Loss and Gain in Narimān al-Shamly's Intralingual Translation of al-Maʿarrī's Risālat al-Ghufrān [Epistle of Forgiveness]

Loss and Gain in Narimān al-Shamly's Intralingual Translation of al-Maʿarrī's *Risālat al-Ghufrān* [Epistle of Forgiveness]^(*)

Dr. Heba Fawzy El-Masry
Lecturer of Translation Studies - Department of English Language and Literature
Faculty of Arts - Tanta University

Abstract

This study explores the loss and gain of meaning, content, and effect in Narimān al-Shamly's intralingual translation of al-Maʿarrī's *Risalat al-Ghufrān* [Epistle of Forgiveness] from classical Arabic into semi-literate spoken Arabic which is the level of Arabic used by Egyptians in their daily lives. The study employs the concept of translation universals as a basis for a method of analysis that assesses the success or failure of al-Shamly's translation strategies in conveying the meaning and merit of al-Maʿarrī's text into the translation. The study contributes to the field of translation studies by broadening our understanding of the little explored territory of updating classical Arabic texts through intralingual translation. It sheds light on the possible effects and consequences of the use of certain translation strategies which are usually associated with the translation universals that tend to appear in texts which are made easier to read for the target audience. The study can also help translators when they make conscious decisions during the process of translating a classical Arabic text into spoken Arabic dialects.

Keywords: intralingual translation, levels of contemporary Arabic, updating classical texts, translation universals

مستخلص:

تقوم هذه الدراسة بتقصي المكاسب والخسائر على مستوى المعنى والمحتوى والتأثير في الترجمة داخل اللغة الواحدة التي قدمتها ناريمان الشاملي لرسالة الغفران للمعري من خلال نقل الرسالة من فصحى التراث إلى عامية المثقفين، وهو مستوى اللغة العربية الذي يستخدمه المصريون في حياتهم اليومية، وتستخدم الدراسة فكرة القواسم المشتركة في الترجمة كأساس لطريقة تحليل تسعى إلى تقييم مدى نجاح أو فشل استراتيجيات الترجمة التي استخدمتها ناريمان الشاملي في نقل معنى وقيمة نص المعري ، وتساهم الدراسة في مجال دراسات الترجمة من خلال زيادة فهمنا لمجال تحديث النصوص العربية الكلاسيكية بواسطة الترجمة داخل اللغة الواحدة وهو مجال نال قدرا قليلا من الدراسة، كما تلقي الضوء على التأثيرات والعواقب المحتملة لاستخدام بعض الاستراتيجيات المرتبطة غالبا بفكرة القواسم المشتركة في الترجمة التي تميل إلى الظهور في النصوص المبسطة للجمهور المستهدف، ويمكن أن تقوم هذه الدراسة أيضا بمساعدة المترجمين عند اتخاذهم قرارات واعية خلال عملية الترجمة داخل اللغة الواحدة من فصحى التراث إلى اللهجات العربية المنطوقة المستخدمة في الحياة اليومية.

كلمات مفتاحية: الترجمة داخل اللغة الواحدة، مستويات اللغة العربية المعاصرة ، تحديث النصوص الكلاسيكية، القواسم المشتركة في الترجمة

Introduction

In his tripartite classification of translation types, Jakobson (1959) distinguishes between three types of translation which he labels as "intralingual translation", "interlingual translation", and "intersemiotic translation" (p. 233). The three types are defined as follows:

1. Intralingual translation or "rewording" is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language (Jakobson, 1959, p. 233).
2. Interlingual translation or "translation proper" is an interpretation

of verbal signs by means of verbal signs of some other language (Jakobson, 1959, p. 233).

3. Intersemiotic translation or "transmutation" is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems (Jakobson, 1959, p. 233).

Although generally acknowledged, intralingual translation and semiotic translation are often thought of as marginal translational phenomena (Zethsen, 2009, p. 797). Zethsen (2009) states that authors who write about translation often refer to Jakobson's tripartite classification because it basically serves "the purpose of defining translation", and that they mainly focus on studying interlingual translation (p. 797).

Baker (2009) states that translation scholars have a narrow definition of translation, and she stresses that intralingual translation is not a peripheral translation phenomenon as the lack of research about it in the field might suggest (p. xviii). Zethsen (2007) expresses her concern over the rarity of relevant research about intralingual translation in the field of translation studies (p. 282). Because of the research gap within the field, Zethsen (2009) calls for doing more research about intralingual translation in order to have a better description of it which may enable scholars to explore the extent to which it is similar to or different from interlingual translation (p. 810).

Although empirical study of intralingual translation is little, intralingual translation is common (Zethsen, 2009, p. 800). Instances of intralingual translation include forms of "expert-to-laymen communication", simplified versions of books which are made for children, subtitling for people with hearing impairment, new translations of classical works, etc. (Zethsen, 2009, p. 800). In these and other forms of intralingual translation, communicating the message within the same system of linguistic signs is often required to fulfil a need for accessibility to the text being translated. Contemporizing a classical text to make it accessible to modern Egyptian readers is what triggers Narimān al-Shamly's intralingual translation of al-Ma'arrī's *Risālat al-Ghufrān* [Epistle of Forgiveness]

(al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016) on which this study focuses.

In the case of classical literary works, the difficulty of reading the source text may result from the cultural change that increased fast because of new technologies (Savas, 2018, p. 190). Savas (2018) argues that new technologies change the way people communicate as well as their language and that the language of a book may thus be outdated in less than fifty years (p. 190). Therefore, Savas (2018) suggests that intralingual translation can relatively "prevent cultural alienation" as it may help the new readers to overcome the barriers that arise from the inevitable change in language (p. 190).

To make a classical text that was written in classical Arabic during the Abbasid Era accessible to modern Egyptian readers, al-Shamly translates the text into the level of Arabic language Egyptians speak in their everyday lives and makes many changes that make the translation easier to read (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, pp. 9-13). The changes reflect a dominating presence of simplification, explicitation, and conventionalisation or normalisation which are often called translation universals (Laviosa, 2009, pp. 307-308).

The present study, which revolves around al-Shamly's intralingual translation of *Risālat al-Ghufrān*, aims at investigating the loss and gain involved in contemporizing classical Arabic texts through intralingual translation. The study employs a method of analysis that is based on the three translation universals of simplification, explicitation, and conventionalisation or normalisation. Using the explanatory power of these universals which tend to appear in texts that aim at making source texts easier to read, the study assesses al-Shamly's translation decisions and highlights the possible consequences of using certain strategies in the intralingual translation of classical Arabic texts.

The Status of Intralingual Translation in the Field of Translation Studies

The acceptance of intralingual translation as a translational phenomenon is not unanimous in the field of translation studies. Zethsen (2007) clarifies that the regular exclusion of intralingual

translation from translation studies is deliberate or "de facto" (p. 19). Zethsen (2007) observes that some scholars have narrow definitions of translation which make them regard interlingual translation as the focus of translation theory, and she claims that Newmark has the most limited understanding of translation (p. 19). Newmark (1999) describes a definition of a translation activity that focuses on conveying a message from one language to another as "perfectly adequate" (p. 152). When discussing other translation activities which include ones that do not involve transferring the message between two different languages, Newmark (1981) calls them "restricted methods of translation" and states that they do not fall within the scope of translation theory (p. 12).

