). There are various dialects of Arabic, but fusha is the common standard variety in the Arab-speaking world. Although it is not used in oral communication, it is taken to be the base (Høigilt & Mejdell, 2017). By virtue of being the language of the Quran and classical poetry, fusha is regarded as "the sublime" language, whilst

the colloquial variety “has for fourteen-hundred years been considered an inferior language, not fit for use as a vehicle of ‘serious’ literature” (Rosenbaum, 2011, p. 326). In the linguistic rivalry between fusha and ammiyya, the close association between fusha and Islam tilts the balance in the favor of fusha advocates, which translated into establishing fusha as the appropriate language variety for literary production in Egypt (Hanna, 2016). Egyptian intellectuals who advocated the use of Egyptian Arabic in the literary domain, such as Ahmed Lutfi Al-Sayyid, Salama Musa, and Lewis Awad, faced charges of “harbouring ‘anti-religious’ motives and serving the ‘imperialist agenda’” (Hanna, 2016, p. 174). In their battle for legitimizing the use of Egyptian Arabic in literature, these intellectuals adopted “a dual subversion strategy” based on, firstly, defying the argument that Egypt should be confined to an Arab-Islamic identity and putting forward a substitute identity centered on “Egyptianness” and, secondly, questioning the efficiency of fusha as a linguistic medium for “high culture” (Hanna, 2016, p. 175). This deep-seated conflict between fusha and Egyptian Arabic can be further navigated in the light of the so-called language ideologies.

1.2. Language Ideologies

One of the areas in which ideology is enacted is linguistics. Linguistic or language ideology denotes “ubiquitous set of diverse beliefs, however implicit or explicit they may be, used by speakers of all types as models for constructing linguistic evaluations and engaging in communicative activity. They are beliefs about the superiority/inferiority of specific languages” (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 497). They are suffused with moral and political values since “implicitly or explicitly they represent not only how language is, but how it ought to be” (Woolard, 2021, p. 2). They can be viewed as “attempts to rationalize language usage,” and this act of rationalization is “typically multiple, context-bound, and necessarily constructed from the sociocultural experience of the speaker” (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 496). They are characterized by a normative strand that helps them function as “a bulwark against attempts to change the existing order in the socially reproductive institutions of society” (Suleiman & Abdelhay, 2021, p. 152).

An important concept in the discussion of the Arabic diglossic situation is the so-called standard language ideology. It refers to “a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language which is imposed from above, and which takes as its model the written language” (Lippi-Green, 1994, p. 166). It is characterized by “prescriptive attitudes” toward the standard language and “intolerance” toward linguistic varieties (Swann et al., 2004, p. 296). By dint of its normative mainstay, fusha is paradigmatic of standard language ideology (Høigilt & Mejdell, 2017). It carries “near-totemic power” (Walters, 2007, p. 655). Conversely, the use of Egyptian Arabic in the writing domain can be construed as “part of a consciously anti-elitist, oppositional language ideology” (Høigilt & Mejdell, 2017, p. 12). Significantly pertinent to the issue of standard language ideology is the concept of linguistic purism which is fueled by nationalism (Thomas, 1991). Linguistic purism is premised on the imperative of safeguarding the purity of the standard language, which is fusha in the case of the Arabic diglossic situation, and purging it of unwelcome influences from various forms of dialects and styles (Thomas, 1991). This notion of linguistic purism is closely related to language anxiety. The latter denotes “heightened and generalized concerns about language that straddle the linguistic and extra-linguistic worlds, coming to the fore at times of stress, crisis, or conflict in society” (Suleiman, 2014, p. 59). It relays concerns about the future of the language and its speakers and attempts to preserve the role of language in constructing and maintaining identity. It is “future-oriented” as it relies on mustering “the support of the community in defense of the language to ensure its health, instrumentally, as a vibrant medium of communication” (Suleiman & Abdelhay, 2021, p. 153). Language anxiety plays out in the conflictual relation between fusha and Egyptian Arabic and the identity politics they are entrenched in. Identity politics refers to “political positions and activism based on an aspect of identity (e.g. ethnicity, religion, sex, or sexual orientation) shared by a group that feels it is marginalized, underrepresented, and misrepresented” (Chandler & Munday, 2011, p. 198). Since fusha is the dominant literary language, the use of Egyptian Arabic in a domain

monopolized by fusha can be indicative of an oppositional ideological stance where language and identity constellate.

1.2.1. Indexicality, Stance, and Identity.

Of paramount pertinence to the ideological conflict between fusha and Egyptian Arabic and the identity politics they are enmeshed in is the issue of indexicality. It is a linguistic property that shows how “aspects of language are connected to a sociocultural context” (Swann et al., 2004, p. 143). Conceptually, indexicality is “ideological, habitual, and perceptual” (Bassiouney, 2018, p. 356). Language performs two major functions: instrumental and symbolic. Regarding the instrumental function, language is a vehicle for interaction. Concerning the symbolic function, language can serve as a symbol, particularly an indicator of identity, and as an index via the connotations it conjures up in a particular linguistic community (Aboelezz, 2018). Language can be instrumentalized in stance-taking as the latter is based on “the associations that language choices invoke in social interactions; i.e. the indexicality of language, which is part of its symbolic function” (Aboelezz, 2018, p. 515). There is a solid connection between linguistic forms and linguistic ideology as when language users resort to the use of certain linguistic forms, they attempt to “take a stance, while simultaneously appealing to linguistic ideologies and practices that reflect identity” (Bassiouney, 2014, p. 40), and that is why languages can be rightly perceived as “flags of allegiance” (Rajagopalan, 2001, p. 26). Put simply, language can be used as an index of a particular stance and identity (Bassiouney, 2014). Under the symbolic function, language can also serve as a proxy by communicating language anxieties and throwing light on an individual or group’s political inclinations (Suleiman, 2013). In this respect, language has long been functioning in modern Egypt as “a site for constructing and contesting different versions of national identity” (Hanna, 2009, p. 157). The various historical, political, and ideological shuffles that befell Egypt in the onset of the twentieth century, which eventually paved the way for the eruption of the 25th of January Revolution in 2011, heightened the cognizance of a discrete identity (Bassiouney, 2014). The notion of “Egyptianness” is one of the positive indexes of Egyptian Arabic (Bassiouney, 2018, p. 354). Notwithstanding, it has negative indexes; it is regarded as “a

corrupt version of fusha and a potential disintegrating factor for the Arab nation” (Bassiouney, 2014, p. 128). Another stigmatic index of Egyptian Arabic is its association with leftism. Egyptian Poets who wrote poems in Egyptian Arabic, like Salah Jahin, Fouad Haddad, Sayyid Hijab, and Abdel Rahman Al-Abnudi, were upholders of Marxist views, which forged a connection between Egyptian Arabic and Marxism (Haeri, 2003). In other words, there is a historical connection between Egyptian Arabic and “nonreligious opposition groups and individuals whose views were perceived as threatening political stability in the Arab world” (Haeri, 2003, p. 134). The notion of markedness comes to the fore in the discussion of the indexes of fusha and Egyptian Arabic and the identity they are associated with. Markedness refers to “the process whereby some social categories gain a special, default status that contrasts with the identities of other groups, which are usually highly recognizable” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, p. 372). Fusha is the unmarked, prestigious, dominant variety of Arabic that is associated with unmarked identity, whereas Egyptian Arabic is the marked variety that relies on diverging from the norms set by fusha. The polarization between fusha and Egyptian Arabic in Egypt thus constitutes “an ideological battlefield of discourses and counter-discourses that sought to accumulate gains in the fields of cultural production, as well as the social space at large” (Hanna, 2016, p. 173). Pan-Arab nationalism and Egyptian nationalism epitomize these conflicting discourses. They are loaded with variegated indexes of the standard language and its foil, the vernacular.

