

***Al-Munqidh mina al-Dalāl* in English**

With Special Focus on Retranslation

**A thesis submitted to the University of Salford for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

2016

Ayman Haj Yasin

The School of Humanities, Languages & Social Sciences

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	viii
Notice on Transcription of Arabic.....	ix
Abstract	xi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Motivations and Aims of the Study.....	2
1.2 Data of the Study.....	3
1.3 Research Questions and Methodology	3
1.4 Organization of the Study	5
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW OF TRANSLATION THEORY	9
2.1 Linguistic Approaches to Translation	9
2.2 Translation and Text Typology	16
2.3 Skopos Theory.....	20
2.4 Descriptive Translation Studies: Polysystem and Norms Theory	22
2.5 The Cultural Turn and Politics of Translation.....	26
2.5.1 Venuti’s Hermeneutic Model	29
2.5.2 Foreignizing Translation	31
2.6 Summary of Chapter Two	43
CHAPTER THREE: CULTURE-SPECEFIC ITEMS IN TRANSLATION	45
3.1 Culture-Specific Items.....	45
3.2 Translation of CSIs.....	48
3.3 Typologies of Translating CSIs.....	52
3.3.1 Vladimir Ivir.....	52
3.3.1.1 Borrowing.....	52
3.3.1.2 Definition.....	53
3.3.1.3 Literal Translation	53
3.3.1.4 Addition.....	54
3.3.1.5 Substitution.....	54
3.3.1.6 lexical Creation.....	55
3.3.1.7 Omission.....	55

3.3.2 Aixelá's Typology	56
3.3.2.1 Preservative Procedures.....	56
3.3.2.1.1 Repetition	56
3.3.2.1.2 orthographic Adaptation.....	56
3.3.2.1.3 Linguistic (non-cultural) translation.....	57
3.3.2.1.4 Extratextual Gloss	57
3.3.2.1.5 Intratextual Gloss	57
3.3.2.2 Substitutive Procedures	58
3.3.2.2.1 Synonymy.....	58
3.3.2.2.2 Limited Universalization.....	58
3.3.2.2.3 Absolute Universalization	58
3.3.2.2.4 Naturalization	59
3.3.2.2.5 Deletion	59
3.3.2.2.5 Creative Autonomous Creation	59
3.4 Discussion of Ivir's and Aixelá's Typologies	60
CHAPTER FOUR: RETRANSLATION THEORY	64
4.1 What is Retranslation?.....	64
4.2 Berman on Retranslation	65
4.2.1 The Progress Argument.....	66
4.2.2 The Updating Argument.....	70
4.3 Retranslation as a Challenge	71
4.3.1 Passive and Positive Retranslation	72
4.3.2 Venuti's Perspective.....	75
4.3.2.1 Retranslation: Making the Difference	75
4.3.2.2 Retranslation and Agency of Translation	76
4.3.2.3 Canonicity and Economic Reasons	78
4.3.2.4 Readership and Ideology	79
4.3.2.5 Retranslation and History	81
4.3.2.6 Summary of Venuti's Perspective	83
4.4 The Retranslation of non-Literary Texts	84
4.4.1 Retranslating Barthes and Cixous	85
4.4.2 Retranslation of <i>The Second Sex</i>	89

4.4.3 Retranslation of <i>The Arts of War</i>	92
4.5 Summary of Chapter Five	95
CHAPTER FIVE: AL-MUNQIDH MIN AL-ḌALAL	98
5.1 An Overview	98
5.2 The Time of al-Ghazālī	99
5.3. Al-Ghazālī: Life and Work.....	101
5.4 <i>Munqidh</i>	103
5.4.1 The Title	104
5.4.2 Chapter one: Introduction.....	105
5.4.3 Scepticism	105
5.4.4 Chapter two: Seekers for Truth	106
5.4.5 Chapter Three: Theologians	106
5.4.6 Chapter Four: Philosophers	107
5.4.7 Chapter Five: the Ismāʿīlīs	107
5.4.8 Chapter Six: the Sufis.....	107
5.4.9 Chapter Seven: Prophecy	108
5.4.10 Chapter Eight: Return to Teaching.....	108
5.5 A New Reading of <i>Munqidh</i>	109
5.6 <i>Munqidh</i> in Modern Literature	111
5.7 Some stylistic and Formal Features of <i>Munqidh</i>	112
5.7.1 The Autobiographical Nature of <i>Munqidh</i>	112
5.7.2 The Technical Nature of <i>Munqidh</i>	113
5.7.3 Semantic Repetition.....	113
5.7.4 Rhymed Prose.....	114
5.7.5 Metaphor	114
5.8 Summary of Chapter Five	115
CHAPTER SIX: MOTIVATIONS FOR THE TRANSLATION AND RETRANSLATION OF MUNQIDH	116
6.1 An Overview	116
6.2 Translation of <i>Munqidh</i> by Field (1909)	119
6.2.1 The Translator	119
6.2.2 Motivations for Field’s Translation.....	120

6.2.3	General Features of Field's Translation	121
6.2.4	How al-Ghazālī and <i>Munqidh</i> are Presented by Field.....	124
6.2.5	The Reception of Field's Translation	125
6.3	The First Retranslation of <i>Munqidh</i> by Watt (1953).....	127
6.3.1	The Translator	127
6.3.2	Why a New Translation?.....	129
6.3.2	General Features of Watt's Translation.....	130
6.3.3	How Watt presented al-Ghazālī and <i>Munqidh</i>	133
6.3.4	The Reception of Watt's Translation	135
6.4	McCarthy's Translation (1982).....	138
6.4.1	The Translator	138
6.4.2	Why a New Translation?.....	141
6.4.3	Some Features of McCarthy's Translation.....	145
6.4.4	How al-Ghazālī and <i>Munqidh</i> are Presented by McCarthy.....	147
6.4.5	The Reception of McCarthy's Translation	148
6.5	Abūlaylah's Translation (2002).....	151
6.5.1	The Translator	151
6.5.2	Why did Abūlaylah Retranslated <i>Munqidh</i> ?	152
6.5.3	General Features of Abūlaylah's Translation.....	157
6.5.4	The Images of Al-Ghazālī and <i>Munqidh</i>	158
6.5.5	Reception of Abūlaylah's Translation	161
6.6	Holland's Translation (2011)	161
6.6.1	The Translator	162
6.6.2	Background for Holland's Translation.....	162
6.6.3	Holland's Translation: Motivations and General Features	163
6.6.4	How al-Ghazālī and <i>Munqidh</i> are Presented	165
6.7	Conclusion of Chapter Six	165
CHAPTER SEVEN: RETRANSLATION HYPOTHESIS, CLOSENESS AND LITERALISM		
.....		168
7.1	Overview	168
7.2	Data of this Chapter.....	169
7.2.1	Example (1)	169

7.2.2 Example (2)	170
7.2.3 Example (3)	170
7.2.4 Example (4)	170
7.2.5 Example (5)	171
7.2.6 Example (6)	171
7.2.7 Example (7)	172
7.2.8 Example (8)	172
7.2.9 Example (9)	172
7.2.10 Example (10)	173
7.3 Data Analysis: Field and Watt.....	173
7.3.1 Example (1)	173
7.3.1.1 Discussion of Example (1)	174
7.3.2 Example (2)	175
7.3.2.1 Discussion of Example (2)	176
7.3.3 Example (3)	177
7.3.3.1 Discussion of Example (3)	177
7.3.4 Example (4)	178
7.3.4.1 Discussion of Example (4)	178
7.3.5 Example (5)	179
7.3.5.1 Discussion of Example (5)	179
7.3.6 Example (6)	180
7.3.6.1 Discussion of Example (6)	180
7.3.7 Example (7)	181
7.3.7.1 Discussion of Example (7)	181
7.3.8. Example (8)	182
7.3.8.1 Discussion of Example (8)	182
7.3.9 Example (9)	183
7.3.9.1 Discussion of Example (9)	183
7.3.10 Example (10)	184
7.3.10.1 Discussion of Example (10)	184
7.4 Compared Analysis: Watt and McCarthy.....	185
7.4.1 Example (1)	185

7.4.1.1 Discussion of Example (1)	186
7.4.2 Example (2)	187
7.4.2.1 Discussion of Example (2)	188
7.4.3 Example (3)	188
7.4.3.1 Discussion of Example (3)	189
7.4.4 Example (4)	189
7.4.4.1 Discussion of Example (4)	190
7.4.5 Example (5)	191
7.4.5.1 Discussion of Example (5)	191
7.4.6 Example (6)	192
7.4.6.1 Discussion of Example (6)	192
7.4.7 Example (7)	193
7.4.7.1 Discussion of Example (7)	193
7.4.8 Example (8)	194
7.4.8.1 Discussion of Example (8)	194
7.4.9 Example (9)	195
7.4.9.1 Discussion of Example (9)	195
7.4.10 Example (10)	196
7.4.10.1 Discussion of Example (10)	196
7.5 Compared Analysis: McCarthy and Abūlaylah.....	197
7.5.1 Example (1)	197
7.5.1.1 Discussion of Example (1)	198
7.5.2 Example (2)	198
7.5.2.1 Discussion of Example (2)	200
7.5.3. Example (3)	201
7.5.3.1 Discussion of Example (3)	201
7.5.4 Example (4)	202
7.5.4.1 Discussion of Example (4)	202
7.5.5 Example (5)	203
7.5.5.1 Discussion of Example (5)	204
7.5.6 Example (6)	204
7.5.6.1 Discussion of Example (6)	205

7.5.7 Example (7)	205
7.5.7.1 Discussion of Example (7)	206
7.5.8 Example (8)	206
7.5.8.1 Discussion of Example (8)	207
7.5.9 Example (9)	207
7.5.9.1 Discussion of Example (9)	208
7.5.10 Example (10)	208
7.5.10.1 Discussion of Example (10)	209
7.6 Compared Analysis: Abūlaylah and Holland	210
7.6.1 Example (1)	210
7.6.1.1 Discussion of Example (1)	211
7.6.2 Example (2)	212
7.6.2.1 Discussion of Example (2)	213
7.6.3 Example (3)	214
7.6.3.1 Discussion of Example (3)	215
7.6.4 Example (4)	215
7.6.4.1 Discussion of Example (4)	216
7.6.5 Example (5)	216
7.6.5.1 Discussion of Example (5)	217
7.6.6 Example (6)	217
7.6.6.1 Discussion of Example (6)	218
7.6.7 Example (7)	218
7.6.7.1 Discussion of Example (7)	219
7.6.8 Example (8)	220
7.6.8.1 Discussion of Example (8)	220
7.6.9 Example (9)	221
7.6.9.1 Discussion of Example (9)	221
7.6.10 Example (10)	222
7.6.10.1 Discussion of Example (10)	223
7.7 Concluding Remarks	223
CHAPTER EIGHT: CULTURAL REFERENCES IN <i>MUNQIDH</i> AND THE RETRANSLATION HYPOTHESIS	226