Other scholars who exclude intralingual translation from their definitions of translation include Schubert (2005) who claims that translation is "by definition interlingual" (p. 126), Mossop (2016) who states that the term "translation" should not be used to describe texts which are made easy for laymen through intralingual translation (p. 1), and Derrida (1985) who questions Jakobson's typology of translation. Derrida (1985) observes that the use of the term "proper" to refer to interlingual translation suggests that the other two types are not translations "in the 'proper' sense of the word 'translation'" and are thus deficient (p. 174).

However, many scholars argue in favour of regarding intralingual translation as a translational phenomenon that falls within the scope of translation studies. Steiner (1975) argues that any act of communication between human beings involves translation (p. 47). Therefore, he believes that a translation theory that is concerned with interlingual translation only is "damagingly restrictive", and he states that a translation theory that is concerned with all forms of "expressive articulation and interpretive reception" is a useful one (p. 279).

Hermans (1996) echoes Steiner's view that translation is part of each communicative act and states that the scope of translation theory can broaden when we regard understanding itself as translation

(para. 6). Hermans (1996) refers to two aspects of translation that make intralingual translation fall within the scope of translation studies: the first aspect is "cultural transmission and retrieval" which refers to the translator as an agent who enables the target audience to have access to the source text by removing barriers that prevent the audience from understanding the text (paras. 11-12), and the second aspect deals with translation as an imitation of another text that has a linguistic order (para. 12). Consequently, the task of the translator is to give access to any text regardless of the language in which it was originally produced.

Bakkal (2019) observes that there are no obvious criteria for telling how sufficiently different languages are (p. 51). In fact, there does not seem to be specific criteria that determine why a certain dialect becomes a language and vice versa (Zethsen & Hill-Madsen, 2016, p. 702). Zethsen and Hill-Madsen (2016) state that the role of socio-political conventions in drawing the boundaries between languages undermines the arguments which advocate using interlinguality as "a demarcation criterion for the concept of translation" and substantiates arguments which call for including intralingual translation in translation theory (p. 702). Hill-Madsen (2015) clarifies that there are internal barriers within the same linguistic systems such as the ones between different regional dialects or varieties (p. 87). He concludes that the act of transcending internal barriers which intralingual translation involves makes it and interlingual translation share a common core (Hill-Madsen, 2015, p. 87).

The arguments against regarding intralingual translation as a translational phenomenon that can be systematically studied seem to be rooted in the lack of definitional work about the concept of translation. Tymoczko (2005) argues that most scholars seem to believe that "the stage of defining translation is essentially over" (p. 1804). Schmid (2012) notes that translation theory and practice are interconnected and calls for more definitional work in the field to keep the concept of translation updated so that it can coexist with changes that come up in the domain of translation practice (p. 17).

To keep the concept of translation updated in accordance with modern developments, Zethsen (2009) proposes a more comprehensive description of translation (pp. 799-800). She describes the translational situation as follows:

> A source text exists or has existed at some point in time. A transfer has taken place and the target text has been derived from the source text (resulting in a new product in another language, genre or medium), i.e. some kind of relevant similarity exists between the source and the target texts. This relationship can take many forms and by no means rests on the concept of equivalence, but rather on the *skopos* of the target text (Zethsen, 2009, pp. 799-800).

Zethsen (2009) states that her description views translation as intrinsic in every act of human communication (p. 800). The description thereby pushes the limits of translation to make it include many forms of much needed communicative mediation, especially intralingual translation.

The Need for Intralingual Translation and the Four Parameters That Instigate It

Steiner (1975) states that literature needs to be constantly translated within its own language in order to live on and that it would die without this sort of animation (p. 29). He adds that art and literature continue to exist because of a perpetual act of intralingual translation that is often carried out unconsciously, and he states that it is no exaggeration to say "that we possess civilization because we have learnt to translate out of time" (Steiner, 1975, pp. 30-31).

Zethsen (2009) refers to four factors or parameters that lead to the existence of intralingual translation and that also seem to influence it: knowledge, time, culture, and space (pp. 805-807). The boundaries between the parameters are not "watertight" and any instance of intralingual translation is likely to be affected by more than one parameter (Zethsen, 2009, p. 805).

The parameter of knowledge revolves around the target audience's "ability to understand the text", how much they know

about a certain subject, or their level of proficiency in relation to a certain subject (Zethsen, 2009, p. 805). The parameter of time is related to temporal distance which necessitates the production of a new text (Zethsen, 2009, p. 806). The parameter of culture is related to "the need to explain cultural references" which can be unfamiliar to the target audience because of temporal distance or lack of general knowledge which may make it difficult for the target audience to understand the text even if the translation is done within the same linguistic system (Zethsen, 2009, p. 807). The parameter of space covers texts which are "either reduced or extended" (Zethsen, 2009, p. 807). Examples of reduced or extended texts include shortened versions of classical texts, subtitling that is made for people with hearing impairment, and extended texts where additions are inserted to make the text easier for target audiences who are expected to be unfamiliar with some information in the source text (Zethsen, 2009, p. 807).

al-Shamly's translation of *Risālat al-Ghufrān* (al-Maʿaarī, 1033/2016) seems to be instigated by the parameters of knowledge, culture, and time. In one of the sections that precede her translation—in which she explains the motives for translating the text, responds to predicted criticism, and explains her methodology— al-Shamly lists four reasons which made her translate the text into colloquial Egyptian Arabic:

1- She aims at bridging the big gap between modern Egyptians' everyday language and the language and style that was used in classical literary texts. She notes that the belief that modern readers can understand classics simply because they are written in Arabic is a myth.

2- She states that classics should not be only accessible to those who studied classical Arabic.

3- She states that it is the right of children and adolescents to read classics.

4- She notes that it is natural to produce new translations of older books in any language, and she gives Don Quixote as an example of classics which are retranslated every few years (al-Maʿarrī,

1033/2016, pp. 7-8).

She responds to criticism—which she expects to be voiced by conservative linguists—by stating that the renaissance of the Arab countries cannot take place if people are not familiar with their roots (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, p. 8). Savas (2018) states that the main function of language is to enable communication within a speech community (p. 186). As Denton (2007) clarifies, communication stops when it is not possible to activate the required "slots in the cognitive frame" (p. 248). The changes in language and culture which happened over time created barriers that now prevent many Egyptians from understanding Arabic classics due to their lack of knowledge of classical Arabic or the culture that these classical works describe. The three parameters of time, culture, and knowledge thus instigate al-Shamly's translation of *Risālat al-Ghufrān* whose update through intralingual translation al-Shamly finds necessary for transferring the cultural heritage of Arabs to the new generations.