1.2.2. Pan-Arab Nationalism and Egyptian Nationalism.

A crucial aspect of language politics in the Egyptian context is characterized by a binarism between Egyptian nationalism and pan-Arab nationalism. The Egyptian nationalist ideology tilts toward Egyptian Arabic, whereas the pan-Arab nationalist ideology endorses fusha (Aboelezz, 2017). The liaison between language and nationalism played out in the wake of the independence of Arab states in the twentieth century. The pan-Arab nationalist sentiments emerged during the Arab countries’ endeavors to achieve political affinity in the midst of fighting foreign powers (e.g., Ottomans,

European imperialists, and Zionists) and grappling with domestic discords (Walters, 2018). According to pan-Arab nationalism, the Arabic-speaking world is one nation that is linguistically, geographically, and culturally united and is struggling with similar political issues (Bassiouney, 2014). Following their independence, Arab states pledged allegiance to pan-Arab nationalism in which fusha is ensconced as the national language of the Arab world (Aboelezz, 2018). In pan-Arab nationalism, fusha is idealized as the vehicle for uniting the Arab countries. Local varieties do not have a place in the pan-Arab nationalist ideology as they are distinct and hence schismatic. They are sacrificed on the altar of pan-Arabism whose conception of political unity rests on effacing cultural differences among Arab countries (Haeri, 2003). Syria is believed to be the seedbed of the movement of pan-Arab nationalism that was initially cultural in essence but then took on political nuances at the turn of the twentieth century (Suleiman, 2003). The start of the twentieth century witnessed the beginning of Egypt's emancipation from the yoke of foreign powers and the concomitant burgeoning of nationalist hankerings. The unificatory leverage of fusha crystallized in the course of late Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser's pursuance of a pan-Arab nationalist agenda. Amid the cauldron of pan-Arab nationalist sentiments, an image of Egypt as belonging to the Arab nation was constructed (Bassiouney, 2014).

At the other end of the spectrum lies Egyptian nationalism. It is buttressed by the concept of environmental determinism that is based on the belief that "the physical and climatic conditions of the Nile Valley have endowed the Egyptians with group characteristics which made them distinct from those who surround them" (Suleiman, 2003, pp. 175-176). The 1919 Revolution and the discovery of Tutankhamun's tomb in 1923 gave momentum to the Egyptian territorial nationalist movement (Aboelezz, 2018). In the wake of the historic discovery of Tutankhamun's tomb, which is a milestone in the nationalist quest for a separate identity, the argument that Egyptian Arabic is the original language of the Egyptian people entered the intellectual scene (Bassiouney, 2014). The dissolution of the Turkish Caliphate at the hands of Moustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1923 and the vigorous promotion of a Turkish territorial nationalism greased the wheels of Egyptian nationalism by thwarting the premise

of an Islamic nation and lending weight to the Egyptian nationalist ideology during its territorial phase (Suleiman, 2003). Given this environmentally unique character of Egypt, its language is essentially different from the languages of other Arabic-speaking countries. Accordingly, it is difficult for Arabic to be construed as a distinctive indicator of a single nation since it does not constitute a single language but rather an array of languages of a kindred relation (Suleiman, 2003). There is a belief among some Egyptians that Egyptian Arabic is a language that is distinct from Arabic and can fulfil all purposes (Mejdell, 2018).

The prelude to the deterioration of Egyptian Arabic is marked by Gamal Abdel Nasser's decision to tread the path of pan-Arab nationalism instead of Egyptian nationalism (Nabulssi-Maselbas, 2021). As a corollary of Egypt's segue into the pan-Arab nationalist phase, the power of the colloquial variety declined, and it just served as the language of everyday interactions (Bassiouney, 2014). The burgeoning of the Arab renaissance last century and the weight accorded to pan-Arab nationalism exacerbated the marginalization of writing in Egyptian Arabic (Høigilt & Mejdell, 2017). Nevertheless, in the period following Nasser's demise and Egypt's 1979 peace treaty with Israel, which reduced Egypt to a pariah state, the notion of Egypt's distinctive non-Arab identity was resuscitated (Bassiouney, 2014). There are "agents of change" who actively participate in effectuating language change concerning the promotion of writing in Egyptian Arabic (Aboelezz, 2017, p. 213). Among these agents of change are the Liberal Egyptian Party and Malamih. The former is an Egyptian political party that subscribes to a separatist ideology and promotes the standardization of Egyptian Arabic. By the same token, Malamih is a publishing house that supports the practice of publishing in Egyptian Arabic (Aboelezz, 2017). The establishment of Wikipedia Masry signifies the upswing of Egyptian nationalism. Created in 2008 and written in Egyptian Arabic, Wikipedia Masry serves as a purveyor of Egyptian separatism on the linguistic and ethnic levels (Nabulssi-Maselbas, 2021). The creation of an Egyptian Arabic version of Wikipedia is based on the belief that Egyptian Arabic is a language and not an Arabic variety. It is divisible into various

dialects, for example, Cairene and Alexandrian dialects (Nabulssi-Maselbas, 2021). Hunna publishing house is considered one of the significant agents of change given its promotion of the use of Egyptian Arabic in the translation of literary texts as the one under scrutiny.

1.3. *Retranslation*

Retranslation refers to either the undertaking of translating a text that has been already translated or the product of the act of retranslation (Gürçağlar, 2020; Koskinen & Paloposki, 2010). The growing interest in studying retranslations and disclosing the various motives that trigger them has contributed to the rise of “retranslation studies” (Albachten & Gürçağlar, 2019, p. 1). Retranslations constitute “a linguistic yardstick of the stylistic flavour of an age, a homage paid by a new generation of authors, sensitive to the great writers of the past” (Al-Shaye, 2018, p. 22). They mirror the changing historical, social, and cultural contexts (Cadera & Martín-Matas, 2017; Cadera & Walsh, 2022). Retranslation is often studied within the scope of the ageing of earlier translations and outdatedness of the language used. Because translation norms and literary styles are not static (Cadera, 2017), retranslation can be motivated by the urge to create new target texts that can adjust to conditions disparate from those associated with earlier translations (Desmidt, 2009; Urgorri, 2017). It can be spurred by the desire to bring classic works closer to the audience of the modern day. For example, Penguin Classics commissioned Michael Glencross to retranslate Jules Verne’s *Around the World in Eighty Days* in 2004 in an endeavor to provide a classic work of literature in a simplified, modern language away from the complexities of archaic styles (O’Driscoll, 2011).

The argument of insufficiency and inaccuracy is usually made in connection with earlier translations of the original text (Venuti, 2013). In this respect, retranslation can be perceived as an attempt at improving earlier translations on account of having failed to either relay the stylistic aspects of the original text or cater to the target readers’ expectations (Hanna, 2016). Translators turn to retranslation in an attempt to delve deeper into the aesthetic dimensions of the source text (Zhang, 2013). Besides the purpose of offering unhackneyed interpretation of the source text, retranslations can be

“read more antagonistically as trying to supersede, discredit or demolish their predecessors” (Hermans, 2020, p. 427). Those engaged in the act of retranslation aspire to mark their products with distinction from previous translations through resorting to deviation from common practice (Hanna, 2016). The notion of intentionality on the part of the translator is central to retranslation as the translator is intent on flaunting the distinction of the new translation of the original text by coming up with a new reading that is infused with varying values, ultimately establishing a novel reception of the original text in the target culture (Venuti, 2013). For example, in the field of drama translation, those who retranslated Shakespeare's tragedies attempted to achieve distinction and legitimacy by arguing that their retranslations fulfil a novel function in the target culture (Hanna, 2016). In the light of this, retranslations amount to a form of argument on the grounds that they count on, for example, highlighting inaccuracies in existing translations, offering unprecedented readings for the source text, employing different strategies that fit in with the dominant translation norms, and tailoring the target text to meet the target audience's expectations (St. André, 2003).

Establishing a specific identity and imparting influence on a particular institution are among the motives for retranslation of canonical texts. Owing to their cultural leverage, canonical texts, such as Shakespeare's works, propel retranslations to cater to the target audience's need to read these works in the light of the values of their own times, which therefore requires new strategies that reflect contending understandings (Venuti, 2013). Ideological changes in the target system can serve as a catalyst for retranslation (Urgorri, 2017). Since translation is not merely the transfer of words from one language to another but rather involves the conveyance of one culture to another, ideology inheres in the process of translation; the choices made by the translator during the process of translation indicate that “there is a voluntary act that reveals his history and the socio-political milieu that surrounds him” (Álvarez & Vidal, 1996, p. 5). Deciding to retranslate a certain text “is inevitably bound to prevailing ideologies and values” (Cadera & Walsh, 2022, p. 18). To take this argument further, retranslations can serve nationalist agendas. By way of

illustration, amid Quebec's separatist movement, retranslation of canonical drama texts was deployed to establish the authority of Québécois French in defiance of its subordinate status to the dominant language varieties of North American English and Parisian French (Venuti, 2013). The retranslation selected as data for the present study is scrutinized in conformity with this line of thought.