8.1 Overview	226
8.2 Data Analysis	229
8.2.1 Example (1): المعتزلة (<i>mu'tazilah</i>)	229
8.2.1.1 Translation of <i>mu'tazilah</i>	230
8.2.2 Example (2): الطريقة (<i>tarīqah</i>)	230
8.2.2.1 Translation of <i>tarīqah</i>	230
8.2.3 Example (3) باطني (<i>bāṭinī</i>).....	231
8.2.3.1 Translation of <i>bāṭinī</i>	232
8.2.4 Example (4): ظاهري (<i>zāhirī</i>).....	233
8.2.4.1 Translation of <i>zāhirī</i>	233
8.2.5 Example (5): إخوان الصفا (<i>Ikhwān al-ṣafā</i>).....	234
8.2.5.1 Translation of <i>Ikhwān al-ṣafā</i>	235
8.2.6 Example (6) سؤال الإضلال (<i>suāl al-idlāl</i>).....	235
8.2.6.1 Translation of <i>suāl al-idlāl</i>	236
8.2.7 Example (7): الكتاب (<i>al-kitāb</i>).....	237
8.2.7.1 Translation of <i>al-kitāb</i>	237
8.2.8 Example (8): السنة (<i>sunna</i>).....	237
8.2.8.1 Translation of <i>sunna</i>	238
8.2.9. Example (9): الصحاح (<i>ṣiḥāḥ</i>)	238
8.2.9.1 Translation of <i>ṣiḥāḥ</i>	239
8.2.10 Example (10) الفطرة الأصلية (<i>fiṭrah aṣliyyah</i>)	240
8.2.10.1 Translation of <i>fiṭrah aṣliyyah</i>	241
8.2.11 Example (11): الشرح (<i>sharḥ</i>)	241
8.2.11.1 Translation of <i>sharḥ</i>	241
8.2.12 Example (12) نفحات (<i>naḥāḥāt</i>)	242
8.2.12.1 Translation of <i>naḥāḥāt</i>	243
8.2.13 Example (13) إجماع الأمة (<i>Ijmā' al-ummah</i>).....	244
8.2.13.1 Translation of <i>Ijmā' al-ummah</i>	244
8.2.14 Example (14): القبلة (<i>qiblah</i>)	245
8.2.14.1 Translation of <i>qiblah</i>	245
8.2.15 Example (15): أركان الحج (<i>arkān al-ḥajj</i>)	245
8.2.15.1 Translation of <i>arkān al-ḥajj</i>	246

8.2.16 Example (16): ذكر الله (<i>dhikr Allāh</i>)	246
8.2.16.1 Translation of <i>dhikr Allāh</i>	248
8.2.17 Example (17): التحريم (<i>tahrīm</i>)	249
8.2.17.1 Translation of <i>tahrīm</i>	249
8.2.18 Example (18): الخليل (<i>al-khalīl</i>)	249
8.2.18.1 Translation of <i>al-khalīl</i>	250
8.2.19 Example (19): عين النبوة (<i>‘ayn al-nubuwwah</i>)	250
8.2.19.1 Translation of <i>‘ayn al-nubuwwah</i>	251
8.2.20 Example (20): السجود <i>sujūd</i>	251
8.2.20.1 Translation of <i>sujūd</i>	252
8.2.21 Example (21): صلاة الصبح (<i>ṣalāt al-ṣubḥ</i>).....	252
8.2.21.1 Translation of <i>ṣalāt al-ṣubḥ</i>	252
8.2.22 Example (22): صلاة العصر (<i>ṣalāt al-‘aṣr</i>)	253
8.2.22.1 Translation of <i>ṣalāt al-‘aṣr</i>	253
8.2.23 Example (23): الظهر (<i>zuhr</i>).....	253
8.2.23.1 Translation of <i>zuhr</i>	253
8.2.24 Example (24): المغرب (<i>maghrib</i>)	254
8.2.24.1 Translation of <i>maghrib</i>	254
8.2.25 Example (25): أهل الإباحة (<i>ahl al-ibāḥah</i>)	254
8.2.25.1 Translation of <i>ahl al-ibāḥah</i>	255
8.2.26 Example (26): الركوع (<i>rukū’</i>).....	256
8.2.26.1 Translation of <i>rukū’</i>	256
8.2.27 Example (27): الركعات (<i>rak‘āt</i>)	256
8.2.27.1 Translation of <i>rak‘āt</i>	257
8.2.28 Example (28) رمي الجمار (<i>ramy al-jimār</i>)	257
8.2.28.1 Translation of <i>ramy al-jimā</i>	258
8.2.29 Example (29): the term الزاوية (<i>zawiya</i>)	258
8.2.29.1 Translation of <i>zawiya</i>	259
8.2.30 Example (30): أهل التعليم (<i>ahl al-ta‘līm</i>)	260
8.2.30.1 Translation of <i>ahl al-ta‘līm</i>	260
8.2.31 Example (31): المشايخ (<i>mashāyikh</i>).....	261
8.2.31.1 Translation of <i>mashāyikh</i>	261

8.3.32 Example (32): الصخرة (<i>al-ṣakhrāh</i>).....	262
8.2.32.1 Translation of <i>al-ṣakhrāh</i>	262
8.2.33 Example (33): جبل حراء (<i>jabal ḥirā'</i>)	262
8.2.33.1 Translation of <i>jabal ḥirā'</i>	263
8.2.34 Example (34): الإمام المعصوم (<i>imām ma'ṣūm</i>).....	263
8.2.34.1 Translation of <i>imām ma'ṣūm</i>	263
8.2.35 Example (35): ثقب القمر (<i>shaqq al-qamar</i>)	264
8.2.35.1 Translation of <i>shaqq al-qamar</i>	264
8.2.36 Example (36): الفقه (<i>fiqh</i>)	264
8.2.36.1 Translation of <i>fiqh</i>	264
8.2.37 Example (37): دينار (<i>dinār</i>).....	265
8.2.37.1 Translation of <i>dinār</i>	265
8.2.38 Example (38): الحجام (<i>ḥajjām</i>)	266
8.2.38.1 Translation of <i>ḥajjām</i>	266
8.2.39 Example (39): ثريد (<i>tharīd</i>)	266
8.2.39.1 Translation of <i>tharīd</i>	267
8.2.40 Example (40) دانق (<i>dāniq</i>).....	267
8.2.40.1 Translation of <i>dāniq</i>	267
8.3 Concluding Remarks	267
CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSIONS	273
9.1 Overview	273
9.2 Achievements	274
9.2.1 <i>Munqidh</i> in English	274
9.2.2 Representations of al-Ghazālī and <i>Munqidh</i>	277
9.2.3 Testing the Retranslation Hypothesis	279
9.2.4 Methodology	282
9.3 Limitations of this Study and Future Research	284
Endnotes of Chapter Eight	286
Bibliography	289

Acknowledgment

I owe a considerable debt of thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Maria Sanchez, who has provided me with helpful suggestions and academic advice throughout the last phase of my doctoral research, and to my former supervisor, Dr. Domenyk Eades, who supervised this work for more than two years. His advice and criticism have been of great value, sustaining this work especially during its early preparation.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. William Hope and Dr. Nadia Rahab, my internal and external examiners, for their careful scrutiny of my thesis and for the valuable suggestions they offered on the theoretical framework and discussion chapters of this study.

I am also grateful for Professor Myriam Salama-Carr and Dr. Orieb Masadeh-Tate for advising me on theoretical and methodological issues arising throughout my research.

My thanks are also due to Emma Sutton from Salford University who generously and unstintingly provided me with all types of advice and assistance with a multitude of personal and administrative matters.

I also owe a considerable debt of thanks to all my family and my friends for their continuous encouragement and support.

But most of all I must thank *Suha* without whose help and support this thesis would not have been possible.

Notice on Transcription of Arabic

For the transcription of Arabic, this study mainly follows the style used by *The International Journal of Middle East Studies*. Transliterated names and titles were kept as found in their original form. The symbols used to transcribe Arabic sounds are as follows:

Arabic	English	Arabic	English
ء	'	ط	T
ب	B	ع	'
ت	T	غ	Gh
ج	J	ف	F
ح	h	ق	Q
خ	Kh	ك	K
د	D	ل	L
ذ	Th	م	M
ر	R	ن	N
ز	Z	ه	H
س	S	و	W
ش	Sh	ي	Y
ص	ṣ	ال	al-
ض	Ḍ	ة	H

Long vowels: ā, ū, ī.

Short vowels: a, i, u.

Doubled vowel ّ:

īyy (in middle position)

ī (in final position).

ال is dropped from common nouns but maintained in proper nouns and *idāfa* constructions .

hamza is preserved in all cases (except for initial hamza, which is dropped).

Abstract

Al-Munqidh mina al-Ḍalāl (Munqidh) is a well-known autobiography that was written by Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d.505/1111), one of the most influential theologians and philosophers in medieval Islamic thought. This text has received much attention in the West since its re-discovering in the 19th century, but the conditions that have occasioned and influenced the translation and retranslation of it in English have not been explored in depth yet. This study aims to study five English translations of *Munqidh* in order to 1) locate them into the socio-cultural, political and historical conditions that have occasioned and shaped their production and reception in English; 2) to determine the reasons behind choosing *Munqidh* to be translated for the first time in English and the reasons why other translators later retranslated it into the same language; 3) to determine the different strategies each translator develops to establish his translation in the receiving system field; 4) to identify and discuss the representations the producers of this text created about al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh* in the receiving culture, and 5) to assess to what extent the Retranslation Hypothesis, which states that retranslations emerge to restore previous translations and bring them closer to the source text and culture, can be confirmed by the data of *Munqidh* and its five English translations.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This study aims to explore five English translations of the intellectual autobiography of Abu Hamid al-Ghazālī, which is known in Arabic as *Al-Munqidh min al-Dalal*, or more briefly as *Munqidh*. The study aims to locate the translated texts in the socio-cultural and political conditions that have occasioned and shaped their production and reception in English, and to determine the reasons behind choosing *Munqidh* to be translated for the first time in English and the reasons why other translators later retranslated it into the same language. The study aims also to examine to what extent the Retranslation Hypothesis, which states that retranslations tend to be closer to the source text than first translations, can be confirmed by the five English translations of *Munqidh*.