All four parameters seem to influence al-Shamly's translation. Because of differences in culture brought about by time that leads to lack of knowledge, al-Shamly adds and removes parts from the text to avoid overloading the message with details she deems redundant or to explain culture-specific details that the readers are not expected to be familiar with (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, p. 11). The space parameter affects the translation because the translation is much shorter than the source text due to the translator's heavy dependence on the strategy of omission to simplify the text (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016).

al-Shamly says that she is translating al-Ma'arrī's text into the Egyptian language, which may suggest that she considers classical Arabic and colloquial Egyptian Arabic as two different languages (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, p. 6). However, her explanation of the level of language she translates *Risālat al-Ghufran* into shows that she is moving within the boundaries of the same language (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, p. 9). al-Shamly depends on al-Sa'īd Badawy's classification of the levels of contemporary Arabic language in Egypt when she discusses the level of language she uses in her translation

(al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 9). Badawy (1973) states that contemporary Arabic in Egypt has five levels: *fuṣḥa al-turāth* or classical Arabic, *fuṣḥa al-ʿasr* or modern standard Arabic, *ʿāmiyyat al-muthaqafīn* or educated spoken Arabic, *ʿāmiyyat al-mutanawerīn* or semi-literate spoken Arabic, and *ʿāmiyyat al-umiyyīn* or illiterate spoken Arabic (p. 83). Classical Arabic refers to traditional standard Arabic; it is almost exclusively learnt by students and scholars of al-Azhar (Badawy, 1973, p. 83). Modern standard Arabic refers to standard Arabic that is particularly influenced by contemporary civilisation (Badawy, 1973, p. 83). Badawy (1973) notes that this level is more widely used than classical Arabic, and he adds that it seems to be connected to all the subjects of our modern life (p. 84). Educated spoken Arabic is influenced by standard Arabic and contemporary civilisation (Badawy, 1973, p. 83). Badawy (1973) notes that this level is often used in discussions about abstract issues or in the intellectuals' discussions about issues related to civilisation such as education, politics, art, and social problems (p. 84). Semi-literate spoken Arabic is influenced by contemporary civilisation (Badawy, 1973, p. 83). Badawy (1973) states that this is the level of language that literate people usually use in their daily activities like shopping, selling, talking to family members, etc. (p. 85). Illiterate spoken Arabic is not influenced by standard language or by contemporary civilisation (Badawy, 1973, p. 83).

Badawy (1973) states that these levels are not completely isolated from each other and that they all have one origin which is the Arabic language (p. 92). Although there are no watertight boundaries between them, Badawy (1973) states that the different levels perform different functions, and that there are varying degrees of differences between these functions, explaining that some differences may be sharp and that others may be slight (p. 92). Badawy (1973) clarifies that almost every member of the Egyptian society can use more than one level except in rare cases and among illiterate people (p. 93).

al-Shamly clearly states that she translates *Risālat al-Ghufrān* from classical Arabic which is the first level of the Arabic language into semi-literate spoken Arabic which is the fourth level of

contemporary Arabic in Egypt according to Badawy's classification that she refers to and depends on when she discusses the level of language she chooses for her translation (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/ 2016, p. 10). By saying that she is moving from the first level to the fourth level in Badawy's classification of the levels of contemporary Arabic language in Egypt, she shows that she is doing intralingual translation. She explains that the fourth level will make the readers feel that they are listening to a family member narrating some situation in an uncomplicated and unaffected way (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 10). al-Shamly thus attempts to make the text easy to read by rewriting it in the language that people use in their everyday lives.

Typology of Intralingual Translation

Steiner (1975) borrows the linguists' diachronic/vertical and synchronic/horizontal distinction of language structure and applies it to intralingual translation to distinguish between its types (p. 31). Steiner (1975) states that the transmission of a message can be done internally across time and can also be done in space (p. 31). When it comes to the second type, he explains that languages which are used in a large geographical space will have regional dialects and that disparities between these dialects can be so great to the extent that comprehension may require a form of translation (Steiner, 1975, p. 31). He also adds that there can be differences within the same dialect between social classes (Steiner, 1975, p. 31). Based on Steiner's explanation of synchronic structure and transmission of language across classes, it can be said that the different levels of contemporary Arabic in Egypt reflect different levels of intellectual sophistication, education, or linguistic knowledge within the same language. In the case of al-Shamly's translation of *Risālat al-Ghufrān*, the translation seems to be done both diachronically and synchronically. There is a temporal distance between the time of the original text's production and the time of its reception which results in linguistic and cultural differences that trigger a new intralingual translation that is easier to read; hence, the translation is done across time. Although the level of the language of the source text is temporally distant, it has not totally disappeared and still coexists with other levels of the Arabic language

in Egypt because it is still known to the scholars and students of religious studies and classical Arabic literature. Therefore, the translation is done across different levels of the same language which are used by different groups within the same society.

Hill-Madsen (2015) refers to three types of intralingual translation: "diamesic", "diaphasic", and "diglossic" (p. 88). The diamesic type involves transmitting language between the written mode and the oral mode; a common example of this type is intralingual subtitling (Hill-Madsen, 2015, p. 88). Petrilli (2013) defines the diaphasic type as translation between registers (as cited in Hill-Madsen, 2015, p. 88). A common example of this type is expert-to-laymen translation which can be seen in daily situations such as conversations between physicians and patients (Hill-Madsen, 2015, p. 88). Petrilli (2013) states that the diglossic type of intralingual translation involves a standard dialect and a non-standard dialect (as cited in Hill-Madsen, 2015, p. 88), and Hill-Madsen (2015) observes that this definition needs to be expanded and gives American English versions of novels written in British English as an example of this type of intralingual translation (p. 88). According to this typology, al-Shamly's translation of *Risālat al-Ghufrān* is diaphasic because the translation is done between a language level that is almost exclusive to experts and a level that is used by educated laymen.

Translation Universals: Definition, Typology, and Adaption into a Descriptive Method of Analysis

As she explains the motivation behind her translation, al-Shamly makes it clear that her translation aims at making the classical text accessible to readers whose weak knowledge of classical Arabic does not enable them to read the original text (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, pp. 7-8). The aim of targeting a new audience dictates al-Shamly's decisions that eventually result in a translation that is simpler and much shorter than the original. The translation decisions of al-Shamly that make the text simpler can be understood in light of translation universals.