1.3.1. Translation into Egyptian Arabic.

Translation into the vernacular can be instrumentalized to legitimize its use in "serious" writing like fusha (Håland, 2021, p. 577). In the field of drama translation, Egyptian Arabic has become a legitimate medium for the translation of comedies and is allowed to be used in literary writing only for dialogues and not narrative parts. Early translations of Molière and Jean Racine's plays were produced in Egyptian Arabic by Uthman Mohamed Jalal. There are many cases of translators who swam against the current and ventured into translating Shakespeare's comedies into Egyptian Arabic, including Mohamed Anani, Sami Sarhan, and Abdel Rehem Youssef. Concerning tragedies, two significant Egyptian Arabic translations that were pilloried were those produced by Nouman Ashour and Moustafa Safouan. The translation of Shakespeare's tragedies into Egyptian Arabic has always been met with virulent criticism to the extent that such translations were deemed "iconoclastic" (Hanna, 2016, p. 185). The use of Egyptian Arabic, which is the index of Egypt's national identity, in translating literature fulfils two political aims, namely eliminating the schism between lay people and intellectuals and defying "the homogenizing function of fusha" (Safouan, 1998, as cited in Hanna, 2016, p. 190). Accordingly, using Egyptian Arabic can serve as "a tool for liberating Egyptians from a prefabricated unity that suppresses difference and downgrades diversity" (Hanna, 2016, p. 190). In the context of the retranslation of Shakespeare's works, Mathijssen (2007) posits that the use of the vernacular is not antithetical to the preservation of the poetic underpinnings of dramatic texts. On the contrary, its use reflects a stylistic shift toward realism, ultimately representing "a form of modernisation" (p. 47). Similarly, De Angelis (2016) argues that Egyptian Arabic has the ability to express concepts in a simpler way than fusha. It is difficult to qualify the linguistic situation in Egypt as

being democratic when the written language is comprehensible only to the minority. The attainment of linguistic democracy in Egypt hinges on the Egyptian variety (De Angelis, 2016). In this regard, Egyptian Arabic is ideologically loaded, and its use in translation can have political implications.

1.4. *Translation and Reception: Horizon of Expectations*

Coined by Jauss (1982), the so-called horizon of expectations is a key term in the study of the readers' reception of texts. It refers to "the set of cultural norms, assumptions, and criteria shaping the way in which readers understand and judge a literary work at a given time" (Baldick, 2001, p. 116). It functions as a "shared 'mental set' or framework" through which readers can view and assess a particular cultural product (Chandler & Munday, 2011, p. 190). It is imbued with the prevalent moral standards and norms (Baldick, 2001). It is both subjective and collective and relies on issues pertinent to history, age, and culture (Gambier, 2018). Horizons of expectations are not fixed; they undergo changes as time goes by, where new generations can view and evaluate texts in a new light (Baldick, 2001).

The import of the reception theory into translation studies marks a considerable departure from a parochial linguistic approach that is tied to the issue of equivalence to a reader-oriented perspective that takes into account the impact imparted by translation on the target culture regarding the question of identity (Brems & Pinto, 2013). It opens up a vista on the afterlife of the translated text in its new linguistic and cultural environment and the dynamics of its appreciation or unappreciation. In reception-oriented translation studies, the reader occupies a central position in the process of interpreting and evaluating the translated text. When exploring translation from the lens of reception, the impact of factors beyond the linguistic features of the translated text needs to be taken into account, including reviews. Reviewers hold sway over the how translated texts are read and received (Nelson & Maher, 2013). Studying retranslations from the prism of reception brings to light the correlation between society, culture, and language (Gulyás, 2022). This brings up the notion of norms in translation. Norms play a vital role in the reception of translations. When translations deviate from

certain norms established in the literary canon, this could result in shaking the very foundations of the readers' horizon of expectations, which is the case in the adverse reception of the retranslation in question.

2. Methodology

2.1. *Epitexts as a Methodological Tool*

A paratext is analogous to a “threshold” that “constitutes a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of transaction” (Genette, 1987/1997, p. 2). It serves as a bridge between the target text and the target audience, significantly influencing the reception of the translated text (Batchelor, 2018; Gürçağlar, 2011). Regarding its functions, a paratext contributes to “explaining, defining, instructing, or supporting, adding background information, or the relevant opinions and attitudes of scholars, translators and reviewers” (Pellatt, 2013, p. 1). In other words, paratexts can serve as “a valuable methodological tool in contextualizing translated texts and exploring implicit traces of ideological and socio-cultural motivation of translation agents which could be sometimes unseen in translated texts” (Kung, 2013, p. 53). Occasionally, retranslations are accompanied by paratextual materials that signal the new reading underlying the new translation (Venuti, 2013). What is central to the act of retranslation is the emphasis laid on flagging the distinction of the new translation from earlier versions, which is usually couched in paratexts (Gürçağlar, 2020). Examining the paratexts of retranslations can reveal a host of conditions, be they ideological, cultural, social, or economic, that shape the process of retranslation (Deane-Cox, 2014). The positionings realized in paratexts guide the reader down a specific path for interpreting the target text (Hermans, 2020).

Paratexts are divided into two main types: peritext and epitext. The former falls out of the scope of the study. An epitext refers to “any paratextual element not materially appended to the text within the same volume but circulating, as it were, freely, in a virtually limitless physical and social space. The location of the epitext is therefore anywhere outside the book” (Genette, 1987/1997, p. 344).

Reviews are considerably important paratextual elements in the study of different forms of cultural products (Batchelor, 2018). Epitexts, such as interviews, can be instrumental in unveiling how translators position themselves apropos of a variety of issues, such as their roles as well as their perception of translation and other translators (Hermans, 2020). The epitextual materials of reviews and censure set the scene for the reception of retranslations of canonical texts; they unveil the reasons behind the emergence of new translations and may “wax nostalgic about the era of grand style” (Gulyás, 2022, p. 230). Against this backdrop, an epitextual analysis is adopted to reveal how the Egyptian Arabic retranslation is entangled in a web of competing language ideologies, which further explains the reasons behind its antagonistic reception.

2.2. *Data of the Study*

The data of the study are gleaned from the epitexts of the Egyptian Arabic retranslation of Hemingway's novella *The Old Man and the Sea*. These epitexts encompass articles that feature the translator and the publisher's motivations for the retranslation under exploration as well as the critical reviews of it. These epitexts are analyzed in the light of the sociolinguistic concepts of diglossia, language ideologies, and indexicality. The critical reviews are also analyzed in reference to the reception-related concept of horizon of expectations.

3. Epitextual Analysis

3.1. *Interview: Motivations Behind the Egyptian Arabic Retranslation*

The translator and the publisher's motives behind using Egyptian Arabic in the retranslation of Hemingway's novella are outlined in an interview published in an article entitled *ترجمة رواية هيمنغواي "العجوز والبحر" إلى العامية المصرية تثير جدلاً* (Translating Hemingway's Novella *The Old Man and the Sea* into the Egyptian Vernacular Stirs Controversy) by Al-Said (2023). The first lines of the article read:

أثار إعلان دار نشر مصرية عزمها إصدار ترجمة جديدة باللهجة العامية لرواية "العجوز والبحر" للكاتب الأميركي الشهير إرنست هيمنغواي، جدلاً ثقافياً محتدماً، حول استخدام اللهجات المحلية وسيطاً لنقل أعمال أدبية كلاسيكية. وبينما اعتبر نقاد ومثقفون الخطوة "قضية خاسرة"، وأن كل محاولات كتابة أو ترجمة الأدب بغير اللغة العربية الفصحى "لم تحقق نجاحاً يذكر"، دافع منتجو ترجمة الرواية عن موقفهم بأنهم يحاولون تذويب الفوارق بين اللغة المكتوبة والمحكية، و"إعادة القارئ المصري إلى جذوره"، لافتين إلى أن "اللغة المصرية" ساهمت في بناء القوة الناعمة لمصر على امتداد المنطقة العربية.¹

An announcement by an Egyptian publishing house of its intention to release a new translation of famous American writer Ernest Hemingway's novella *The Old Man and the Sea* in the vernacular has stirred a heated cultural controversy on the use of local dialects as a medium for transferring classic literary works. While critics and literati considered the step "a lost cause" and all attempts to write literature in or translate it into a language other than fusha "barely successful," the producers of the translation defended their stance, saying that they are trying to dissolve the differences between the written and spoken language and to "bring the Egyptian reader back to their roots," noting that "the Egyptian language" has contributed to building the soft power of Egypt along the Arab region.