This introductory chapter gives an account of the motivations and aims of this study, the research questions and methodology, and a summary of the organisation and content of the subsequent chapters.

1.1 Motivation and Aims of this Study

Retranslation is the repeated translation of a given text in the same language. As a topic in its own right, this phenomenon has recently received interest in the field of translation studies (Berman (1990); Pym (1998); Venuti, 2004). However, it is still, generally speaking, an unexplored field of research. The main focus of the research done on retranslation has been on literary texts, particularly classical literary texts. Little has been said about the retranslation of philosophical and theoretical texts (Susam-Sarajeva (2003) and Flotow, (2009)). One of the main objectives of this study is to contribute to the discussion of the retranslation of non-literary texts through exploring the motivations behind the retranslation of a classical autobiography of the great theologian and mystic Abū Ḥamid al-Ghazālī known as *Al-Munqidh mina al-Dalāl* (*Munqidh*). The text was translated into English by five translators in different times and received since its rediscovery in the 19th century in Europe and then in the Arab World much attention from Western and Arabic scholarship. Apart from the Qur'an, and perhaps the much celebrated text *The Arabian Nights*, *Munqidh* is possibly the most often translated Arabic text into English. Even al-Ghazālī's masterworks "*The Incoherence of Philosophers*" and "*The*

Revival of Religious Sciences” have not enjoyed this number of translations into English. The reasons behind selecting *Munqidh* to be retranslated four times by different translators are a main focus of this study.

Retranslation has been seen from different points of view, but the most common explanation of this phenomenon is embedded in the so called Retranslation Hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, retranslations tend to be closer to the source text than first translation(s) (Chesterman, 2004: 8). In other words, retranslations are produced to improve on first translations, to bring them closer to the source text. This study also aims to test this hypothesis with reference to *Munqidh* and its five translations in English.

Though studying the retranslation of *Munqidh* constitutes the core and main objective of this study, placing the English translations of *Munqidh* in their broader socio-cultural and historical context is another important objective. The study will also identify and discuss the representations the translators of this text created about the text, its author, and the source culture in order to see to what extent they reflect dominant thoughts and values in the translating language and culture.

This study draws on the dominant current of research in Translation Studies where translations and retranslations are described and explained by reference to a complex network of linguistic, social, cultural, political, and ideological factors.

1.2 Data of the Study

The data of this study consists of *Munqidh* and the English translations of the text by Claud Field (1909), Montgomery Watt (1952), Richard McCarthy (1980), Muhammad Abūlaylah (2002), and Muhtar Holland (2011). The translation produced by Muhammad Ali Khalidī (2005) is excluded from the analysis, because the translator presented it as being an incomplete translation of *Munqidh*. The first three translations of the aforementioned translations are carried out by Christians who are also orientalists, whereas the fourth and fifth translations are carried out by Muslims, from Egypt and the United Kingdom respectively.

I take this study to be a single case study that is to be organized around research questions. The case study is not taken to be a sample of a whole but a case that is complete and interesting in its own merit. A case study, it is argued, is part of a population that we are interested in, in our case the translation of Arabic philosophical and autobiographical texts in English, but it need not be taken to be a representation of the whole. The findings of any single case can be used to consider or explore other similar cases in similar contexts, but they are not carried out with the assumption that they will enable us to generalize the results to the larger group of which the case forms a part (Saldanha and O'Brien, 2013: 208).

1.3 Research Questions and Methodology

The major questions upon which this study is based are: Why was *Munqidh* translated into English for the first time? Why was it chosen by other translators for subsequent retranslations? How did later translators respond to and deal with the first translations of *Munqidh*? To what extent did the ways in which these translators responded to the first translations of the same text reflect tension and conflicts between different agents and groups over the proper interpretation of *Munqidh*? Do the English translations of *Munqidh* show a linear development toward literalism as prescribed by the Retranslation Hypothesis? What are culture-specific items (CSIs)? And why they are important in translation? Which procedures of translation have English translators of *Munqidh* used to render these items into English? To what extent can these procedures be described as being more source-oriented or target-oriented in translation? Do the results obtained from the description of the procedures used in translating CSIs contained in *Munqidh* confirm the logic of the Retranslation Hypothesis?

In answering these and similar questions, this study adopted a method which is at the same time descriptive, explanatory, and critical. It is descriptive in the sense that it takes into account translations as well as the paratextual materials published with them as they present themselves in our experience of the world, rather than as they must be. It is explanatory because it makes use of causal explanations. Texts are seen as both effects and causes. They are 'effects' because they are influenced and shaped by textual and non-textual factors. Textual factors cover things such as the nature of the languages involved in translation, the source text, and the existing translations

in the target language. Non-textual factors cover socio-cultural, political, and historical conditions that have occasioned and influenced the translated texts including the creative role of agency of translation (for example, translators and publishers) in shaping these texts. Translations are also considered as ‘causes’ because they can shape the source text, source language and culture and the translating language and culture in significant ways. Which of these causal explanations should be prioritized cannot be determined a priori, because it will depend upon the data and methodology of the research itself.

Although this method is mainly descriptive and explanatory, it is critical because it permits a limited place for evaluating translations as well as for evaluating statements or discourses made on translations. The major tools and concepts of this methodology mainly draw on the work of Chesterman (2000, 2012), Hermans (1999), Venuti (1995, 1998, and 2013), Brownlie (2003b), and Song (2012), among others).

This study has one major hypothesis, the Retranslation Hypothesis. This hypothesis is divided into four sub-hypotheses as follows:

First: retranslations tend to be more literal than first translation(s). Each new translation will be compared with the nearest previous translation in order to see whether there is a linear development toward literalism in these retranslations or not. The concept of literal translation as understood in early linguistic approaches to translation (e.g. Nida 1965) will be mainly deployed in the context of testing this hypothesis.

Second: retranslations tend to be more source-oriented translations than first translation(s). This study will compare each new translation with the nearest previous translation in order to determine whether retranslations tend to be closer to the source text than first translations. Source-oriented translation mainly refers to semantic and pragmatic equivalence between source and target text.

Third: retranslations tend to be closer to the source culture than first translation(s). This hypothesis will be examined with reference to the so called culture-specific items (CSIs) contained in *Munqidh*. The procedures employed in translating these items will be, first,

identified using Aixelá's typology (1996). These procedures will then be categorized into source-oriented and target-oriented procedures using the same typology. A comparison of the procedures used by each translator will then be compiled in order to determine whether the subsequent translators have favoured source-oriented translation (foreignization) or target-oriented translation (domestication) when translating these items. This will make it possible to test the Retranslation Hypothesis with reference to the cultural features of the source text. In addition to Aixelá's typology, this study will refer to domestication and foreignization as two general strategies of translation (Venuti, 1995, 1998, 2014).

Fourth: the translator's visibility becomes more 'present' in retranslations in comparison to first translations. This hypothesis will be examined through investigating and comparing the paratextual materials published with the English translations of *Munqidh*, mainly translators' introductions and notes, in order to see to what extent they reveal a linear increase in the 'visibility' of the translator. The concept of 'paratextual visibility' as understood by Koskinen, (2000) and Venuti (1995, 1998, 2013) is vital for testing this hypothesis.

1.4 Organization of the Study

This study consists of eight chapters. Chapter one is a brief summary of the study. It provides the reader with an account of the key research questions that motivated the study and the methodologies used in answering them, and an overview of the organization of the thesis.

Chapters two, three, and four constitute the theoretical background of this study. Chapter two gives a description of the main schools of thought in the field of translation studies. It aims to illustrate how translation came to be regarded as a complex phenomenon that is better seen from different points of view. The chapter shows how translation research has been viewed for a long time as a comparison between source and target texts through the notion of equivalence, and how this perspective has essentially been questioned in the field of translation studies. The chapter clarifies how translation is better seen as a socio-cultural phenomenon that involves the rendering of the foreign text according to dominant interpretations, interests, and values in the translating language and culture. The new and broader approach to translation takes it for granted that translation cannot be accurately described and explained without taking into account, among

other things, the languages and cultures involved in translation, power-relations, the nature and function of the source and target texts, and the creative role of the agency of translation (translators, patrons of translation, publishers, editors, critics). The central discussion in this chapter draws mainly but not exclusively on the work of Critical-Descriptive Translation Studies as developed in the work of Hermans (1999) and Chesterman (2000, 2007, 2012), Brownlie (2003b) as well as on the hermeneutic model of translation as developed by Venuti (1995, 1998, and 2013).

Chapter three is dedicated to the translation of CSIs. It starts with a definition of culture and CSIs, a general account of the importance of these items in translation and the challenges they pose for translators. Then two typologies of the procedures for translating these items are reviewed, and these are: the typology of Ivir (1987, 1998) and the typology of Aixelá (1996). Both typologies are useful in approaching the translation of CSIs, but it is the latter that will be preferred for the purposes of this study because it is more relevant to the data of this study, and because it provides a coherent model through which the Retranslation Hypothesis can be tested with reference to the procedures used in translating CSIs.

Chapter four is a literature review of retranslation theory. It provides the reader with an account of the main lines of thought on this phenomenon in the field of translation studies. The main focus of this chapter will be on how different scholars of translation posit a variety of explanations of retranslation. Berman, (1985, 1992, 1999) was the first scholar to reflect on this phenomenon in a systematic way. He suggested two major explanations of retranslation. The first explains retranslation by the 'defective' and 'assimilative' nature of first translations, while the other is based on the notion that retranslation 'updates' first translations. Berman's explanation comes closer to the Retranslation Hypothesis, that is, to the hypothesis which states that retranslations bring first translations closer to the source text and culture. More recently research on retranslation tends to depart from Berman's model, focusing more on the socio-cultural and political context of retranslation, particularly how these texts can be motivated and shaped by particular conflicts and tensions in the translating language and culture. The main discussion here draws notably on the work of Pym (1998), Venuti (2004), Susam-Sarajeva (2003), and Song (2012), among others. Throughout this chapter it is argued that these scholars

present a more accurate approach to retranslation because they recognize its complex practice as well as the impact of the socio-cultural and political context on generating and shaping the retranslated texts.