Before discussing translation universals, it must be noted that

their very existence is a matter of debate and that there is no consensus over the terminology that labels them. For example, Baker (1993) calls them "universals" (p. 243), Toury (1995) calls them "probabilistic laws" (p. 80), and Blum-Kulka (2000) chooses the word "hypothesis" to refer to an individual tendency that can qualify as a universal (p. 300). Toury (2004) claims that the search for regularities and generalisations that is central to science has not been a common practice in the field of translation and he even observes that some scholars met the concept of finding regulating patterns with hostility (p. 16). Some translation scholars insist that searching for the general in translation studies is not possible because scholars cannot get translations done in all languages or from all times (Mauranen & Kujamäki, 2004, p. 2)

However, the search for the general in translation studies found a strong advocate in Chesterman (2004) who is against the hostile attitude towards finding regularities in translation studies (p. 34). Chesterman (2004) states that any discipline needs to search for similarities between individual cases to form generalisations which may help scholars to make predictions in the future, and he observes that searching for regularities to make predictions about the future is essential for a discipline to progress or establish relations with other disciplines (p. 34). Chesterman (2004) adds that if an interdiscipline like translation studies ignores the need and search for generalisations, it will be stagnant (p. 34).

Despite the scepticism and lack of agreement regarding the existence of universals in translation, a growing interest in search for regulatory laws or universals in translation studies has been witnessed since the 1990s (Mauranen & Kujamäki, 2004, p. 1). In the realm of descriptive translation studies in particular, the term "universal" refers to "a general tendency…rather than an absolute truth" (Bernardini & Zanettin, 2004, p. 52), and that is the sense in which the term is used in this study. Toury (2004) states that what matters about universals is not their existence but rather their usefulness or "explanatory power" (p. 29), and the present study attempts to employ this power in analysing al-Shamly's translation.

According to Baker (1993), translation universals are linguistic features which often characterise translated texts and are generally regarded to be uninfluenced by certain linguistic systems (p. 243). She suggests that universals are the result of the constraints which are part of translation itself as a process and she proposes that this is the reason why they are "universal" and that "they do not vary across cultures" (Baker, 1993, p. 246). Baker (1993) suggests that a methodology that may be used to identify a universal is to isolate patterns which tend to occur in translated texts regardless of the target language and which do not occur or do not occur with the same frequency in the source text (p. 245). Intentionality is most probably involved in decisions relating to the use of universals which are taken to improve the target audience's reception of the translation (Kuusi, 2006, p. 108). However, translators are not necessarily always aware of the consequences of the use of universals or their impact on the target audience (Kuusi, 2006, p. 108).

Translation scholars classified universals in different ways. Under the list of potential universal differences between translations and their source texts, Baker (1993) lists "explicitation" (p. 243), "disambiguation and simplification", conventional grammar, "tendency to avoid repetition", and "tendency to exaggerate the target language's features" (p. 244).   Chesterman (2004) distinguishes between two types of universals: "S-universals" and "T-universals" (p. 39). S-universals refer to "differences between translations and their source texts", while T-universals refer to "differences between translations and comparable non-translated texts" (Chesterman, 2004, p. 39). In this classification, "explicitation" and reduction of repetition and "complex narrative voices" are listed under potential S-universals while simplification and conventionalisation are listed under potential T-universals (Chesterman, 2004, p. 40). Kuusi (2006) refers to three potential widespread features of translations which are "explicitation", "conventionalisation", and "simplification" (p. 101) and Laviosa (2009) discusses these three universals as the linguistic translation universals most notably studied in descriptive translation studies (p. 307). This section focuses on and briefly discusses these three

universals.

Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997) state that the term "explicitation" refers to a "phenomenon" where the translation makes some information more explicit than they are in the source text, and they explain that explicitation is achieved by adding explanatory information to the translation to make the text more readable (p. 55). Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997) note that the use of explicitation can be triggered by the translator's honest desire to explain unclear or implicitly stated information to the target reader or it can be the unavoidable consequence of translation (p. 55).

Klaudy (2009) refers to four types of explicitation: "obligatory explicitation", "optional explicitation", "pragmatic explicitation", and "translation-inherent explicitation" (pp. 106-107). Obligatory explicitation is done on the syntactic and semantic levels and is required to make the sentences in the target text grammatical (Klaudy, 2009, p. 106). Klaudy (2009) explains that one of the most obvious cases where syntactic explicitation is obligatory is when the target language does not have categories that exist in the source language (p. 106). Klaudy (2009) also clarifies that obligatory use of semantic explicitation stems from the fact that different languages structure reality linguistically in different ways (p. 106). For example, some categories of objects or colours are more detailed in some languages than they are in others; therefore, the translator may resort to the use of "more specific words" in the translation (Klaudy, 2009, p. 106). Optional explicitation may be employed when there are differences between languages regarding the ways in which the texts are built up (Klaudy, 2009, p. 106). There are cases where the sentences can be grammatical in the translation, but the text as a whole may be awkward; the use of explicitation can be optional in such cases to improve the translation (Klaudy, 2009, p. 106). Pragmatic explicitation involves cases where the source text has implied culture-specific information which may be unfamiliar to the target audience because of the gap between the source culture and the target culture (Klaudy, 2009, p. 106). Translation-inherent explicitation is related to translation itself as a process (Klaudy, 2009, p. 107).

Baker (1996) defines simplification as "the idea that translators subconsciously simplify the language or message or both" (as cited in Kafipour, 2016, p. 29). There are "lexical" simplification, "syntactic" simplification, and "stylistic" simplification (Kuusi, 2006, p. 93). Lexical simplification involves substituting a lexical unit in the source text with a more familiar unit in the target language (Kuusi, 2006, p. 93). In case the source text is an expert text that is made simpler for laymen, lexical simplification may aim at decreasing technicality or formality to make the text more accessible (Hill-Madsen, 2015, p. 92). Syntactic simplification involves substituting a complex structure in the source text with an easier one in the translation (Kuusi, 2006, p. 93). Stylistic simplification often involves breaking up long sentences and forming shorter ones as well as omitting repeated or redundant units (Kuusi, 2006, p. 93). Kafipour (2016) observes that omission is the most-commonly used form of simplification in translation (p. 31).

Conventionalisation or normalisation is the act of shaping the target text so that it reflects the regular and predictable use of the target language (Kenny, 1998, p. 1). Kenny (1998) observes that the conventional use of language is useful in the sense that it can help us to identify creativity; however, she suggests that creativity is not the norm among ordinary language users (p. 1). Therefore, a translator is expected to make the target text conform to the target language's routine patterns relating to "punctuation, lexical choices, style, sentence structure and the organization of the text as a whole" (Kuusi, 2006, p. 92).

It must be noted that explicitation, simplification, and conventionalisation or normalisation are not totally separate (Kuusi, 2006, p. 93). For example, Kussi (2006) clarifies that a decision such as breaking up long sentences into shorter ones may be done to achieve syntactic simplification and stylistic simplification at the same time because stylistic decisions relate to the lexical as well as the syntactic aspects of language (p. 93). Likewise, simplification and normalisation may overlap if the decisions which relate to lexical simplification and lexical normalisation occur at the same time (Kuusi, 2006, p. 93).

Kuusi (2006) observes that the interest in studying universals in translation has been relatively recent and that its future cannot be predicted; however, Kuusi (2006) states that the study of universals boosts awareness of these tendencies and may help the translators to make conscious decisions regarding them (p. 109). In this study, the widespread tendencies which scholars propose to be universal features of translations can be part of a descriptive method of analysis of the strategies that al-Shamly employs in her intralingual translation of *Risālat al-Ghufrān*.