With the likening of the use of Egyptian Arabic in the retranslation to going back to the roots, the discourse of Egyptian nationalism enters the picture where Egyptian Arabic is perceived as an index of a genuine Egyptian identity. The use of Egyptian Arabic in the writing domain is a crucial factor in the birth of Egyptian nationalism. By virtue of the nationalist timbre of Egyptian Arabic, siding with it is akin to remedying the Egyptian identity. In this context, Egyptian Arabic is deemed prestigious and authentic. The association the translator draws between Egyptian Arabic and soft power highlights the centrality of Egyptian Arabic in materializing particular ideological goals and its significant status in the Arab world. Attributing the retranslation to an attempt at narrowing the gap between the spoken variety and fusha conjures up the diglossic question where the two varieties occupy hierarchical positions (i.e., Egyptian Arabic is the low variety, whereas fusha is the high variety) and are assigned specific domains to function in. Given this

¹ All translations of the Arabic extracts into English are mine.

dichotomous relation, attempts to override the prescribed hierarchical order and to widen the fields where Egyptian Arabic can be used as a writing language are frowned upon. This idea is manifested in describing the use of Egyptian Arabic in literary translation as “a lost cause” and claiming that translations in Egyptian Arabic are nugatory.

The choice of Egyptian Arabic in translation is an attempt by the translator to ideologically mark his oppositional stance on claims of the inadequacy of Egyptian Arabic as a medium for literary expression as shown in the following:

وقال مجدي عبد الهادي، مترجم الرواية ... إن فكرته الأساسية من وراء ترجمة عمل روائي معروف لكاتب سبق له الفوز بجائزة "نوبل" للآداب (عام ١٩٥٤) هي: "لحض الادعاء بأن اللغة المصرية الحديثة التي توصف بأنها (عامية) لا تصلح لكتابة الأدب رفيع المستوى". وأبدى عبد الهادي الذي تحدث لـ"الشرق الأوسط" من العاصمة البريطانية لندن، وأصر على صياغة إجاباته بالعامية المصرية، اعتراضه على وصف ما يعتبره "اللغة المصرية" بـ"العامية"، مؤكداً أن هذا الوصف "غير علمي".

Magdy Abdelhadi, the translator of the novella ... said that his main idea behind translating a famous novella by a writer who won the Nobel Prize in literature in 1954 is to “refute the claim that the modern Egyptian language, which is described as being (colloquial), is not suitable for writing high literature.” Abdelhadi, who spoke to “Asharq Al-Awsat” from London and insisted on answering in the Egyptian vernacular, expressed his rejection of calling what he considers “the Egyptian language” “colloquial,” stressing that this is “unscientific.”

Abdelhadi's vernacular retranslation amounts to an ideological statement whereby he tries to debunk the myth of the unsuitability of Egyptian Arabic in literary translation by using it in the retranslation of a high-brow literary text. The age-old debate about the inadequacy of Egyptian Arabic, the low variety as per the principle of Arabic diglossia, as a medium for writing or translating authoritative texts is an integral aspect in the conflicting language ideologies underpinning the scrutinized epitexts. Language attitude toward fusha is for the most part positive given its association with the Quran. Understandably, fusha has accumulated a host of positive indexes related to tradition, literary legacy, eloquence, and pan-Arab identity.

Conversely, the attitudes to the colloquial varieties of Arabic are mostly negative; these varieties are deemed debased and subordinate to fusha. The inveterate antipathy toward the use of Egyptian Arabic in writing stems from its perception as a sullied version of Arabic. Taking issue with qualifying Egyptian Arabic as a colloquial variety can be construed as the translator's rejection of the classicist view of Egyptian Arabic that pigeonholes it as the variety of the laity that fits quotidian dealings, hence its unfitness as a literary conduit due to its alleged weak capacity of expressiveness and strong association with illiteracy. The retranslation is thereby an attempt to de-minoritize Egyptian Arabic and standardize its use in literary translation. The translator's insistence on using Egyptian Arabic in the interview substantiates the argument that the use of a particular variety is reflective of a particular stance. It further reinforces his positive language attitude toward Egyptian Arabic.

Another reason that triggered Abdelhadi's retranslation is outlined in the following extract:

قال عبد الهادي إن هناك بالفعل أكثر من ترجمة لرواية "العجوز والبحر"؛ إلا أنه يعيب على تلك الترجمات "افتقارها إلى البساطة بتاعة أسلوب هيمنغواي، وده أكثر شيء بيميز أسلوبه السردي والذي حصل بسببه علا جائزة نوبل"، معرباً عن اعتقاده بأن "اللغة المصرية أقدر في توصيل البساطة دي من العربية الكلاسيكية".

Abdelhadi said there is indeed more than one translation for *The Old Man and the Sea*; however, these translations "lack Hemingway's simple style, which distinguishes his narrative style the most and because of which he earned a Nobel Prize," expressing his belief that "the Egyptian language is more capable of conveying this simplicity than Classical Arabic."

As mentioned earlier, it is common practice for those embarking on the act of retranslation to point out the inadequacy of previous translations in a bid to mark the distinction of their works by resorting to non-standard strategies. By highlighting pitfalls and inaccuracies in the previous Arabic versions of Hemingway's novella, Abdelhadi's retranslation can be viewed as playing a restorative role via deploying the marked variety of Egyptian Arabic. Another point of significance concerning the use of Egyptian Arabic in literature is its harmonious tie with simplicity and realism. The translator argues

that the previous translations do not reflect the simple style that marks Hemingway's novella. That is why he attempts to recuperate Hemingway's stylistic felicity, his down-to-earth literary style through using the vernacular to lend verisimilitude to the translation.

A further reason for the use of Egyptian Arabic is provided in the following extract:

وحول الانتقادات الموجهة للعمل باعتباره محاولة للالتفاف على اللغة العربية الفصحى المفهومة في مختلف المجتمعات العربية، قال عبد الهادي إن تلك الانتقادات "غير دقيقة" لأنها تتجاهل أن المواطن العربي استمتع وتفاعل مع أعمال بـ"اللغة المصرية"، وتجاوب مع روائع كتبها شعراء مثل: بيرم التونسي، وأحمد رامي، وعبد الرحمن الأبنودي، وصلاح جاهين، وفؤاد حداد، معتبراً إنتاج هؤلاء الشعراء باللهجة المصرية "إرثاً جباراً من الإنتاج الأدبي". وأضاف أن كتابة روايات أو ترجمة روايات للقارئ المصري بلغته التي يتحدث بها "تستهدف خلق تراكم في مجال السرد والرواية بلغة الناس، ومع الوقت يتراكم عندنا إحنا المصريين إرث روائي زي ما حصل مع الشعر" ... ويرفض المترجم ... الانتفاص من كتابة أو ترجمة الأعمال الأدبية باللهجة العامية، مؤكداً أن "الناس اللي بتوصف الكتابة والترجمة للمصري انحطاط بيوصموا المجتمع كله بالانحطاط"، ويضيف: "المصرية هي اللغة اللي الشعب المصري كله معجون بيها وفيها، وأنتج كم من المسرحيات والأفلام والشعر الرائع بيها، والمصرية لغة الحياة والفن ولغة الشعب كله ومش بس لغة العامة".

Concerning the criticism levelled at the retranslation for being considered an attempt to get around fusha, which is understood in all Arab societies, Abdelhadi said that those criticisms are "inaccurate" because they ignore that the Arab citizens enjoyed, interacted with works in "the Egyptian language," and appreciated masterpieces written by poets, such as Bayram Al-Tunisi, Ahmed Rami, Abdel Rahman Al-Abnudi, Salah Jahin, and Fouad Haddad. He regards those poets' productions in the Egyptian dialect as "an immense legacy of literary production." He added that writing novels or translating them for Egyptian readers using their language that they speak "aims at creating a canon in the field of novels in people's language, and in time we, the Egyptians, will have a novel legacy just like the poetry one" ... The translator ... rejects the denigration of writing or translating literary works using the vernacular, stressing that "people who call writing in and translating into Egyptian disparaging disparage the whole society," adding that "Egyptian is the language the whole Egyptian people are fluent in and in which they produced many marvelous plays, movies, and poems. Egyptian is the

language of life, art, and all the people, not just the language of the commoners.”

The retranslation defies the dyed-in-the-wool belief that Egyptian Arabic is not adequate for literature. Abdelhadi's retranslation advocates the expansion of Egyptian Arabic beyond being merely a vehicle for verbal interaction and its development into a literary language. The retranslation can be viewed as a constituent in a nationalist project aimed at creating a literary canon in the vernacular, which can break down the hegemonic status of fusha as the sole medium for literary expression. Abdelhadi further gainsays the classicist view of Egyptian Arabic, which is the corollary of the hierarchical rationale underlying Arabic diglossia. The denigration that has been plaguing Egyptian Arabic for many years has resulted in the inferior status it occupies in the eyes of a segment of its speakers and the belief that it is a corrupt version of fusha. The translator capitalizes on the retranslation to decenter the literary hegemony of fusha and destigmatize the vernacular, arguing that it is the language of all Egyptians that is effectively employed in different walks of life.