Chapter five provides the reader with a survey of the content and the general features of the source text, *Munqidh*, as well as the major lines of research about it in both Arabic and English. The importance of this chapter consists in providing a background for the analysis and discussions of subsequent chapters. Special attention will be given to the different readings or interpretations of the text in order to see how these interpretations are represented within English translations of the text.

Chapter six has four main aims. The first is to situate the five English translations of *Munqidh* into their contexts, socially, culturally, and politically. The second aim is to describe the general features of the translated texts including how they are presented within the target language and culture. This is done mainly through the analysis of the texts published with the translated texts (translators' or publishers' introductions, prefaces, notes, front and back cover, the title, etc.). The third aim is to determine the representations each translator constructed about *Munqidh* and its author. The fourth aim is to determine to what extent the translator's visibility becomes more present in retranslation than in first translations.

Chapter seven aims to test the Retranslation Hypothesis, using data from the translated texts themselves. The Retranslation Hypothesis posits that each new translation becomes more literal and closer to the source text than previous or first translation(s). This chapter compares each new translation of *Munqidh* with the nearest previous translation of the same text in order to see if the retranslations of this text became gradually more literal and closer to the source text than first translations or not.

Chapter eight examines the translation of CSIs of *Munqidh* in order to determine the procedures used by each translator in the rendition of these items. A comparison of the procedures used by each translator will then be compiled in order to see, first, if there are any significant similarities or differences between them, and, second, to determine whether the subsequent translators have favoured source-oriented translation (foreignization) or target-oriented translation

(domestication) when translating these items. This will make it possible to test the Retranslation Hypothesis further by using CSIs as peculiar units of translation.

Chapter nine is the conclusion of the thesis. It puts forward the findings of this study, and revisits its research questions and motivations. It also comments on the merits and shortcomings of the methodologies used by this study, and outlines suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER TWO: A LITERATURE REVIEW OF TRANSLATION THEORY

This chapter reviews the main lines of thought of translation in the field of translation studies in the West from the 1950s to the present, and discusses the controversial principles of equivalence, faithfulness and invisibility. This will provide a theoretical background for the ensuing analysis of the data of this study. It throws light on the major shifts in this field from studying translation as a linguistic practice toward studying it as a socio-cultural and political practice. Throughout the chapter, it is argued that translation is a complex phenomenon that involves linguistic as well as cultural and political elements, and that in understanding it one needs to take into account a myriad of textual and non-textual factors including the relationship between source and target text, the genre and text typology of the source text, the function(s) of the translated text, the languages and cultures involved in translation, power-relationships, the creative role of translators, publishers, editors, patrons of translation, critics, and the socio-cultural, historical, and political context in which translation is produced and consumed.

Section one of this chapter provides a general account of linguistic approaches to translation as exemplified in the work of Nida (1964) and Newmark (1988), among others. Section two provides a general account of text linguistic approaches to translation, particularly the adaptation of the notion of text typology in the field of translation studies in the work of Katharina Reiss (1971/2000), among others. Section three gives a general account of functionalist approaches to translation or Skopos Theory as understood by Vermeer (1978) and Nord (2006, 2010). Section four reviews the work of Even-Zohar (1978, 1979) and Toury (1980), illustrating how it paved the way for Descriptive Translation Studies. Section five gives an account of cultural approaches in translation studies through a discussion of the relationship between translation and politics, mainly, but not exclusively, in the work of Venuti (1995, 1998, 2008, and 2013).

2.1 Linguistic Approaches to Translation

Translation can be used to refer to the process of translation or to the product of this product, that is to say, to the translated texts themselves. I will be using “translation” to refer to both the process and the product; the context should clarify which meaning is intended. The conception of translation and the proper methods to study and explain what is involved in translation have

been seen from different points of view in the field of translation studies. Though linguistic, literary and philosophical reflections on translation can be traced back to antiquity, Translation Studies as an academic discipline and as a systematic way of thinking only emerged and developed in the second half of the 20th century (Schäffner, 2011: 308). During the 1960s up until the 1970s, translation was significantly viewed from a linguistic point of view as can be shown in the work of Jacobson (1959), Catford (1965) and Nida (1964), among others (see Brisset, 2010: 69). Translation was seen here as “a linguistic phenomenon, as an operation performed on languages, more precisely: as a process of linguistic transcoding” (Schäffner: *ibid*). The theories proposed by these theorists were, generally speaking, based on linguistics, particularly contrastive linguistics, and highly influenced by structuralism as a mode of research wherein language is treated as a system of signs and meaning as the function of the semantic and syntactic rules that define the meanings of these signs. Thus, translation was about finding equivalents in different languages and cultures, and was largely described and assessed in terms of correspondence between source and target text or between parts of the source text, particularly words and sentences, and their correspondents in the target text. Schäffner summarizes the major lines of thought within this perspective:

Since the language switch was considered to be the determining characteristic feature of translation, the aim of translation studies was to give a precise description of the systematic relations between signs and combinations of signs in the two languages, i.e. the source language (SL) and the target language (TL). Any difference between SL and TL that became obvious in a translation was attributed to the differences in the two linguistic systems. In this way, translation problems were identified and explained from a linguistic perspective. Key concepts of linguistic approaches are reproduction of the SL-text, invariance of the message, faithfulness, equivalence. (*ibid*: 308-9)

Equivalence in translation does not mean ‘sameness’ or ‘absolute identity’ between source and target text, though some might think it to be so. If a single expression in one language is taken to be equivalent in translation to another expression, this does not mean that they are synonymous or interchangeable in all contexts, but rather that they are the same in particular respects with

reference to a particular context. Equivalence can be at the level of meaning (content), form, effect, or a combination of two or more of these levels:

Equivalence [...] says that the translation will have the same value as (some aspect of) the source text. Sometimes the value is on the level of form (two words translated by two words); sometimes it is reference (Friday is always the day before Saturday); sometimes it is function (the function “bad luck on 13” corresponds to Friday in English, to Tuesday in Spanish). (Pym, 2007: 273)

As explained by Pym, equivalence in terms of reference, function, and form are reflected in Nida’s well-known typology of formal and dynamic equivalence. In formal equivalence, the translator focuses on the message of the source text, in both form and content. Thus, formal equivalence aims to achieve accuracy and correctness in translation. The most typical of this kind of translation is “gloss translation,” where the translator strives to gain close proximity to the source text structure, often with footnotes, to gain close access to the language and customs of the source culture. A translation of a philosophical text such as the *Republic* by Plato fits neatly within this category. In translating a text like this, the translator should make every effort not only to render the conceptual content (for example, key terms) of the text by using equivalent concepts in the target language as literally and meaningfully as possible, but also the form and style. According to Nida, formal equivalence permits the reader to ‘understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression’ of the SL [source language] context” (quoted in James, 2001: 4).

In contrast, dynamic or functional equivalence in translation is mainly concerned with creating a target text that has the same effect as that of the source text, even if this is achieved at the expense of the semantic content and the peculiar form of the source text. In such translation, “one is not so concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but with the dynamic relationship, that the relationship between receptor and message should substantially be the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message” (Nida, 1964/2002: 129). Here, the message of the source text is adapted to linguistic and cultural needs and expectations of the receptors of the translated text. In other words, lexical, syntactic, stylistic features (for example, rhythm) and cultural elements of the source text are

adapted according to what is deemed as a natural and idiomatic way of expression in the target language in order to achieve the same emotive impact of the original text even if this resulted in minimizing the peculiar or foreign nature of the source text (Devi, 2010: 69). However, in actual practice, dynamic equivalence does not rule completely “situations where foreign associations can hardly be avoided, in which case the use of importation combined with intratextual covert glosses was suggested as the proper way of approaching the foreign” (Młotkowski , 2006: 9).

Though Nida’s sympathy is with dynamic equivalence in translation because it is the ideal method in translating the Bible, he makes it clear that selecting one of these two methods of translation is a complex issue that is dependent on a myriad of factors such as the diversity of linguistic and cultural differences of the receptor languages, the dominant literary tradition in the translating language, the background of the receptors of the translation, and the nature or the content of the source text (Nida, 1970: 105).

Newmark’s semantic and communicative method of translation is very similar to Nida’s formal and dynamic equivalence. Semantic translation is similar to formal equivalence in that it is a source-oriented translation that aims to “render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the target language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original”, whereas communicative translation is described as target-oriented translation that aims to “produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original; it renders the contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership” (Newmark, 2009: 30). Newmark is aware that these two methods are not to be understood as clear-cut, but rather interrelated in the actual practice of translation.

Nida’s formal and dynamic translation and Newmark’s semantic communicative translation are in fact modern versions of the old distinction between literal translation and sense-for-sense translation. In practice and when it comes to whole texts (an article, a poem, a novel, etc) these methods are both used in different parts of the text. Thus, it is important to see literal and free translation not as closed compartments, but rather as two extremes in a continuum (see Watt, 2002: 256-9). Therefore, we can talk about a continuum ranging from extreme literal translation at one end and extreme free translation at the other, with a range of options in between. Though

the different parts of a single translation might be associated with different positions on the continuum, this does not mean that a translation might not have a specific focus. Thus a translation can still be legitimately described as being more or less literal than another translation of the same text. By “more literal” it is meant “manifesting more formal similarity with the source” (Chesterman, 2010: 5). Literal translation “revolves around the representation of literal meanings of individual words, phrases and sentences as well as the preservation of the word order in ST [source text]”, whereas free translation “focuses on the reproduction of the meaning in the original without much consideration of keeping the ST form” (Tian, 2014: 57). This distinction between these two methods of translation is useful for the purposes of this study, particularly in the context of testing the Retranslation Hypothesis, i.e. comparing new translations with old translation in order to see whether the latter became less/more literal in comparison with the former.