Methodology of Analysis

The present study employs the universals of explicitation, simplification, and conventionalisation or normalisation as a basis for a method of analysis of the translation decisions of al-Shamly. The method of analysis consists of three steps:

1- identifying the units of translation which may be difficult to understand or may be very unusual to use for an average Egyptian reader who uses the fourth level of contemporary Arabic in his or her everyday life;

2- identifying the translation strategies that al-Shamly employs to make the text easier to read and analysing them in light of the three specified translation universals; and

3- assessing the use of the employed strategies and exploring the loss and gain that result from using them.

The steps are not always followed in this order. Sometimes, the identification of the translation strategy may precede the identification of the unit of translation in case several units in one excerpt are translated by using the same strategy. The steps are only numbered here to be clearly explained and differentiated from each other.

The study aims at boosting our understanding of intralingual translation of Arabic classics which aims at contemporizing the source texts by making them easier to read. The study also aims at exploring the connection between some translation strategies which fall under the umbrella of the universals of explicitation, simplification, and

conventionalisation or normalisation—which tend to appear in texts made more accessible or easier for the target audience—and the loss and gain in terms of meaning and effect in intralingual translations of classical Arabic texts.

Analysis

Although al-Shamly's translation refers to al-Ma'arrī's *Risālat al-Ghufrān* only in the title of her translation, she also translates Ibn al-Qāriḥ's epistle to al-Ma'arrī to which al-Ma'arrī responds with *Risālat al-Ghufrān* (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016). This study analyses al-Shamly's intralingual translation of the two texts included in her book which does not mention Ibn al-Qāriḥ's epistle in the title.

The texts of Ibn al-Qāriḥ and al-Ma'arrī are not divided into chapters. Each author abruptly jumps from one theme or story to another. In the case of al-Ma'arrī's text, the lack of division sometimes leads to confusion. al-Shamly introduces a few changes into the organisation of the text in the translation. She divides Ibn al-Qāriḥ's text into nine chapters and divides al-Ma'arrī's into eight chapters, and she chooses a title for each chapter (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, pp. 15, 17). Dividing the texts into titled chapters which mark the beginning and end of each theme or story may eliminate the confusion.

al-Shamly explains that there are some instances of digression which may distract the reader, and that the rearrangements are meant to avoid such distraction (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, p. 12). For example, al-Ma'arrī imagines how Ibn al-Qāriḥ meets some poets in Heaven and how he recognises them; then, he imagines Ibn al-Qāriḥ narrating his story at the gates of Heaven; shortly, al-Ma'arrī abruptly goes back to describing Ibn al-Qāriḥ's imaginative encounters with the poets in Heaven (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/1975, pp. 91-99). In her intralingual translation, al-Shamly extracts the imagined scene of Ibn al-Qāriḥ at the gates of Heaven from the part dedicated to his encounters with the poets in Heaven, and she gives it a title and turns it into an independent chapter (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, pp. 125-134). al-Shamly's decision to introduce changes into the organisation of the

text falls under the umbrella of conventionalisation or normalisation. Dividing texts into chapters is a characteristic of most of the books published nowadays. Normalisation can thus make the text less confusing for a modern reader.

Instances of explicitation and simplification appear in al-Shamly's translation of the following excerpt from Ibn al-Qāriḥ's epistle where he describes the ignorance of those who deny the genius of al-Maʿarrī:

ومن أين للضباب صوب السحاب، وللغراب هوى العقاب!! وكيف وقد أصبح ذكره في مواسم الذكر آذانا، وعلى معالم الشكر لسانا؟ فمن دافع العيان، وكابر الإنس والجان، واستبد بالإفك والبهتان، كان كمن صالب بوقاحته الحجر، وحاسن بقباحته القمر، وهذى وهذر، وتعاطى فعقر، وكان كمحموم بُلِسم فعفر.... (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1977, p. 24)

أنا فين وانت فين؟ هو الغراب زي النسر؟ دا انت بقيت أشهر من نار على علم واسمك بقى على كل لسان زي الأدان. واللي ينكر دا، ويحاول يضحك على الناس بأي كلام تاني غير دا، ويوصل بيه الكدب والإفترا للدرجة دي، يبقى إنسان في منتهى الوقاحة، أو يبقى عامل زي القبيح اللي بيقارن نفسه بجمال القمر....-al) Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 25)

In the source text, Ibn al-Qāriḥ always refers to al-Maʿarrī using the third person, and such use may cause confusion for a modern reader. When translating the text, al-Shamly uses the second person to refer to him to clarify the identity of the person that ibn al-Qāriḥ refers to. Such clarification is an instance of explicitation which contributes to eliminating confusion relating to the identity of al-Maʿarrī in the translation of Ibn al-Qāriḥ's epistle.

al-Shamly seemingly expects that the too many metaphors which Ibn al-Qāriḥ uses, which are written in classical Arabic, may be cumbersome for the 21st century target readers and she replaces them with modern colloquial expressions or metaphors. She does not reproduce the metaphor "من أين الضباب صوب السحاب" where the author states that the difference between him and al-Maʿarrī whom he deeply respects is like the difference between fog and clouds, and she replaces this stylistic device with the colloquial expression "أنا فين وانت

"فين" which directly reflects the gap between Ibn al-Qāriḥ and al-Maʿarrī. She also omits the metaphor of "تعاطى فعقر" which means "to take (something) and hurt (something or somebody)" and which echoes the Quranic verse " فنادوا صاحبهم فتعاطى فعقر " (1985, 54:29). The metaphor is not used in the Egyptians' everyday language and is expected to be difficult to understand by many readers. Furthermore, she omits the simile of "كمحموم بُلِسم فعفر" which can be translated as "like someone who contracts smallpox and rolls in the sand" and which includes the old word "بُلِسم " that is unfamiliar to the average educated Egyptian reader. The decision to replace the stylistic devices with commonly used expressions in semi-literate spoken Arabic or to completely omit them demonstrates a case of stylistic simplification. The simplification removes the load of the metaphors which may be awkward to the modern Egyptian reader (especially the ones with unfamiliar images or words), but it weakens the effect of the original text where musicality stems from the use of successive, rhyming metaphors.