The publisher concurs with the translator's defensive position apropos of the vernacularized retranslation as shown in the following extract from the same aforementioned Asharq Al-Awsat article:

من جانبه، يدافع رجائي موسى، مدير النشر بدار "هَنْ"، المصدرة للترجمة العامية لرواية "العجوز والبحر"، عما يسميه "النشر باللغة المصرية"، ويقول إن تجربة "العجوز والبحر" هي الثالثة للدار، فقد سبق أن أصدرت رواية "الغريب" للكاتب الفرنسي ألبير كامو، و"الأمير الصغير" للكاتب الفرنسي أنطوان دو سانت إكزوبيري، لافتاً إلى أن العاملين السابقين "لم يحققوا ربحاً تجارياً"؛ لكنه يبدي إصراراً على المواصلة، منطلقاً من "قناعة والتزام فكري وأدبي". ويقول موسى لـ"الشرق الأوسط" إن إصدار ترجمة بـ"اللغة المصرية" لرواية عالمية لا يتضمن بأي حال من الأحوال انتقاصاً من اللغة العربية، أو محاولة للهجوم عليها، لافتاً إلى أن العربية "باتت جزءاً من اللغة المصرية". ويتابع بأن "اللغة العامية المصرية هي التي منحت العربية ليونتها ومرونتها، واستطاعت الحفاظ على اللغة العربية إلى اليوم، بفضل انتشار الأعمال الدرامية والغنائية المصرية التي يستطيع كل مواطن عربي فهمها وتذوقها". ويضيف مدير النشر بدار "هَنْ" أن الدار لا تستهدف سوى القارئ المصري، وأبناء المصريين بالخارج الذين يقول إنهم يقبلون على شراء هذا النوع من الأعمال لتعليم أبنائهم اللهجة المصرية، فضلاً عن الأجانب الذين يقبلون على تعلم اللغة المصرية ليتحدثوا بها، ولا يتحدثون الفصحى. ويستشهد رجائي موسى بأن شعر الفصحى للشاعر أحمد شوقي "لم يخلد" مثل الأعمال التي كتبها بـ"اللغة المصرية" للموسيقار محمد عبد الوهاب، وأن قصائد الشاعر أحمد رامى بالفصحى "لا يكاد يعرفها أحد"، مقارنة بأغانيه التي كتبها لأُم كلثوم، معتبراً أن الإصرار على "فرض"

لغة قراءة مختلفة عن لغة الحديث "مسألة غريبة"، معرباً عن "صدمته من المصريين الذين ينتكرون للغتهم"، ويريدون التعامل بلغة غير منطوقة في حياتهم اليومية.

For his part, Ragai Moussa, the director of "Hunna" publishing house that released the vernacular translation of *The Old Man and the Sea*, defends what he calls "publishing in the Egyptian language," saying that *The Old Man and the Sea* is the third publication in this respect by the publishing house. It released the Egyptian translations of French writer Albert Camus's *The Stranger* and French writer Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *The Little Prince*. He pointed out that these two translations "were not commercially successful"; however, he insists on continuing out of "intellectual and literary commitment and conviction." Moussa tells "Asharq Al-Awsat" that the publication of a translation of a world novel in "the Egyptian language" entails by no means a belittling or an attack of the Arabic language, noting that the Arabic language "has become part of the Egyptian language" and that "the Egyptian vernacular is what gave Arabic flexibility and managed to preserve it up till this day thanks to the spread of Egyptian series and songs, which are understood and enjoyed by every Arab citizen." The director of "Hunna" adds that the publishing house targets only Egyptian readers, the children of Egyptians living abroad, who he says are keen on purchasing this kind of works to teach their children the Egyptian dialect, and foreigners who are eager to learn the Egyptian language to speak in it and not fusha. Ragai Moussa cites that the fusha poetry by poet Ahmed Shawqi "did not survive" like the works he wrote in "the Egyptian language" for musician Mohamed Abdel Wahab and that the fusha poems by poet Ahmed Ramy "are barely known by anyone" in comparison to the songs he wrote for Oum Kalthoum. He considers the insistence on "imposing" a reading language different from the spoken language "a strange issue," expressing "his shock at Egyptians who discredit their language" and want to use a language not spoken in their daily lives.

The publisher's insistence on producing Egyptian retranslations of prestigious literary works despite their being economically unrewarding attests to the argument adopted herein, that is, the choice of Egyptian Arabic in retranslating Hemingway's novella is not random but rather serves a particular cause, namely the

promotion of the fitness of Egyptian Arabic as a medium for literary translation. The publisher's mention of the fusion of the Arabic language (fusha) into the Egyptian language evokes a milestone in the history of Egypt when it was conquered by the Arabs in the seventh century. The claim that Egypt possesses an autonomous identity is based on the fact that Coptic was the mother tongue of Egyptians prior to the Arab conquest of Egypt, that Egypt was the cradle of the Pharaonic civilization, and that Egypt's national boundaries remained unchanged in contrast to other Arab countries (Haeri, 2003). The publisher's staunch advocacy for the Egyptian language is manifested in his argument that it helped fusha survive, which reinforces the potency of the Egyptian language and its capacity to be interpretable across the Arab world. Apart from supporting the cause of the adequacy of Egyptian Arabic in literary translation, the publisher claims that publications in Egyptian Arabic serve educational purposes, thereby situating them within a particular niche, which further reinforces the intellectual weight of the vernacular. His defense of Egyptian Arabic extends to the claim that the songs written in it are more memorable than those produced in fusha. He is opposed to the standardization of one literary language that is distinct from the language spoken by the Egyptians. This confinement of literary language to fusha has resulted in dismissing Egyptian Arabic as incompatible with literary translation and exacerbating its diglossia-imposed low status. The publisher's motivations for the unorthodox use of Egyptian Arabic in retranslation are interlaced with positive indexes of Egyptian Arabic, such as genuineness and puissance. It becomes clear how he, like the translator, advocates an oppositional language ideology that pivots on de-minoritizing Egyptian Arabic and promoting it as a language, not a dialect, that can be perfectly employed in the translation of prestigious literature.

3.2. *Critical Reviews*

One review that takes issue with the Egyptian Arabic retranslation features in the aforementioned Asharq Al-Awsat article:

اعتبر الكاتب والروائي عزت القمحاوي محاولات الكتابة باللغات المحلية، ومن بينها العامية المصرية "قضية خاسرة"؛ مشيراً إلى أن اللهجة العامية "سريعة التحول والتغير"، وألفاظها "تتقدم بسرعة شديدة"، وهو ما يتنافى مع اللغة التي ينبغي أن تمتاز بها لغة الأدب من ديمومة واستمرارية، لتقرأها أجيال متتابعة... واعتبر القمحاوي اختيار ترجمة روايات عالمية بالعامية

مجلة وادي النيل للدراسات والبحوث الإنسانية والاجتماعية والتربوية (مجلة علمية محكمة)

المصرية "خياراً شديداً السوء"، وأن لجوء بعض الكتاب والمترجمين لتقديم أعمال باللهجات العامية هو "نوع من العجز، وتراجع للمستوى الثقافي"، لافتاً إلى أن اللغة العربية الفصحى "تتسع لكل أشكال التعبير والإبداع".

Writer and novelist Ezzat Al-Qamhawy considered attempts to write in local dialects, including the Egyptian vernacular, "a lost cause," noting that the colloquial dialect "transforms and changes rapidly," and its terms "become outdated really fast," which runs counter to the language of literature that should be characterized by permanence so that successive generations can read it ... Al-Qamhawy considered the translation of world novels into the Egyptian vernacular "a really bad choice" and the resort of some writers and translators to the production of works in colloquial dialects "a form of ineptitude and cultural regression," indicating that fusha "fits all forms of expression and creativity."

The issue of linguistic purism is well evinced in Al-Qamhawy's fulmination against the use of Egyptian Arabic in translation; fusha is valorized as the only authentic language that is associated with sublimeness in comparison with the debased colloquial varieties. Al-Qamhawy's criticism articulates the standard language ideology which is impregnated with bias toward and positive indexes of fusha. This standard language ideology rests on suppressing variation; accordingly, attempts to use colloquial varieties, such as Egyptian Arabic, are often met with skepticism and resistance. The use of Egyptian Arabic is not in harmony with the horizon of expectations of the reviewer, which is informed by the norm of using the unmarked standard language, fusha, in translating a canonical literary text like Hemingway's novella given the unmatched ability of fusha to preserve literariness.