Generally speaking, linguistic approaches to translation such as those of Nida and Newmark take translation to be a transfer of invariant meaning or message from one language into another through establishing equivalence between source and target text or between constituents of these texts. Equivalence within this perspective was essential because it was used to connect source and target text and distinguish translations from other types of texts. From this point of view, translation should be described and assessed in terms of the degree of equivalence the source and target text show.

Although the advocates of early linguistic approaches to translation were aware of the problems involved in establishing complete equivalence between texts or parts of texts, they generally assumed that meaning can be determined and equivalence can be established. They assumed that “there is something definite of which the *meaning* can be determined, which then can be rendered in a different language with a large measure of correspondence” (Watt, *ibid*: 274, italic original). Similarly, Bassnett (1993) explains how equivalence was taken for granted in the 1960s and 1970s despite the increasing awareness of the problems involved in maintaining it in translation:

Generations of translators have wanted to believe in equivalence and have sought to define it in terms of sameness, sometimes arguing that that sameness could be

interpreted in different ways and was open to negotiation, but nevertheless was possible. (145)

However, given the fact that establishing a complete equivalence between source and target text with respect to all desirable features is difficult because of the differences between the languages and cultures involved, and given the fact that translators do not typically translate words or grammatical forms, but texts with specific communicative functions (Schäffner, *ibid*: 310), translation theorists have become largely convinced that it is the text and its communicative function that should be regarded as the starting point of translation:

Hence, problematic aspects of the notion of ‘translational equivalence’ arise from the fact that cultural differences, and differences with respect to grammatical and lexical structure between source and target language, often makes it impossible to achieve translational equivalence with respect to all desirable properties. In practice, then, the translation task is to create a target version that is equivalent to the original with respect to as many as possible of relevant properties, and the selection of relevant properties will depend on the purpose and communicative function of the source text. (Thunes, 2011: 19)

Therefore, equivalence in translation cannot be achieved without taking the genre and/or the function of the actual text into consideration. Gledhill (2001: 97-8) explained how four expressions that can be regarded as synonymous or equivalent in meaning figure differently in translation when they occur in different texts or genres. To understand the example given by Gledhill it is important to understand the difference between reference and sense as developed in the work of Frege (1848-1925). Frege argued that two or more expressions or signs can have the same reference (the object to which they refer) but differ in the senses (the information) they invoke about that object. Thus, *the first Arab holder of Nobel prize* and *the author of the Trilogy* are two expressions that refer to the same object (in this case, Naguib Maḥfouz), although the two expressions have different senses. Saying this, *Venus*, *the Morning Star*, *the Evening Star* and *the second nearest planet to the sun within the solar system* refer from a logical (semantic) point of view to the same object and are identical in reference. But from a literary perspective, the various expressions referring to this particular planet are by no means identical with regard to

their sense. According to Gledhill, in a hypothetical poem referring to a very amorous poet or even philanderer, a line such as:

(a) *My heart leapt for joy when I saw Venus flood the evening sky*

is certainly not equivalent with regard to sense to:

(b) *My heart leapt for joy when I saw the Evening Star flood the evening sky*

as the romantic or in some contexts, erotic connotations are totally lost.

If the Morning Star is substituted, there is a paradoxical effect, but quite different from the original (a) and also, interestingly, from (b):

(c) *My heart leapt for joy when I saw the Morning Star flood the evening sky.*

If we use the scientific equivalent (d), the effect becomes absurd:

(d) *My heart leapt for joy when I saw the second planet nearest to the sun within the solar system flood the evening sky.*

This example clearly shows that literary and scientific equivalence are completely different in translation even when the reference is the same. Equivalence in translation is thus determined, at least partly but essentially, by the nature of the source text or its function. This fact has become clear in the light of developments in text linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis, which have led translation scholars to adopt a new approach to translation that is based on language in use or texts as actual communicative acts. Snell-Hornby (2010: 210-11) illustrated this point in this way:

the professional translator is not primarily concerned with linguistic items, be they words or structures, nor with sentences or scholarly abstractions, but with texts, and in translation the text cannot be seen merely as a sequence of sentences, each consisting of a string of items, but as a “communicative occurrence” in the definition of Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) or the “verbalized part of a socioculture” in the words of Hönig and Kussmaul (1982: 58), hence language as used in a specific situation and as inseparable from its cultural background or— seen from the hermeneutic viewpoint – as a gestalt, a multi-dimensional structure which is more than the mere sum of the individual words and structures of which it consists.

The following section attempts to clarify this shift in translation research by showing how the notion of text genre and typology affects translation. It gives a very general account of one of the most influential models that relates translation and translation equivalence to the rhetorical function of the source text. The model was originally developed by the German theorist Katharina Reiss (1971/2000) and then adopted by several researchers in the field of translation studies.

2.2 Translation and Text Typology

The relationship between the nature or the genre of the source text and translation has been a subject of reflection in the history of translation for a long time. One need only to recall the old distinction between translating the Bible and translating other texts in Jerome's (347-420 AD) reflections (see Garrett, 2011: 35-36), or the old distinction between translating literary and non-literary texts in Schleiermacher's (1768-1834) thought. The latter, for example, argued that business-related texts (non-literary texts) on one hand, and literary texts, including philosophical texts, on the other hand, pose different problems for translators and require different methods in translation (see details in Kittel and Poltermann, 1998: 416).

Translating different texts that belong to different genres requires different strategies of translation and lead to different end products (Roberts, 1988: 72). The term "genre" is used here to refer to "global linguistic patterns which have historically developed in a linguistic community for fulfilling specific communicative tasks in specific situations" (Schäffner, 2002: 4). Although the term genre was used traditionally as "a distinctive type or category of literary composition", it is now widely used to refer to "a distinctive category of discourse of any type, spoken or written, with or without literary aspirations" (Trosborg, 1997: 7). Classifying texts into genres of different kinds, literary or non-literary, is still widely used in the field of translation studies (see Chesterman and Williams, 2002: 9).

Analysing texts in terms of genre can help the translator "develop strategies that facilitate his/her work and provide awareness of various options as well as constraints" (Trosborg, *ibid*, viii). Although recent research has witnessed an observable focus on the classification of texts according to their functions (whether they are used to inform or persuade, for example),

Schäffner argues that the notion of genre seems to have greater importance in the field of translation studies than the notion of text types, because genres, rather than text types, can be described as typical combinations of contextual and structural features:

Genres are embedded in sociologically determined communicative activities. They can be described as conventional, typical combinations of contextual (situational) or communicative–functional, and structural (grammatical and thematic) features. It is in this respect that genres, rather than text types, have become relevant for Translation Studies. Due to their (more or less) conventional structures, genres can provide some orientation for the production of texts, including translation as text production. (Schäffner, *ibid*)

However, the classification of texts according to genres has been criticized as being too broad; for different texts within one and the same genre may serve different rhetorical functions, and different texts from different genres may share one and the same rhetorical function (Trosborg, *ibid*: 16). For this and other reasons, some theorists have developed a more nuanced typology of texts that is based on the functions of texts, regardless of the genre of those texts.

The classification of texts into types has been a “recurrent concern of translation scholars, based on the assumption that identifying text types according to specific criteria can be a useful starting point for translation analysis and assessment or for providing guidelines of a procedural nature” (Palumbo, *ibid*: 114). Different text types are characterised by certain linguistic features, which in turn are an expression of the author’s intention. If these features are taken into account in translation, the communicative function of the translated text will be similar in its communicative function to that of the original text. The identification of texts into types can thus provide guidelines for translating different types of texts on one hand, and provide a conceptual framework within which one can explain and assess the different methods used in translating these texts, on the other hand.

One of these is a typology that was proposed by the German theorist Katharina Reiss. Reiss (1971/2000) was, perhaps, the first translation scholar to suggest a model of text typology in the field of translation studies. This model is based not on the subject matter of texts but rather on

the functions of texts. Reiss divided texts into three types and tied them to specific genres and methods of translation. These three types are informative texts, expressive texts, and vocative or persuasive texts.

Informative texts are those texts that aim at communicating the content or the information included in texts. Informative texts would include a wide range of texts such as news reports, commercial and correspondence, directions for use, treaties, official documents, educational works, non-fiction books of all sorts, essays, reports, theses, and specialized texts in the humanities, the natural sciences, and other technical fields (Cuéllar, 2007: 233-4). The main function of informative texts is to “pass information”. As Dukāte points out, readers of these texts generally expect “to receive information and are less critical as to the language quality of the text” (2009: 28). Readers also expect that these texts “will not [be] translated word for word, and sound more or less natural in the target language” (*ibid*). In other words, in such texts the most important thing in translation is to establish a semantic equivalence between source and target text, and only secondarily, to convey “connotative” meanings and aesthetic values (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 181).

Expressive texts are those texts that aim at communicating the artistic and aesthetic content of texts or the message as well as the style of the source text (what is said and how it is said). This would include literary prose (essays, biographies), imaginative prose (short stories, novels), and poetry in all its forms (Cuéllar, *ibid*: 234). It is expected that in translating expressive texts “the original is not tampered with” (Dukāte, *ibid*: 29). The translator of these texts is required to recreate the “form” of the source text (to render a story by a story and a poem by a poem and so on and so forth).

Persuasive texts belong to the third type of texts in Reiss’s model. These texts aim at communicating the “persuasive character” of the content of texts or, to put it in different way, aim to generate a non-linguistic effect on the receivers. Persuasive texts include texts such as advertising, publicity, preaching, propaganda, polemic, demagoguery or satire (Cuéllar, *ibid*). The translation of these texts is target-oriented that requires “adaptation of the text to the new cultural situation because of the differences between cultures” (Dukāte, *ibid*). The main task of

translation here is to successfully render the extra-linguistic effect of the text even if this is achieved at the expense of both form and content.