The translation is rife with many other instances of stylistic simplification. For example, the metaphors " أنت جذيلها المحكك و عُذيقُها المُرَجَب" –which can be translated as "you are the rugged trunk and the distant protected fruit"— are used by an interlocutor called Abul-Qāsim al-Maghraby to praise and encourage Ibn al-Qāriḥ to take up a challenge (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1977, p. 60). The metaphors are quite obsolete, and al-Shamly translates the sentence as "طب ورينا شطارتك" which means "Well, show us what you can do!" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 62). In the story where al-Maʿarrī imagines how Ibn al-Qāriḥ tries to convince the angels at the gates of Heaven— especially Raḍwān— to let him in, he describes how futile his efforts to attract Raḍwān's attention are by saying " فكأنني أحرك ثبيرا، وألتمس من الغضرم عبيرا" which can be translated as "It was like moving a mountain, or trying to get a good smell from cracking clay soil" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1977, p. 91). Although these metaphors can be translated into semi-literate spoken Arabic, they are not widely used in Egyptians' daily lives. al-Shamly translates these sentences which refer to Raḍwān's response to Ibn al-Qāriḥ's efforts to enter one of

Heavens' gates communicatively, and she substitutes the metaphors with " فطنشني " which simply means "he ignored me" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 126). The omission of the metaphors may be understood in light of al-Shamly's explanation of her methodology of translation where she states that she omits parts which she finds to be repetitive and which contribute nothing new to the meaning (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 11).

These and many other examples where the metaphors in the source text are not reproduced in the translation—whether because they have no equivalents in semi-literate spoken Arabic or because a literal translation of them would be awkward because they are not common in everyday language use in Egypt—show loss in effect. The merit of Ibn al-Qāriḥ's and al-Maʿarrī's writings partly resides in their style and their creative use of language where they depend on stylistic devices to create an impact on the readers. However, the reproduction of stylistic devices in the translation may prevent al-Shamly from achieving her aim of making the text easy to read for the average educated Egyptian reader nowadays; therefore, she resorts to stylistic simplification. While stylistic simplification removes the load of unfamiliar metaphors and similes and enhances clarity, it results in the loss of effect that the use of such stylistic devices often has upon the readers of literary texts.

Omission of what al-Shamly deems redundant goes beyond form and affects content. A large part of Ibn al-Qāriḥ's imaginative story in Heaven revolves around the poets he meets there and the lengthy discussions that al-Maʿarrī imagines him to have with them about grammar, language, and their poetry. For example, al-Maʿarrī imagines that Ibn al-Qāriḥ meets a poet named ʿUdai ibn Zaid and has a lengthy discussion with 'Udai' about his poetry and grammatical mistakes as well as how Abu-Bakr Ibn Duraid tried to imitate 'Udai (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1975, pp. 48-56). al-Shamly only touches upon the main topics of the discussion and omits all the lines except for only one line from 'Udai's poem and one line from Ibn Duraid's (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 96). The semi-literate spoken Arabic in Egypt does not always abide by the grammatical rules of classical

Arabic. However, educated people are expected to study grammar at school. al-Shamly herself translates some of the discussions about Arabic grammar between Ibn al-Qāriḥ and Abu 'Ubaida (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, p. 114). Nevertheless, she often chooses to omit the metalanguage and the omission seems to be related to expectations about how difficult the grammar of classical Arabic or modern standard Arabic can be even for educated people in a manner which may make their reading experience less enjoyable. It is an instance of simplification which removes a load of details from the translation. However, the merit of al-Ma'arrī's masterpiece resides not only in the originality of the imaginative story, but also in the discussions which revolve around poetry and language which showcase his genius and vast knowledge. The omissions—whether they seem to be obligatory or optional—are instances of simplification that result in loss of content and in weakening the text's effect.

Moreover, many of the lines that al-Ma'arrī refers to are central to the very story of Ibn al-Qāriḥ's imagined journey to Heaven and Hell. In many cases, the lines themselves are the reasons why their authors go to Heaven or Hell or the lines include the reasons why the poets end up where they are. For example, al-Ma'arrī imagines Ibn al-Qāriḥ's encounter with a jinni in Heaven, and the jinni tells Ibn al-Qāriḥ about his repentance in detail in twenty-one lines from which I quote the following five lines:

عني، فأصبــــح ذنبي اليوم مغفورا   حمدت من حط أوزاري ومزقها

خوذا، وبالصين أخرى بنت يغبورا   وكنت آلف من أتــــراب قرطبة

في ليلة، قبل أن استــــوضح النورا   أزور تاك وهذي، غير مكترث

إلا وغادرتــــه ولــــهان مذعورا   ولا أمر بوحشي ولابشــــر،

والــروم والتــرك والسـقلاب والغـورا....   أروع الزنـــج إلماما بنسوتها

(al-Ma'arrī, 1033/1975, p. 124)

The jinni thanks God for forgiving him for wrongdoing; then, he talks about the sins he committed which included terrifying and causing trouble for animals and people—especially women— from many races in many places of the world. In the rest of the twenty-one lines

which the jinni recites, he mentions the names of some of the people he had misled and narrates in detail how he had terrorised and inflicted harm on animals and people before he finally repented before Judgement Day and was finally sent to Heaven (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/1975, p. 124).

In her translation, al-Shamly translates the first line only as "ليك الحمد ياللي محيت ذنوبي... غفرتها بفضلك ومسحت عيوبي" and omits all the other lines (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/2016, p. 150). The omission thus removes details which are central to the story of the jinni and his journey from wrongdoing to repentance which led him to Heaven.

Other parts which al-Shamly omits include al-Nabigha's explanation of how he managed to avoid mentioning the name al-Nu'mān's wife in his poetry (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/1975, p. 62), all the lines of al-Nābigha of Bani Ga'da that Ibn al-Qāriḥ quotes upon meeting him (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/1975, pp. 64-65), most of the lines of al-A'sha that Ibn al-Qāriḥ recites when he meets al-'Asha in Heaven (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/1975, p. 67), Ibn al-Qāriḥ's questions about grammar in some of the lines composed by Hassān Ibn Thābet (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/1975, p. 82), and all the lines which al-Akhtal al-Taghloby composed to praise wine in his lifetime which Ibn al-Qāriḥ cite as the reason why al-Akhtal was sent to Hell (al-Ma'arrī, 1033/1975, p. 161).The omission of these and many other long parts from the source text results in producing a much shorter translation that is almost half the length of the source text. The omission is an instance of simplification which removes many of the details which may make the reading experience somewhat unpleasant. However, the many lines which Ibn al-Qāriḥ and other residents of Heaven or Hell recite are part and parcel of the imagined story as they contribute to portraying the scenes in Heaven and Hell where the journey takes place as imagined by al-Ma'arrī. Therefore, simplification through omitting large parts of the source text results in loss of content and in weakening the meaning of the message.

Another way in which al-Shamly attempts to bridge the gap between the source text and the modern Egyptian reader is through

substituting some of the words in the source texts with modern words which include loan words that have been naturalised and adopted into colloquial Egyptian Arabic. For example, she replaces "صدقت" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1977, p. 34) which means "you are right" with "برافو" or "bravo" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 34). She also uses "برفان" or "parfum" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 87) to translate "رائحة" which means "smell" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1975, p. 40), and she translates "غرانق" which means "elegant" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1975, p. 43) as "شيك" or "chic" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 91). These and other instances of lexical simplification bring the text closer to the target reader without sacrificing the meaning of the substituted words.