In the article entitled *الترجمة ومعركة العامية والفصحى في مصر* (Translation and the Fusha-Vernacular Fight) by Ali (2023), the author contemplates the reasons behind the fury that surrounds the retranslation of Hemingway's novella into Egyptian Arabic in particular and literary texts in general:

ولعل ما أثار حفيظة النقاد والقراء هو وصف الترجمات بأنها إلى اللغة المصرية وليس اللهجة العامية، والحديث عن أنها لغة مستقلة يجب أن تصبح اللغة القومية لمصر. يرى

بعض النقاد، مثل الأديب أحمد الخميسي والناقد أحمد كريم بلال، أن هذه الدعوات تحمل في طياتها خطابًا شعبيًا وطعنًا في الهوية العربية وقطيعة مع التراث الإسلامي.

Perhaps what aroused the critics and readers' anger is saying that the translations are into the Egyptian language and not the colloquial dialect and talking about it as being an independent language that should become Egypt's national language. Some critics, like author Ahmed Al-Khamisi and Ahmed Karim Bilal, believe that such calls comprise a populist rhetoric, an attack on Arab identity, and a break with Islamic heritage.

This polemic can be interpreted with reference to the conflict between the standard language ideology (fusha) and the oppositional language ideology (Egyptian Arabic). It voices a national concern and echoes the notion of language anxiety, where the use of Egyptian Arabic in translation in defiance of fusha is deemed a threat to Arab identity and a dissociation from Islam. Language ideologies offer a one-sided view of a particular phenomenon, and this partisan view is more advantageous to certain actors than others. In the context of the conflict between fusha and Egyptian Arabic, the standard language ideology associated with fusha offers a partial view of it; it is the language of the Quran that unities the Arabs and should thus be preserved, which secures the domination of the social actors, who subscribe to this ideology, over the field of cultural production and political power (Woolard, 2021). Ideology-infused discourses concerning the use of fusha and Egyptian Arabic in Egypt are intertwined with two contesting forms of national identity, namely the Egyptian and the pan-Arab. Fusha is the language of Islam, ergo the indisputability of the tight-knit bond between a person's identity as an Arab as well as their affiliation to Islam. Moreover, this intricate link between fusha and Islam renders those who advocate the use of Egyptian Arabic in literary translation separatist since colloquial varieties are viewed as menacing to the unity of the Arabic-speaking countries. Those who adamantly advocate fusha disparage the vernacular and maintain that it should be regarded as neither an index nor a constituent of an Arab national identity. Fusha, on the other hand, should be the sole index of a genuine national identity, and this is what pan-Arab nationalism is premised on.

The dangers posed to fusha by translating into Egyptian Arabic are also discussed in an article entitled *الخطر القادم من الداخل: من أي ناحية يتربص الموت باللغة العربية؟* (The Danger from the Inside: From Which Side Does Death Ensnare Fusha?) by Kuwaiti author Layla Al-Ammar. After writing a few lines related to the publication of Hemingway's novella in Egyptian Arabic, Al-Ammar (2023) mentions Moustafa Safouan's call to use the spoken varieties in the writing domain and takes umbrage at it:

في كتابه "لماذا العرب ليسوا أحراراً؟"، يطرح صفوان فرضية مثيرة للجدل مفادها أن التقدم العربي يتطلب احتضان لهجاتنا المنطوقة واستخدامها في الكتابة ... ربما يكون أكبر خطأ وقع فيه مصطفى صفوان هو اعتبار المصرية لغة وليست لهجة من اللهجات العربية. ما معنى أن نسمي شيئاً ما "لغة"؟ كيف يمكن أن يمثل هذا خطراً علينا كعرب؟ ما الآثار المترتبة على تجسيد المصرية (أو أي لهجة أخرى) كلغة مكتوبة؟ ... إذا كان السعودي يفهم اللهجة المصرية حين يسمعها في أغنية متداولة أو من زميل مصري، فلماذا لا يفهم رواية مكتوبة بها؟ الأمر برمته يتعلق بمتطلبات اللغة المكتوبة، وهو ما يمكن أن يفصل اللهجات العربية عن مصدرها الأصلي المشترك، وبالتالي يجردنا من فكرة العروبة التي نتشاركها.

In his book *Why are Arabs not Free?* Safouan poses a controversial hypothesis that says that Arab progress requires embracing our spoken dialects and using them in writing ... Perhaps Moustafa Safouan's greatest mistake is considering Egyptian a language and not an Arabic dialect. What does calling something "a language" mean? How can this constitute a threat to us, the Arabs? What are the consequences of using Egyptian (or any other dialect) as a written language? ... If a Saudi can understand the Egyptian vernacular when they hear it in a popular song or from an Egyptian colleague, why can't they understand a novel written in it? The whole thing is related to the requirements of the written language, which could sever the Arabic dialects from their common source of origin, consequently stripping us of the idea of pan-Arabism that we share.

The title of the article is a most telling indication of the antagonistic perception of the vernacular. The latter is likened to a malicious threat endangering fusha. The reviewer brings up the controversy of what qualifies as a language. The specter of the division of the Arabs rears its ugly head with the calls for expanding the remit of Egyptian Arabic and using it in the writing domain. Such calls are viewed with suspicion because of their imperialist baggage;

the British colonizers played a substantial role in accentuating the importance of Egyptian Arabic in a bid to underscore the uniqueness of the Egyptian identity as an alternative to Egypt's Arab identity. That is why these calls are deemed conspiratorial and menacing to the unity of the Arab countries; consequently, they are lambasted.

Another criticism is levelled by novelist Sherif Shaaban in an article by Mamdouh (2023) entitled *شريف شعيبان: لا يمكن للعامية المصرية أن تتحول للغة أدب مكتوب* (Sherif Shaaban: The Egyptian Vernacular Cannot Be Turned into a Written Literary Language):

بما أن العامية لهجة منطوقة لا تكتب فإن استخدامها لكتابة عمل أدبي بل وترجمة عمل كلاسيكي أجنبي يجعل من العمل هشاً ضعيفاً، ويحط من السرد ... تكمن الخطورة في الاعتماد على العامية في كتابة أعمال أدبية كاملة في قطع التواصل بين قراء وكتّاب الأدب العربي، حيث المفردات الخاصة لكل قومية في الأدب العامي تجعل تلك القومية منعزلة متعصبة للهجتها ويزيد من حالة الانفصال والتفكك، في الوقت الذي يوحد الأدب العربي الناطقين بلغته من المحيط إلى الخليج.

Since the vernacular is spoken and not written, using it in writing a literary work and even translating a foreign classic work makes the work fragile and denigrates narration ... The danger of relying on the vernacular in writing complete literary works lies in severing the connection between the readers and writers of Arabic literature as the vocabulary peculiar to each nationality in colloquial literature renders this nationality isolated and fanatic about its dialect and increases separation and disintegration, whereas Arabic literature unites Arabic speakers from the ocean to the gulf.

Shaaban's criticism pivots on casting doubt on the appropriateness of employing Egyptian Arabic in writing given its oral nature, evoking its deep-rooted negative index of linguistic corruption and frailty. Another negative index of Egyptian Arabic is its association with the peril of disintegration. The negative indexes featured in this review are brought into sharp focus with their contrast with fusha, the salient positive index of which is its unifying force in the Arab world.

A critical review is penned by Egyptian writer Ahmed Al-Khamisi in his article *مغالطات الترجمة إلى العامية* (The Fallacies of Translating into the Vernacular):

المستهدف من وراء تلك المحاولات لتضخيم العامية هو أولاً: ضرب اللغة الفصيحة الميسرة التي تجمع كل فئات وطبقات الوطن، مما يعني مباشرة تفتيت الوطن ذاته بهدم أقوى مرتكزاته أي وسيلة التفاهم بين الجميع. ثانياً: ضرب فكرة الثقافة العربية التي تقوم على اللغة المشتركة ... أخيراً لقد كان ومازال تفتيت اللغة التي توحد الأمة هدفاً للمستشرقين أنصار الاستعمار الإنجليزي، وفي ذلك السياق وضع ويلهلم سبيتا كتابه "لهجات المصريين العامية" عام ١٨٨٠، وتبعه ولیم ويلكوكس أحد رجال الاستعمار البريطاني وكان مهندساً للري في مصر حين ترجم مقطوعات لشكسبير بالعامية في ١٨٩٢، ومازال البعض يخوضون في ذلك عن وعي، والبعض الآخر عن جهل وخطب بين اللغات واللهجات.