Reiss points out that the functions characterizing a group of texts affect the texture or the features of the components of these texts (the lexical, semantic, syntactic, and stylistic components of texts), and, thus, affect the decisions translators take in translating these texts. With this perspective, the translator should “reflect such functions and adjust the linguistic material accordingly” (Palumbo, 2009: 114). The translator is required to establish equivalence in translation according to the function of the source text. If, for example, the source text is informative, the target text should be equivalent to that text in terms of the source text’s content or information. In translating these texts, for instance, the translator should give considerable weight to its content even if this results in sacrificing other aspects of that text (for example, style). One example that Reiss gives is the translation of creative metaphors. Translating creative metaphors in an informative text (for example, in a scientific report) is not like translating creative metaphors in an expressive text (for example, in a poem). In the latter the translator is required to translate a creative metaphor by a creative metaphor, but this is not necessary the case in the former (see Snell-Hornby, 1995:30). Pym rightly remarked that Reiss’s model is based on “a mode of equivalence where the translation has to reproduce aspects of what is functional in the source text” (Pym, 2010: 18). Creative metaphors in a poem, for example, affect the aesthetic expressive function of the text as a whole, and this should be taken into consideration when establishing equivalence between source and target texts in translation.

Reiss’s model is still widely used in translation studies, and considered “a valid and useful point of reference for translating, translation criticism and translation teaching” (Cuéllar, *ibid*: 234-5), despite the fact that it was proposed in the 1970s.

The problem these and similar models face is that a considerable number of texts are essentially multifunctional. A particular text can and often does consist of different sections that may be regarded as informative, expressive, and persuasive. But this problem can be solved if we take into consideration that typically one of these functions is supposed to be dominant in a single text (Nord, 2006: 139).

Another problem that these models seem to face is that they assume the function of the source text remains the same in the target text. This is typically true, but in some cases this is not true. As Baker (2004) pointed out:

Apart from the obvious problems of defining a single function for a text [...], this approach has rightly been criticized as divorced from the realities of translation in that it assumes that the function of the target text is determined by (and therefore has to be equivalent to) that of the source text. This is not at all the case in many situations. If, as often happens, a client gives a translator an advertisement and asks him or her to produce a rough translation of it for informative purposes, it would be perverse of the translator to insist on producing a target text which can function as an advertisement in its own right. (4)

Moreover, it is argued that even if the function of the target text retains the same function as the source text, other purposes or uses of the target text may have important consequences on the text in translation. A philosophical text might be translated differently, to a greater or lesser extent, if it is used to address undergraduate students of philosophy rather than specialists (philosophers), even if its informative or argumentative function remains the same in source and target languages. These issues are better answered within the Skopos Theory to be discussed in the following section.

2.3 Skopos Theory

In its original sense, the word *skopos* means ‘function’ or ‘purpose’. In its technical sense in the field of translation studies, the term Skopos Theory refers to a theory of translation that was originally developed in the work of Vermer (1978). According to the Skopos Theory, translation is “a conscious planned activity that must have a purpose and this purpose determines what would be the equivalents, what would be the style, what would be the translation strategies, who would be the target readers, so on and so forth” (Davi and Panda, 2015: 282). Thus, and contrary to early linguistic approaches to translation, what determines whether a translated text is equivalent to the source text is not primarily the source text or any a priori defined criterion of equivalence but the *skopos* of translation, that is, its purpose (Pym, 1995: 4, see also Nord, 2010:

121-2). Thus, equivalence from this point of view is not an ideal but something that is treated as negotiation, that is, something that is to be decided by the translator and the client or initiator of translation.

With this perspective, it is important to keep in mind that to describe and/or to assess a specific translation, on this view, that what matters is not whether the translated text is equivalent to the source text, but rather whether it has successfully or appropriately fulfilled its function as prescribed by the client of the translator (for example, the patron of the translation), when describing and/or assessing a specific translation. The same can be said about the translator whose work should be assessed in light of whether he or she has successfully fulfilled the intended purpose of translation as specified in the ‘translation brief’, i.e. the instructions of translation as specified by the client or the initiator of translation (see Jabir, 2006: 39-40). Skopos Theory is mainly based on the idea that the translator is an expert in “intercultural communication [who] understands the function of the source text and determines the function of the target text: s/he may retain or change the function depending on the brief or the goal of the target text, its skopos” (Tyulenev, 2014: 114).

Therefore, and from this point of view, translation is a negotiation process that is shaped by those who are involved in translation such as the client and the translator, as well as the function of the translation and the addressed audience. This is an important shift in translation studies not only from the conception of translation as linguistic transfer and of equivalence as determined by the rules of two languages, but also as a shift toward focusing more on the target language and the different purposes translation serves in it.

Skopos theory is relevant to this study because it shows how the purpose and audience of translation can shape the work of the translator in a significant way. It also emphasizes the importance of describing how a given text was received in a particular culture which is a main focus of the current study. However, Skopos theory remains limited in scope, because it is confined to one level of explanation, that is, the purpose or function of translation. Skopos theory only covers what Pym, following Aristotle, calls the ‘final cause’ of translation (see details in O’Driscoll, 2009: 4). By focusing on the function of translation, Skopos Theory ignores other causes of translation such as the role of the agency of translation and the socio-cultural context

within which translation is produced and received. These factors are well addressed within Descriptive Translation Studies and cultural approaches to translation in the 1980s and 1990s, to which we now refer.

2.4 Descriptive Translation Studies: Polysystem and Norms Theory

Probably, the most challenging paradigm of the conception of translation as linguistic transfer and the conception of equivalence associated with it came from two important theories in the field of translation studies in the late 1970s and in 1980s: the so called Polysystem Theory as developed by Even-Zohar (1978, 1979), and Norms Theory as developed primarily by Toury (1980, 1990). These two theories, but especially the latter, paved the way to what is sometimes termed as Descriptive Translation Studies.

Even-Zohar proposed his theory known as Polysystem in the late 1970s as a framework for studying literature in general and translated literature in particular. The types of questions that the Polysystem attempts to answer are: why some cultures translate or are open to translations more than other cultures, and why one culture is, at times, more open to translations than it is at another time? Why translated literature or translations occupy a central position in a specific culture at a time and a marginal position at another? Why it occupies a central position within a specific culture but a marginal position in another? Why a translated work (or genre) occupies a central position in one culture but a marginal position in another? These and other similar questions are answered by treating translated literature as a system that is related to other systems (translated literature as related to original literature) in a larger social and historical context of a particular culture at a particular time (Palumbo, *ibid*: 84). Any translated work, although Polysystem is concerned particularly with literary works, should be seen as part of a translated genre or literature that is related to other genres and literatures within a single culture at a specific time and under a specific social, cultural, and historical context. The focus on relations and systems rather than on isolated works makes it possible to understand the mechanisms of translation in a particular culture through searching for certain laws of translation that can be used to explain translations and the features related to them. Some examples of these laws are: 1) a specific literary system or culture is open to translations when that culture is in development; 2) translated literature does not constitute a rival to national literature.

Toury took Polysystem Theory further by introducing the notion of translation norms. Norms refer to “regularities of translation behaviour” that are in process in a specific culture at a particular time. These regularities are better understood as conventions that are created by observing a set of actions performed by members of a given population (translators) in light of their expectations and preferences. When these conventions are established, people may go on and construct, by idealisation, an abstract norm or standard of conduct. These norms may cover what is to be translated and how it is to be translated.

Norms of translation are not isolated observations, but rather “generalizations that are formulated by studying “a corpus of authentic translations, and identifying regular patterns of translation, including types of strategies that are typically opted for by the translators represented in that corpus” (Baker, 1998: 190). Norms address the translation process from the selection of a text or a group of texts to be translated to the linguistic and textual choices the translator made in translating these texts. According to Toury, these norms constitute a first step toward formulating laws of translation that can be used in explaining translations and the features that are related to them. Munday explains the move from norms to laws as viewed by Toury and how they can be used in explaining translations:

These generalizations may, with further inquiry, lead to the formulation of probabilistic ‘laws’ of translation that reconceive the idea of translation universals. Thus, ‘in text A, produced under conditions and constraints B, X is translated as Y’ becomes ‘in texts of type A, produced under conditions and constraints B, X *is likely to be translated* as Y’. (2009: 11, italic original)

This is very similar to how scientific explanations in both natural and social sciences generally work. A particular phenomenon is explained by reference to a particular law that covers the phenomenon to be explained, in addition to specifying the conditions under which that phenomenon occurs.

The norms of translation cover not only the norms that constrain the work or the strategies translators use in translating a given text, but also the norms that constrain the selection of the translated texts as well as the way these texts are received in a particular language. These norms

can be achieved, not only through observation of the translated texts themselves, that is, the regularities they show, but also the texts published with them which are known as paratextual materials. These include prefaces and/or introductions to the translation by translators, editors and publishers, translators' or editors' notes, front and back cover, and reviews of translation. These paratextual materials are a rich source for searching for norms of translation, and they are also important for examining how the translated text is presented in the target language and culture. For others, translators' extensive prefaces and notes on translation as well as any similar paratextual materials published with the translated text (editors' and publishers' introductions to translations, for example) were and still are regarded as 'scholarly writing' and as a strong indication about the academic nature of translation (Päivärinne, 2012: 43).

Both Polysystem Theory and Norms Theory shifted translation research away from focusing on isolated translated texts in terms of their relationship to source texts toward studying translated texts as literature on their own, i.e. as part of a literary system or culture. Baker (1998) explains the importance of the work of these two scholars which is sometimes referred to as Descriptive Translation Studies, and pointed out how their work has shifted translation research:

These include an explicit refusal to make a priori statements about what translation is, what it should be, or what kind of relationship a translated text should have with its original; an insistence on examining all translation-related issues historically, in terms of the conditions which operate in the receiving culture at any point in time; and an interest in extending the extension of research beyond the examination of translated texts, in particular to include all the evaluative on translation, for example prefaces, reviews, essays, and so on. (163)

Chesterman points out that Polysystem Theory and Norms Theory are both causal in nature compared to early linguistic approaches to translation which are comparative in nature. He states that causal models reflect a shift in translation studies as they "aim to represent both the various causes that affect translations, and the various effects that translations can have. The translations themselves are therefore seen as both effects and causes, like this: Causes → Translations → Effects." (2012: 109). Their terms are closely related to the two main objectives of 'Translation Studies' as formulated by Holmes (1998): "to describe the phenomena of translating and

translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience; 2) to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted” (see Schäffner, 2011: 315).

Instead of limiting translation research to questions of equivalence and faithfulness in translation, these two theories gave more attention to the context of translation, i.e. causes and effects of translation. Given the fact that the current study is a context-oriented study, the questions these two theories address prove to be very useful for the purposes of this study. Among the questions the advocates of these two theories address are: who translated what? When? Where? How? and Why? These questions are related to the production of translation. The questions: “how a specific translation was received?” and “why it was received in a particular way?” are related to the effects or reception of translation. The current study mainly focuses on such questions.