However, the use of modern words sometimes leads to awkwardness. In the part of the epistle where al-Maʿarrī discusses heresy, he mentions "سادات قريش" or the masters of Quraish (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1975, p. 208). al-Shamly translates "سادات" as "باشوات" which means "pashas" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 191). The word "pasha" is an originally Turkish title that was given to rulers and nobles during the Ottoman era and was used in this sense in Egypt until the abolition of the monarchy in 1952. Although the title has been abolished, it is still used but it currently has different meanings which can be understood from the context. For example, it can be used to show respect to superiors or to show familiarity among friends. al-Shamly's use of the Ottoman title does not suit the situation in the source text. A better alternative can be "أسياد" which belongs to the fourth level of the Arabic language in Egypt and which also means "masters".

The use of modern words becomes even shocking or offending to many of the expected target readers in the case of translating a text which has religious importance. When she explains her methodology of translation, al-Shamly states that she translates the sayings of Prophet Muḥammad because she believes that people translate them on a daily basis when they explain what the sayings mean (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 12). One of the sayings of the Prophet quoted in the text refers to the state of people who commit suicide: "الرسول عليه الصلاة والسلام يقول: 'من وجأ نفسه بحديدة حُشر يوم القيامة وحديدته بيده يجأ بها نفسه خالدا

'مخلدا في النار' " (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1977, p. 41). al-Shamly translates the Prophet's saying as follows: " يجي يوم ،اللي يبُغز نفسه بحديدة:عشان الرسول قال" القيامة بنفس الحديدة ويفضل يبُغز بيها نفسه في النار للأبد' " (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 41). The verb "يجأ"—which means "stab"—belongs to classical Arabic and is expected to be incomprehensible to the average modern reader. al-Shamly substitutes this verb with a modern equivalent which is "يبُغز". However, the word is usually considered to be vulgar and is not expected to be used in a serious or sophisticated text. It is the norm to provide the explanations of the Prophet's sayings in dignified language because of the religious importance they have for many readers; therefore, the use of a vulgar word leads to a different effect from that of the Prophet's saying. The verb "يطعن" can be a more appropriate modern equivalent to explain the meaning of the Prophet's saying. The loss of effect is inevitable in the case of lexical simplification of the Prophet's sayings; however, vulgar words have a more negative impact on the reader in terms of loss of effect than appropriate modern equivalents.

al-Shamly also attempts to iron out difficulties by clarifying the identity of people whose names are mentioned in the source texts. al-Shamly inserts a short definition to identify the person mentioned or uses the name by which he or she are most commonly known. For example, Ibn al-Qāriḥ refers to "جعفر بن محمد" or "Gaʿafar Ibn Muḥammad" without explaining who he is (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1977, p. 43); al-Shamly clarifies the man's identity by adding a short definition after his name which states that he is the sixth imam among the twelve Shiite imams (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 43). al-Maʿarrī refers to Abu-Nawās by the name of "الحكمي" or "al-Ḥakamy" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1975, p. 30), while al-Shamly uses the famous nickname in the translation (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 83). al-Maʿarrī uses the nickname "أخي دوس" or "Akhi Daus" to refer to al-Mubarrad (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1975, p. 40), and al-Shamly retains the poet's widely known nickname in the translation (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 89). These and many other instances of explicitation remove the burden of unfamiliar names from the translation.

al-Shamly also specifies the locations of the different places

mentioned in the source text. For example, Ibn al-Qāriḥ seems to expect his audience to know where "تنيس" or "Tinnīs" is and he simply writes "كنت بتنيس" when he refers to his story there (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1977, p. 67). al-Shamly translates this sentence as "كنت مرة في حتة اسمها تنيس، جنب دمياط في مصر" (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 71). The added in-text information which specifies the old city's location near Damietta in Egypt is an instance of explicitation which specifies the location of a place by establishing the relation between this place and other places that are well-known to modern readers.

al-Shamly adds longer in-text explanations to equip the reader with adequate background information to understand some incidents. For example, al-Maʿarrī imagines that Sibawaih will not be mad at al-Kisā'y and his friends after what they did without explaining what happened (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1975, p. 40). al-Shamly provides the reader with information about the incident:

وكمان "سيبويه" مش حايبقى زعلان من "الكسائي"، بعد الموقف اللي "الكسائي" عمله فيه لما الرشيد عزمهم هم الاتنين فـ"الكسائي" طلع "سيبويه" غلطان في كل حاجة، فأمر "الرشيد" إن "سيبويه" يخرج من البيت وإدى "الكسائي" 10 آلاف درهم، فزعل "سيبويه" وقرر إنه مايدخلش البصرة تاني أبدا لغاية لما مات فعلا في إيران (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 89) .

al-Shamly explains that al-Kisā'y was the reason why the Khalifa ordered to throw Sibawiah out of his house after al-Kisā'y had said that Sibawaih had been at fault, and that Sibawaih decided never to visit the city of Baṣra again, and that he never did until he died in what we now call Iran.

al-Shamly sometimes resorts to extratextual additions too. For example, Ibn al-Qāriḥ expresses how lazy he has become in terms of writing and studying literature by using a metaphor that is based on a reference to the names of two men named "Iyāas" and "Bāqel" and says "فلو كنت إياسا صرت باقلا " (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/1977, p. 64). al-Shamly translates the sentence as "وبعد ماكانوا بيشبهوني بـ"إياس" القاضي في ذكاؤه وعلمه، بقيت عامل زي باقل، في كسله" and she explains that he used to be compared to a judge named "Iyās" who was known for his intelligence and knowledge but is now compared to lazy "Bāqel"

(al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 67). Then, she clarifies the identities of both men in a footnote (al-Maʿarrī, 1033/2016, p. 67). These and other examples of in-text and extratextual explanations are instances of explicitaion which make the text more comprehensible to the modern readers of the translation.

The analysis reveals that strategies associated with the universals of simplification, explicitation, and conventionalisation or normalisation which tend to appear in simplified texts can make texts more intelligible in general. However, some of the strategies—especially ones which fall under the umbrella of simplification—may lead to considerable losses if employed excessively. Understanding the effect of employing these strategies may help translators to adopt a balanced approach to the use of these strategies—or at least make expectations about the consequence of employing them—when making conscious decisions in relation to contemporizing classical texts through intralingual translation.

Conclusion

The present study focuses on Narimān al-Shamly's intralingual translation of al-Maʿarrī's *Risālat al-Ghufrān*. It uses the translation universals of explicitation, simplification, and conventionalisation or normalisation as a basis for a method of analysis that aims at exploring the losses and gains of content, meaning, and effect which result from contemporizing al-Maʿarrī's text which was written in classical Arabic by translating it into the semi-literate spoken Arabic which is the fourth level of contemporary Arabic in Egypt.