Those attempts to promote the vernacular aim at, firstly, undermining fusha, the easy language that connects all categories and classes of the nation, which means directly fragmenting the very nation through destroying its firmest pillar—the means of understanding among everybody; secondly, subverting the notion of Arabic culture that is based on the common language. Finally, fragmenting the language that unites the nation has been and still is the aim of orientalists who are pro-British colonialism. In this regard, Wilhelm Spitta wrote his book *The Grammar of the Spoken Arabic Dialects of Egypt* in 1880. Following his lead, William Willcox, a British colonial irrigation engineer in Egypt, translated works by Shakespeare into the vernacular in 1892. Some still engage in this consciously, while others do so out of ignorance and confusion between languages and dialects.

Al-Khamisi (2023) looks askance at the attempts to use Egyptian Arabic owing to their orientalist and colonialist underpinnings. His criticism is predicated on the pan-Arab nationalist belief that fusha is the language that bears the onus of unifying the Arab countries and defying colonialist endeavors to debilitate it, and such endeavors rest on promoting Egyptian Arabic as a potent written language. The negative indexes of Egyptian Arabic are manifested in its being demonized as a possible inducer of dialect fanaticism and Arab fragmentation, encapsulating the language anxiety of those upholding the standard language ideology.

In view of the above critical reviews, the dissonance between the retranslation and the readers' horizon of expectations is manifested in the negative evaluative language used in these critical reviews. The linguistic binarism that exists between Egyptian Arabic

and fusha is evinced in the type of indexes they are associated with in nationalist discourses. Egyptian Arabic has positive indexes in the discourse of Egyptian nationalism and negative indexes in pan-Arab nationalism. On the other hand, fusha has positive indexes in the discourse of pan-Arab nationalism. In the Egyptian nationalist discourse, Egyptian Arabic is elevated to the status of a language, not a dialect, that has all the potential to serve as a literary conduit, just like fusha. This conviction is echoed in the translator and the publisher's defense of their retranslation. In the pan-Arab nationalist discourse, fusha is essentialized as the one and only viable written language. The divine origin of fusha has bestowed upon it an untouchable status to the extent that attempts to use Egyptian Arabic as an alternative are often met with suspicion, reducing its use to absurdity. Fusha wields an undebatable linguistic authority and is idealized as the powerful unifier of the Arabic-speaking world. All these aspects constitute the bedrock of the analyzed reviews that adopt a hostile attitude to the use of Egyptian Arabic in the retranslation of the novella in particular and in literary translation in general. The analysis of the epitexts highlights how Egyptian Arabic and fusha are ideologically polarized so much so that the adoption of the former in the retranslation of a classic literary text has entangled the retranslation in the issue of identity and nationalism.

Conclusion

The symbiotic relationship between translation studies, sociolinguistics, and reception studies crystallizes in the exploration of the language ideologies underpinning both Magdy Abdelhadi's 2023 Egyptian Arabic retranslation of Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* and the barrage of critical reviews the retranslation was met with. By using the marked low variety, the translator and the publisher align with the oppositional language ideology that valorizes Egyptian Arabic. The retranslation is an attempt to dispel the linguistic stigma bedeviling it. The epitextual analysis reveals the motivations for countering the norm of using fusha in literary translation where the latter reigns supreme as the only legitimate language for the translation of canonical texts. These motivations revolve around ameliorating Egyptian Arabic as the language that indexes the genuine identity of Egyptians, legitimizing the use of

Egyptian Arabic in literary translation, reclaiming Hemingway's simple literary style, contributing to the establishment of an Egyptian Arabic literary canon, and employing Egyptian Arabic literary translations for educational purposes. The analysis reveals how the strategic deployment of Egyptian Arabic embroils the retranslation in the matrix of identity and nationalism. Since language can symbolically serve as an index of identity and group affiliation, using the vernacular is tantamount to a form of allegiance to the cause of Egyptian nationalism and a genuine Egyptian identity, the substratum of which is the cognizance of Egyptian Arabic as a language, not a variety, that has all the potential to function effectively in the writing domain.

Since fusha, the high variety, and Egyptian Arabic, the low variety, are assigned certain domains to function in, using the latter in the literary domain that is monopolized by the former has resulted in an adverse reception of the retranslation. Vernacularizing a prestigious literary text is deemed iconoclastic as it rocks the foundations upon which rests the readers' horizon of expectations. The vitriolic criticism hurled at the publication of the Egyptian Arabic retranslation arises from defying and disrupting the readers' horizon of expectations that is undergirded by the standard language ideology. The latter idolizes fusha as the sole legitimate literary language. The negative reviews scrutinized in the present study rest on dismissing Egyptian Arabic as inadequate for writing and translating literature. The censure heaped on the use of Egyptian Arabic in retranslating Hemingway's novella is triggered by the belief that there is a firm connection between Egyptian Arabic and the threat of breaking the unity of the Arab countries. Different identity politics informed both the retranslation and its reception. While the assertion of a bona fide Egyptian identity, which is marked through the use of Egyptian Arabic in the fusha-monopolized domain of literary translation, underpins the retranslation, its adverse reception is anchored to the discourse of pan-Arab nationalism in which fusha is the index of a true Arab identity.

References

- Abdelhadi, M. (2023). *العجوز والبحر* [The old man and the sea]. Hunna/Elles.
- Aboelezz, M. (2017). The politics of pro-ammiyya language ideology in Egypt. In J. Høigilt & G. Mejdell (Eds.), *The politics of written language in the Arab world: Writing change* (pp. 212-238). Brill.
- Aboelezz, M. (2018). The Arabic language and political ideology. In E. Benmamoun & R. Bassiouney (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic linguistics* (pp. 504-517). Routledge.
- Al-Ammar, L. (2023, March 18). الخطر القادم من الداخل: من أي ناحية يتربص الموت باللغة العربية؟ [The danger from the inside: From which side does death ensnare fusha?]. *Manshoor*.
<https://manshoor.com/arts-and-culture/death-of-arabic-language/>
- Albachten, O. B., & Gürçağlar, S. T. (2019). Introduction. In O. B. Albachten & S. T. Gürçağlar (Eds.), *Perspectives on retranslation: Ideology, paratexts, methods* (pp. 1-7). Routledge.
- Ali, H. (2023, June 18). الترجمة ومعركة العامية والفصحى في مصر [Translation and the fusha- vernacular fight]. *Arabic Post*.
<https://arabicpost.live/opinions/2023/06/18/الترجمة-ومعركة-العامية-والفصحى-في-مصر/>
- Al-Khamisi, A. (2023, January 15). مغالطات الترجمة إلى العامية [The fallacies of translating into the vernacular]. *Diwan Al-Arab*.
<https://diwanalarab.com/مغالطات-الترجمة-إلى-العامية/>
- Al-Said, O. (2023, January 7). ترجمة رواية هيمنجواي "العجوز والبحر" إلى العامية المصرية تنثير جدلا [Translating Hemingway's novella The old man and the sea into the Egyptian vernacular stirs controversy]. *Asharq Al-Awsat*.
<https://aawsat.com/home/article/4085751/ترجمة-رواية-هيمنجواي-«العجوز-والبحر»-إلى-العامية-المصرية-تنثير-جدلاً>
- Al-Shaye, S. A. A. (2018). *The retranslation phenomenon: A sociological approach to the English translations of Dickens' Great Expectations into Arabic* [Doctoral dissertation, University College London].

- Álvarez, R., & Vidal, M. C.-A. (1996). Translating: A political act. In R. Álvarez & M. C.-A. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 1-9). Multilingual Matters.
- Angermeyer, P. S. (2020). Sociolinguistics. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (3rd ed., pp. 535-540). Routledge.
- Baldick, C. (2001). *The concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms*. Oxford University Press.
- Bassiouney, R. (2014). *Language and identity in modern Egypt*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Bassiouney, R. (2018). An alternative approach: Understanding diglossia/code switching through indexicality: The case of Egypt. In E. Benmamoun & R. Bassiouney (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic linguistics* (pp. 345-358). Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (1996). The meek or the mighty: Reappraising the role of the translator. In R. Álvarez & M. C.-A. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 10-24). Multilingual Matters.
- Batchelor, K. (2018). *Translation and paratexts*. Routledge.
- Boussofara-Omar, N. (2006). Diglossia. In K. Versteegh (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* (Vol. 1, pp. 629-637). Brill.
- Brems, E., & Pinto, S. R. (2013). Reception and translation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 4, pp. 142-147). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369-394). Blackwell Publishing.
- Cadera, S. M. (2017). Literary retranslation in context: A historical, social and cultural perspective. In S. M. Cadera & A. S. Walsh (Eds.), *Literary retranslation in context* (pp. 5-18). Peter Lang.
- Cadera, S. M., & Martín-Matas, P. (2017). Postcolonial literature retranslated into Spanish: The case of Chinua Achebe's *Things*