In addition, Descriptive Translation Studies emphasized both the description and explanation of translation which are also vital for the current study. Questions such as “who translated what, when, where, and how a specific translation was received?” are related to the description of translation, whereas questions such as “why a given text was translated?” and “why it was translated and received in a particular way?” are related to explanation. In fact, these questions have become the guiding questions for translation research in general and for contextualizing translations in their socio-cultural and historical context in particular (see details in O’Driscoll, *ibid*: 2; and Hermans, 1999: 70).

The approach these two theories developed start with description of translations and the features related to them and then moves beyond that level and search for explanation. Explanation can cover textual and non-textual (socio-cultural and ideological) explanations which are also vital for the purposes of this study.

Moreover, treating translations as part of a literature in the target language (Polysystem theory), examining the impact of translation norms on the work of the translator (Norms theory) and investigating how paratextual materials can shape the production and reception of the translated texts, which is one of the most important achievements of these two theories, seem all to be useful tools for this project as will be shown in the ensuing chapters.

However, and according to Brownlie (1998), Descriptive Translation Studies as developed by Even-Zohar and Toury has been criticized for its “scientificity and rigidity”, especially when it comes to the notion of translation laws (78). It was also criticized for ignoring the role of the individual agency (for example, the translator) and the impact of individual translating situations on the translated texts as well as on their reception. Moreover, explaining the phenomenon of translation and the features that are related to them cannot be reduced to one sort of explanation: systematic explanations. Pym (1998), for example, argued that the complex nature of translation calls for multiple sources of explanation (Brownlie, 2003b: 111-12). This may include the source text, the languages involved, the individual agency of translation (for example, translators and publishers), the purpose and function of translation, and, of course the nature of the system in which the translated texts are produced and consumed, among other things.

In addition, some scholars of translation argued that Descriptive Translation Studies, especially in its earlier phase as developed in the work of Even-Zohar and Toury, neglects the role of values and the political and ideological effects of translation. Venuti highlights this point succinctly:

Norms may be in the first instance linguistic or literary, but they will also include a diverse range of domestic values, beliefs, and social representations which carry ideological force in serving the interests of specific groups. And they are always housed in the social institutions where translation are produced and enlisted in cultural and political agendas. (quoted in Devi, *ibid*: 105)

The increased awareness of the political and ideological dimensions of translation is situated at the core of the so called ‘cultural turn’ in translation studies to which we now refer.

2.5 The Cultural Turn and the Politics of Translation

Since the early 1990s, the field of translation studies has been inspired to a considerable extent by Cultural Studies, anthropology, poststructuralist, postmodern, and postcolonial theories. These approaches differ in many respects, but they have, as Arrojo (1998) points out, a common line of thought: a radical scepticism toward any conception of stable meaning that can be transferred in translation without change, and a conviction that translation is always shaped by cultural, historical, ideological or political circumstances (in Schäffner, *ibid*: 315). Translation on

this account is treated as being a “translation of cultural, political and historical contexts and concepts rather than mere linguistic ones” (Devi, *ibid*: 13). This shift in the conception of translation is commonly referred to as the ‘cultural turn’. From this perspective, “neither the word, nor the text, but the culture becomes the ‘operational unit of translation” (Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990, quoted in Shamma, 2009: 2). But it is issues such as cultural dominance, cultural assertion and cultural resistance that have led some translation theorists to redefine the cultural turn as a power turn, and this “has fostered an increasing attention for the relation between translation and ideology” in this field (Extremera, 2015: 28). The translator emerges here, as Shamma rightly remarks, as being a creative and active mediator who can shape other languages and cultures literarily and politically in essential ways (*ibid*).

A main theme within this perspective of thought is that translation is a cross-cultural relationship or exchange that is essentially shaped by powerrelations between different languages and cultures rather than being a mere ‘fact’ in the target culture as Even-Zohar and Toury claim. Thus, translation from a dominant language and culture such as English and French into a dominated language and culture such as Arabic is not the same as when translation is undertaken from the latter into the former. Because languages and cultures do not meet in equal positions, one culture surrenders, more or less, to the other in translation. In translation, this could take the form of imposing in translation particular concepts of the dominating language and culture on those found in the dominated or less prestigious culture, or imposing stylistic features and aesthetic values of the former culture on the latter culture. In translation, all texts are, more or less, adapted according to norms or values in the target language and culture, but power relations in translation should not be ignored. As Hatim and Mason (1991) pointed out:

Whereas textual patterns and conventions are constantly modified when texts in less dominant languages are translated into English, the reverse is not the case. It seems that many of the world’s languages are finding English rhetorical patterns creeping in. The degree of tolerance of foreign structures seems to be proportional to the relative prestige of a language. (quoted in Młotkowski, *ibid*: 11)

Power relations between the languages and cultures involved in translation also play a role in how the translated texts are presented, particularly through paratextual materials (for example,

prefaces, introductions, notes, appendixes). These materials might be used to highlight cultural differences between the dominating culture and the dominated culture, where the former is portrayed as being culturally and politically superior and the latter is portrayed as inferior and passive. This is something that can be seen, for example, in some translated texts from Arabic or Indian by specialists in Eastern cultures who are known as orientalists. Orientalists show care towards the source texts and cultures, but they tend to use rationality and Christian ‘truths’ to undermine or down play the canons of other cultures (Hue, 1998: 201). Translations that are conducted by Orientalists are also an important means of creating and reproducing representations or images about the colonized or the dominated cultures. These images are presented by the dominant culture as ‘realities’ or ‘facts’ and can be used to reproduce the power relations between the dominating and the dominated cultures, i.e. the inequality of these languages and cultures. It is also held that the texts chosen from the dominated culture to be translated in the dominating culture are those which help to create a desired image of the colonized or suite dominant images in the translating culture. For example, translating spiritual or erotic texts from Arabic or Indian during colonial rule and even after can be seen as a means to construct and strengthen the image of these cultures in the West as being essentially and intrinsically religious and sensual (*ibid*).

Venuti, who emphasized the importance of taking into consideration power relations between the languages and cultures that are involved in translation, went a step further by highlighting how the inequality within languages and cultures themselves constitutes a major factor that can shape translation in specific ways even if the linguistic and cultural nature of translation is acknowledged:

Translation is [...] a linguistic and cultural practice that is situated in multiple sets of *hierarchies* between and within languages, cultures, and institutions. These hierarchies are rankings according to value, authority, or prestige, so that translating, even picking a text to translate is implicated in division and inequality, regardless of the fact that a translation is meant to bridge linguistic and cultural differences. (2012: 1, italic original)

What this means is that power relations are important, but should not be reduced to a simple relationship between dominating and dominated languages and culture. In other words, it should not mean that a single text that belongs to a dominated language and culture will be always susceptible to being manipulated according to the concepts and values of the dominating language at the expense of its linguistic and cultural peculiarities, because even in dominating cultures themselves there are hierarchies, divisions and conflicts that can affect what is translated, how it is translated and how it is presented in the translating language and culture. It is within this context that the role of the agency of translation, mainly the role of the individual translator as a social and political actor is taking to be an important role even in translation between unequal languages and cultures. No work has emphasized this point better than Venuti's work.

2.5.1 Venuti's Hermeneutic Model

The words 'hermeneutic', 'hermeneutical', and 'hermeneutics' are common terms in the field of translation studies. Hermans (1998) in his entry on hermeneutics in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* discusses the work of Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, Gadamer, Ricoeur, and Derrida as some of the well-known theorists within this tradition (*ibid*: 130). To these Hermans also added Steiner's *After Babel* (1975).

According to Hermans, translation is "framed by hermeneutic concerns" because translation between two languages "is not immediately intelligible" (*ibid*). This notion was common amongst the German Romantics in the 19th century, and was strongly revived and revised in the work of Heidegger and Gadamer, and later in the 1980s and the 1990s by the French critic Antoine Berman and then by Venuti. The Romantics emphasized the fact that language is not a mere communication of meaning or thought, and, accordingly, that translation is not a simply transmission of meaning from one language into another. For the Romantics, language has become "a constitutive of thought", where different languages "embedded different ways of conceptualizing the world". As a result of this, "understanding and translating others became fundamentally problematic" (*ibid*: 130-31). For Venuti, every act of translating is mediated by the translator's background and the context of translation, i.e., by meanings, values, and interests dominant in the translating language and culture. The translator inscribes an interpretation in the

foreign text by applying a category that mediates between the foreign language and culture, on one hand, and the translating language and culture, on the other. From this point of view, to translate the foreign text is to interpret it, is to transform or change it in some way, and not to reproduce it or its meaning "intact" in the translating language. Translation as Venuti points out is "an interpretation of the source text, whose form, meaning, and effect are seen as variable, subject to inevitable transformation during the translating process" (2000: 483).

Thus, when we translate a text we interact with it. We come to it holding certain beliefs, expectations, and values, and translate in light of some of the rules or norms that are themselves part of or supported by more abstract concepts or assumptions or a theory of language and thought. The text to be translated is also presented to us as a unique text that was produced by someone in a single time and place, understood in specific ways both in the source or target culture.

Venuti recognizes the correspondences between the source text and the translated text, but takes such correspondence to be inscribed and determined by the translating language and culture. This means that equivalence in translation is important but should be treated only as always relative to a context, i.e., to types and degrees of equivalences that the translator (or other agency of translation) establishes in translation, and should not be seen as universal or as being a standard that is to be defined a priori:

In advancing this hermeneutic model, I am not suggesting that no formal or semantic correspondence can exist between the source text [...] and the translation [...] but rather that any such correspondence are shaped by the exigencies of an interpretation act that is decisively determined by the translating language and culture". (Venuti, 2013: 179)

Thus, translation is about difference in so far as it is about equivalence, and we should never ignore the difference that translation makes. The difference that translation creates in the very essence of the equivalence that it establishes is the creative work of the translator and translation. It is mainly what translation adds not only to the foreign text and foreign culture but also to the translating language and culture as well.