The study concludes that al-Shamly's intralingual translation makes al-Maʿarrī's text easier to read through dividing the text into chapters, substituting archaic or obsolete words with contemporary semi-literate spoken equivalents in Egyptian Arabic, and adding information which equip the readers with adequate background information to understand the significance of unfamiliar names or incidents. However, the study finds that al-Shamly's translation suffers a considerable loss in terms of content and effect due to excessive dependence on omission. The study also finds that lexical

simplification can be problematic if used without regard to the importance that the readers may give to some parts of the text where the use of dignified language is the norm. In a nutshell, the study finds that al-Shamly's strategies of translation lead to gains in terms of clarity and comprehensibility but result in considerable losses in terms of content and effect. By studying loss and gain in intralingual translations which aim at modernising classical texts, translators and translation scholars can better understand the effect of using strategies related to translation universals which tend to appear in simplified texts. Such understanding may help the translators when they make conscious decisions during the process of translating canonical texts within the same language.

The study contributes to the field of translation studies by exploring the little investigated area of study that tackles contemporizing classical Arabic texts through intralingual translation. It highlights the loss and gain involved in intralingual translation aimed at simplifying canonical works to make them accessible to a wider audience by simplifying them. Thus, the study attempts to enhance our understanding of intralingual translation in Arabic. For future research, the study recommends investigating the intralingual translation of other classical Arabic texts into the levels of spoken Egyptian Arabic and other varieties of Arabic in Arabic speaking countries.

References

al-Maʿarrī, A. (1975). *Risālat al-ghufrān* [Epistle of forgiveness]. (A. Shalaq, Ed.). Dār al-Qalam. (Original work published 1033)

al-Maʿarrī, A. (1977). *Risālat al-ghufrān* [Epistle of forgiveness]. (A. Abdul-Raḥmān, Ed.). Dār al-Maʿārif. (Original work published 1033)

al-Maʿarrī, A. (2016). *Risālat al-ghufrān* [Epistle of forgiveness]. (N. al-Shamly, Trans.). al-Kotob Khān. (Original work published 1033)

Badawy, A. (1973). *Mustawayāt al-ʿarabiyya al-muʿāṣera fī Miṣr* [Levels of contemporary Arabic in Egypt]. Dār al-Maʿārif.

Baker, M. (1993). Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implications and applications. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 233-250). John Benjamins,

Baker, M. (1996). Corpus-based translation studies: The challenges that lie ahead. In: H. Somers (Ed.), *Terminology, LSP and translation* (pp. 175-186). John Benjamins.

Baker, M. (2009). Introduction to the first edition. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies* (2nd ed., pp. xiv-xviii). Routledge.

Bakkal, K. (2019). Intralingual translation has no name in Turkey: Conceptual crowdedness in intralingual translation. *TransLogos*, *2*(2), 48-69. http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/transLogos.13

Bernardini, S., & Zanettin, F. (2004). When is a universal not a universal? Some limits of current corpus-based methodologies for the investigation of translation universals. In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp. 51-62). John Benjamins.

Blum-Kulka, S. (2000). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 298-313). Routledge.

Chesterman, A. (2004). Beyond the particular. In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp. 33-49). John Benjamins.

Denton, J. (2007). "...waterlogged somewhere in mid-Atlantic." Why American readers need intralingual translation but don't often get it. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie et Redaction, 20*(2), 243-270. https://doi.org/10.7202/018826ar

Derrida, J. (1985). Des tours de Babel [Towers of Babel]. (J. F. Graham, Trans.). In J. F. Graham (Ed.), *Difference in translation* (pp. 165-248). Cornell University Press.

Hermans, T. (1996). *Translation's other* [An inaugural lecture delivered at University College London]. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/198/1/96_Inaugural.pdf

Hill-Madsen, A. (2015). Lexical strategies in intralingual translation between registers. *Hermes-Journal of Language and Communication in Business, 27*(54), 85-105. https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlcb.v27i54.22949

Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On translation* (pp. 232-239). Harvard University Press.

Kafipour, R. (2016). The study of simplification and explicitation techniques in Khaled Hosseeini's "A thousand splendid suns". *Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature, 2*(2), 28-41. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311993995_The_Study_of_Simplification_and_Explicitation_Techniques_in_Khaled_Hosseini's_A_Thousand_Splendid_Suns

Kenny, D. (1998). Creatures of habit? What translators usually do with words. *META, 43*(4), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.7202/003302ar

Klaudy, K. (2009). Universals. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies* (2nd ed., pp. 104-108). Routledge

Kuusi, P. (2006). Explicitation as simplification. Universal tendencies in the translation of FID. In P. Tammi & H. Tommola (Eds.). *Free language, indirect translation, discourse narratology: Linguistic, translatological and literary-theoretical encounters* (pp. 89-113). Tampere University Press.

Laviosa, S. (2009). Universals. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies* (2nd ed., pp. 306-310). Routledge

Mauranen, A., & Kujamäki, P. (2004). Introduction. In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp. 1-11). John Benjamins.

Mossop, B. (2016). 'Intralingual translation': A desirable concept? *Across Languages and Cultures, 17*(1), 1-24 . https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2016.17.1.1

Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Pergamon Press.

Newmark, P. (1999). Taking a stand on Mary Snell-Hornby. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, *6*(2), 152-154. https://doi.org/10.1080/13520529909615544

Petrilli, S. (2013). Translation and semiosis. Introduction. In Petrilli, S. (ed.), *Translation translation* (pp. 17-37). Rodopi.

The Qur'an. (1985). King Fahd Glorious Qur'an Printing Complex.

Savas, B. (2018). Intralingual translation as a means of intergenerational communication: A linguistic approach. *Journal of International Social Research, 11*(55), 182-193. http://dx.doi.org/10.17719/jisr.20185537190

Schubert, K. (2005). Translation studies: Broaden or deepen the perspective? In H. V. Dam, J. Engberg & H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast (Eds.), *Knowledge systems and translation* (pp. 125-145). De Gruyter Mouton.

Schmid, B. (2012). A bucket or a searchlight approach to defining translation? Fringe phenomena and their implications for the object of study. In I. Herrero & T. Klaiman (Eds.), *Versatility in translation studies: Selected papers of the CETRA research*

seminar in translation studies 2011 (pp. 1-21). https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/schmid.pdf

Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie.M. (1997). *Dictionary of translation studies*. St. Jerome.

Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel*. Oxford University Press.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond.* John Benjamins.

Toury, G. (2004). Probabilistic explanations in translation studies: Welcome as they are, would they qualify as universals?* In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp. 15-32). John Benjamins.

Tymozcko, M. (2005). Trajectories of research in translation studies. *Meta, 50*(4), 1082-1097. https://doi.org/10.7202/012062ar

Zethsen, K. K. (2007). Beyond translation proper—Extending the field of translation studies. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie et Redaction, 20*(1), 281-308. https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/ttr/2007-v20-n1-ttr2280/018506ar/

Zethsen, K. K. (2009). Intralingual translation: An attempt at description. *Meta*, *54*(4), 795–812. https://doi.org/10.7202/038904ar

Zethsen, K. K., & Hill-Madsen, A. (2016). Intralingual translation and its place within translation studies – A theoretical discussion. *Meta, 61*(3), 692-708. https://doi.org/10.7202/1039225ar