- Fall Apart. In S. M. Cadera & A. S. Walsh (Eds.), *Literary retranslation in context* (pp. 85-113). Peter Lang.
- Cadera, S. M., & Walsh, A. S. (2022). Retranslation and reception—A theoretical overview. In S. M. Cadera & A. S. Walsh (Eds.), *Retranslation and reception: Studies in a European context* (pp. 1-22). Brill.
- Chandler, D., & Munday, R. (2011). *A dictionary of media and communication* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Cronin, M. (2020). Minority. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (3rd ed., pp. 334-338). Routledge.
- Deane-Cox, S. (2014). *Retranslation: Translation, literature and reinterpretation*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- De Angelis, F. (2016). The Egyptian dialect for a democratic form of literature: Considerations for a modern language policy. In G. Grigore & G. Bițună (Eds.), *Arabic varieties: Far and wide: Proceedings of the 11th International Conference of AIDA* (pp. 193-201). Universităţii din Bucureşti.
- Desmidt, I. (2009). (Re)translation revisited. *Meta*, 54(4), 669-683. <https://doi.org/10.7202/038898ar>
- Fahmy, Z. (2011). *Ordinary Egyptians: Creating the modern nation through popular culture*. Stanford University Press.
- Gambier, Y. (2018). Translation studies, audiovisual translation and reception. In E. di Giovanni & Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Reception studies and audiovisual translation* (pp. 43-66). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation* (J. E. Lewin, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1987)
- Gulyás, A. (2022). Retranslations and their reception in context. In S. M. Cadera & A. S. Walsh (Eds.), *Retranslation and reception: Studies in a European context* (pp. 215-232). Brill.
- Gupta, P. (1998). Post- or neo-colonial translation? Linguistic inequality and translator's resistance. *Translation and Literature*, 7(2), 170-193. <http://doi.org/10.3366/tal.1998.7.2.170>
- Gürçağlar, S. T. (2011). Paratexts. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 113-116). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Gürçağlar, S. T. (2020). Retranslation. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (3rd ed., pp. 484-489). Routledge.
- Haeri, N. (2003). *Sacred language, ordinary people: Dilemmas of culture and politics in Egypt*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Håland, E. M. (2021). Vernacular varieties in recent Arabic literature. In K. C. Ryding & D. Wilmsen (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of Arabic linguistics* (pp. 565-582). Cambridge University Press.
- Hanna, S. (2009). Othello in the Egyptian vernacular: Negotiating the 'doxic' in drama translation and identity formation. *The Translator*, 15(1), 157-178.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2009.10799275>
- Hanna, S. (2016). *Bourdieu in translation studies: The socio-cultural dynamics of Shakespeare translation in Egypt*. Routledge.
- Hemingway, E. (1952). *The old man and the sea*. Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Hermans, T. (1996). Norms and the determination of translation: A theoretical framework. In R. Álvarez & M. C.-Á. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 25-51). Multilingual Matters.
- Hermans, T. (2020). Positioning. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (3rd ed., pp. 423-428). Routledge.
- Høigilt, J., & Mejdell, G. (2017). Introduction. In J. Høigilt & G. Mejdell (Eds.), *The politics of written language in the Arab world: Writing change* (pp. 1-17). Brill.
- Jauss, H. R. (1982). *Toward an aesthetic of reception* (T. Bahti, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Koskinen, K., & Paloposki, O. (2010). Retranslation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 294-298). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496-517). Blackwell Publishing.
- Kung, S.-W. (2013). Paratext, an alternative in boundary crossing: A complementary approach to translation analysis. In V. Pellatt

- (Ed.), *Text, extratext, metatext and paratext in translation* (pp. 49-68). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1994). Accent, standard language ideology, and discriminatory pretext in the courts. *Language in Society*, 23(2), 163-198. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500017826>
- Mamdouh, N. (2023, January 14). شريف شعبان: لا يمكن للعامية المصرية أن تتحول للغة أدب مكتوب [Sherif Shaaban: The Egyptian vernacular cannot be turned into a written literary language]. *Al-Dostor*. <https://www.dostor.org/4281442>
- Mathijssen, J. W. (2007). *The breach and the observance: Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation, with special reference to retranslations of Shakespeare's Hamlet (1777-2001)* [Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University]. <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/22151/index.htm?sequence=6>
- Mejdell, G. (2018). Diglossia. In E. Benmamoun & R. Bassiouney (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic linguistics* (pp. 332-344). Routledge.
- Nabulssi-Masefbas, Z. (2021). A whole branch of alternative scholarship–Wikipedia Masri and the modern Egyptian language movement. In A. Bareja-Starzyńska (Ed.), *Challenges of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach: New horizon in oriental studies* (pp. 176-189). Elipsa Dom Wydawniczy i Handlowy.
- Nelson, B., & Maher, B. (2013). Introduction. In B. Nelson & B. Maher (Eds.), *Perspectives on literature and translation: Creation, circulation, reception* (pp. 1-10). Routledge.
- O'Driscoll, K. (2011). *Retranslation through the centuries: Jules Verne in English*. Peter Lang.
- Pellatt, V. (2013). Introduction. In V. Pellatt (Ed.), *Text, extratext, metatext and paratext in translation* (pp. 1-6). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pérez, M. C. (2014). Introduction. In M. C. Pérez (Ed.), *Apropos of ideology: Translation studies on ideology–ideologies in translation studies* (pp. 1-22). Routledge.
- Pinto, S. R. (2012). Sociolinguistics and translation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 3, pp. 156-162). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Popa, I. (2018). Translation and communism in Eastern Europe. In F. Fernández & J. Evans (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and politics* (pp. 424-441). Routledge.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2001). The politics of language and the concept of linguistic identity. *Cauce*, (24), 17-28.
https://cvc.cervantes.es/literatura/cauce/pdf/cauce24/cauce24_03.pdf
- Rosenbaum, G. M. (2011). The rise and expansion of colloquial Egyptian Arabic as a literary language. In R. Sela-Sheffy & G. Toury (Eds.), *Culture contacts and the making of cultures: Papers in homage to Itamar Even-Zohar* (pp. 323-343). Unit of Culture Research, Tel Aviv University.
- Schäffner, C. (2014). Third ways and new centres: Ideological unity or difference? In M. C. Pérez (Ed.), *Apropos of ideology: Translation studies on ideology–ideologies in translation studies* (pp. 23-41). Routledge.
- St. André, J. (2003). Retranslation as argument: Canon formation, professionalization, and international rivalry in 19th century sinological translation. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 1(11), 59-93.
- Suleiman, Y. (2003). *The Arabic language and national identity: A study in ideology*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Suleiman, Y. (2013). *Arabic in the fray: Language ideology and cultural politics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Suleiman, Y. (2014). Arab(ic) language anxiety: Tracing a “condition.” *Al-Arabiyya*, 47, 57-81.
- Suleiman, Y., & Abdelhay, A. (2021). Diglossia, folk-linguistics, and language anxiety: The 2018 language ideological debate in Morocco. In R. Bassiouney & K. Walters (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic and identity* (pp. 147-160). Routledge.
- Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis, T., & Mesthrie, R. (2004). *A dictionary of sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Theodoropoulou, I. (2018). Social status, language, and society in the Arab world. In E. Benmamoun & R. Bassiouney (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic linguistics* (pp. 371-386). Routledge.

- Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic purism*. Longman.
- Urgorri, A. M. R. (2017). Retranslation as a reaction to ideological change: The history of Spanish versions of gay American twentieth-century novels. In S. M. Cadera & A. S. Walsh (Eds.), *Literary retranslation in context* (pp. 53-81). Peter Lang.
- Vandepitte, S. (2008). Remapping translation studies: Towards a translation studies ontology. *Meta*, 53(3), 569-588. <https://doi.org/10.7202/019240ar>
- Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation changes everything: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Walters, K. (2007). Language attitudes. In K. Versteegh (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* (Vol. 2, pp. 650-664). Brill.
- Walters, K. (2018). Arab nationalism and/as language ideology. In E. Benmamoun & R. Bassiouney (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic linguistics* (pp. 475-487). Routledge.
- Woodsworth, J. (1996). Language, translation and the promotion of national identity: Two test cases. *Target*, 8(2), 211-238. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.8.2.02woo>
- Woolard, K. A. (2021). Language ideology. In J. Stanlaw (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 1-21). John Wiley & Sons.
- Zhang, J. (2013). Translator's horizon of expectations and the inevitability of retranslation of literary works. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(8), 1412-1416. <https://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol03/08/16.pdf>