Thus, a partial equivalence is not a disappointment, but rather an inevitable condition of all translations given the differences between languages, cultures, and the plural understandings of texts when they are used to address new audiences and respond to new contexts and situations:

In the hermeneutic model, any correspondence is partial and contingent: partial because it is incomplete in re-creating the source text and slanted toward the receiving language and culture; contingent because it is fixed by one among other possible interpretations, each of which establishes a criterion of accuracy that varies among receiving cultural constituencies, social situations, and historical moments.

(Venuti, 2000: 484)

Apart from acknowledging the partial nature of equivalence in translation, Venuti showed little, if any, interest in proposing criteria of equivalence in translation with reference to different types of texts and/or to different functions and purposes of translation. This is explained partially by his adherence to deconstruction where the notions of ‘meaning’, ‘original’ and ‘equivalence’ are problematized but with no alternatives’ (see notes by Cain, 2001: 131).

Although translation involves rendering a text according to dominant interpretations in the translating language, this should not mean that translators are completely free to render the text on whatever basis they want, or that they surrender to dominant interpretations in the translating language and culture. For Venuti, translation should be treated as relatively distinct not only from the source text, but also from dominant interpretations in the translating language and culture. This is the ethical aim that translators should adhere to. Translators can assimilate the source text in translation, but can also register its foreignness. They can conform to dominant interpretations in the translating culture or challenge them. This is what foreignizing translation amounts to. The following section gives more details about the conception of foreignizing translation and its political and ethical basis.

2.5.2 Foreignizing Translation

One of the main questions in the history of translation theory has been the question of the nature of translation, particularly whether the translator should create an acceptable text in the translating language and culture or register the formal and aesthetic features of the original in

order to evoke interest in a foreign culture. This means that the translator should choose between two opposing methods in translation: either to domesticate the foreign text by emphasizing the language and culture of the target text or to foreignize the source text by emphasizing the language and culture of the source text:

An author can choose a fairly aggressive presentation of unfamiliar cultural elements in which differences, even ones likely to cause problems for a receiving audience, are highlighted, or an author can choose an assimilative presentation in which likeness or ‘universality’ is stressed and cultural differences are muted and made peripheral to the central interests of the literary work. (Tymoczko, 1999: 21)

These two methods or strategies that the translator encounters in translation in general and in translating the peculiar linguistic (for example, local dialects) and cultural (for example, religious concepts specific to a given culture) elements were first referred to by Schleiermacher who states that: “Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him” (cited by Venuti, 1995: 19-20). Schleiermacher preferred the second method not only because it can produce faithful translations, but also because it can enrich the translating language through, for example, creating new lexicons and/or creating new modes of thought. For this reason, it can be rightly agreed that Schleiermacher was a major figure in shifting modern thought of translation from the long debate over literal translation versus free translation into thinking of translation on one hand as a relationship not only between languages but also cultures, and toward thinking seriously, on the other hand, about the relationship between translation and the target language.

In English, it is Newman (1805-97) who is considered to be the pioneering figure of foreignizing translation at the end of the 19th century. In the preface to his translation of the *Iliad* Newman strongly criticized what he considered to be a “false and ruinous” method to translation, wherein the reader is required to forget that he is reading a translation, and instead “be lulled into the illusion that he is reading an original work”. Contrary to this, “the English translator should desire the reader always to remember that his work is an imitation, and moreover is in a different material; that the original is foreign, and in many respects extremely unlike our native

compositions” (cited by Birdwood-Hedger, 2006: 29). For Newman, translations should reflect the language of the source text and not the modern language of translation, hence his insistence on archaic translations (*ibid*). Newman’s foreignizing method was echoed in the work and thought of other English writers and translators of the 19th century, but it was the domestication method that became dominant in English at the end of the 19th century (*ibid*: 32-34). This situation continues, as pointed out by Cohen (1962), in the first half of the 20th century under the impact of “science teaching, which had placed increased emphasis on the matter rather than the manner” (*ibid*: 35).

Berman, the French translator and theorist, is one of the most influential advocates of foreignizing translation, and his views in this regard have influenced others in the field of translation studies including Venuti. His main defence of this method of translation is based on his conception of translation as an experience of the foreign and as a re-contextualization of the foreign text in a new environment. As he points out:

Translation is the trial of the foreign. But in a double sense. In the first place, it establishes a relationship between the Self-Same (*Propre*) and the Foreign by aiming to open up the foreign work to us in its utter foreignness.... In the second place, translation is a trial for the Foreign as well, since the foreign work is uprooted from its own language-ground. And this trial, often an exile, can also exhibit the most singular power of the translating act: to reveal the foreign work's most original kernel, its most deeply buried, most self-same, but equally the most 'distant' from itself. (2000: 284)

Schleiermacher did not offer any detailed picture of those practical strategies of translation that may be considered as assimilative or foreignizing translation. In contrast, Berman argued that there are “deforming tendencies” in the target language and culture that could potentially destroy the essence of the original text. These tendencies include things such as clarification (explication), expansion, qualitative impoverishment, the destruction of rhythms, the destruction of underlying networks of signification, the destruction of expressions and idioms, and the effacement of the superimposition of languages (see Berman, 1985/2000: 286-88). He argues

that translators should resist these deforming tendencies by working hard not only on the meaning of the source text, but also its form.

Like Schleiermacher, Berman linked foreignizing translation to a sort of literalism in translation. For them, literal translation can produce more faithful translations and thus a full understanding of the essence of the foreign text, language, and culture. Berman takes this to be the ethical aim of translation as it tries to resist ethnocentrism and promoting openness toward foreign languages and cultures.

Venuti's conception of foreignizing and domesticating translation is largely developed in light of the work of Schleiermacher and Berman. However, Venuti takes it for granted that there is nothing that one can call "the foreign text as such" or the "essence" of the source text that the translator should reflect in a literal or closer translation. However, Venuti argues that the fact that the source text does not have an essence to be reflected in translation by means of a literal translation, and does not and should not mean that translators have the liberty to manipulate foreign texts in translation at will. He agreed with both Schleiermacher and Berman that the translator should register the foreign linguistic or cultural elements of the source text in the translating language in such a way that the reader of the translated text is taken to the world of the 'foreign' text and culture. This can be done in different ways in the translating language including the adoption of literalism. However, for Venuti foreignization is not to be equated or reduced to literalism. For Venuti, foreignizing does not "carry a literal mandate, although literalism sometimes enables its goals of emphasizing the foreign elements of the source text" (Cheung, 2012: 259). Literalism as a method of translation does not carry ideological intentions toward the relationship between translation and the translating language and culture, whereas foreignizing translation does. For Venuti foreignizing translation mainly aims to challenge dominant trends in translation in the translating culture (for example, norms of translation, thoughts, values, and modes of expressions). It is charged, as Tamaki (2005) remarks, with "more emphasis on the ideological pressure against the target-language culture than on the faithfulness to the original text" (cited by Meldrum, 2008: 239). This means that foreignizing translation is "a conscious operation of bringing a foreign flavor into translations in order to counteract the effects of domestication" (*ibid*: 39). But the 'foreign' flavour needs not be only

that which results from incorporating ‘foreign’ elements from the source text and culture into the target text and culture, but also, and more importantly for Venuti, draws on the target culture’s linguistic and cultural resources in order to “achieve a distancing effect” in translation (Koskinen, 2000: 52). In this way, breaking dominant norms of translation in the target culture can be termed as ‘foreignizing’ in the Venutian sense even if this has no obvious link to the foreign elements of the source text and culture.

In Venuti’s opinion, domestication is the opposite of foreignization and can be defined as a sort of translation that erases the linguistic and cultural elements of the source text and culture according to dominant tendencies and values in the translating language, or to following the norms of translation in the target language and culture. Domestication amounts to producing easily read and fluent translations that give the false impression that the translated text addresses the target audience directly as if it was an original text, and manipulating the source text to support dominant values and interests in the translating language including publishing trends in a particular time.

Thus, domestication and foreignization as understood by Venuti are closely related to his conception of translation as violence and resistance. The conflict between these two strategies can be regarded as the cultural and political rather than linguistic extension of the time-worn controversy over free translation and literal translation (Wang Dongfeng 2002, in Yang, 2010: 77).

Venuti’s advocacy of foreignizing translation, which he sometimes terms as minoritizing, is a political position, a left-Marxist reaction against cultural and political homogeneity in general and the Anglo-American tradition in particular. Foreignizing translation for Venuti, as Richter and Burke (2012) point out, “stresses what is strange and unfamiliar in the original, thus resisting and criticizing easy assumptions of domestic superiority, and promoting respect for cultural differences” (5). The same point is emphasized by McRae, who argues that the translator should acknowledge, from Venuti’s point of view, “the violence of translation and attempt to imitate in the target language whatever features of the source text resist dominant cultural values” (2011: 11).

It is important to emphasize that foreignizing translation also opens a door for re-thinking what is translated from other languages and culture. It covers not only the way translation is conducted, but also the selection of the texts to be translated. As Underhill (2006: 104-5) points out:

And part of this change will include selecting texts for translation which do not correspond to ethical and aesthetic codes that dominate in the target culture. This runs counter to the dominant trend in which, as Venuti rightly argues, editors carefully select texts which can be readily assimilated into our culture either as familiar texts or familiar stereotypes. These cultural stereotypes do indeed impose strict limits and serve to make the introduction into our culture of a text which does not conform to them very difficult. Among such Anglo American stereotypes we might list the following: The French are intellectual. Asians are other-worldly. Arabs are religious. Czechs are humorous. Such stereotypes make it very difficult to promote, sell, and therefore finance the publication of a serious Czech author, an Arab uninterested in religious questions. Sartre is guaranteed a future on the shelves of the American bookstore. So is Lao Tzu, though both owe their place to the exclusion of books that do not conform to these prevailing stereotypes.

Although Venuti posits his conception of foreignizing and domesticating translation to be applied to all languages and cultures, his main concern is largely focused on literary translation into the Anglo-American culture. He considers the Anglo-American tradition of translation to be primarily one of domestication, a strategy that he claims is closely linked to producing “fluent” translations. When translations are judged in light of ‘fluency’ and ‘transparency’ within the Anglo-American culture, reviewers tend to pay little attention to the translated text’s “accuracy, its intended audience, its economic value in the book market, its place within the literary trends of English, its place in the translator’s career” (Venuti, 1995: 2). By doing this, they also ignore the role of other agencies of translation such as patrons, editors and publishers who can shape translation in significant ways, and whose decisions support the laws of the economic market and a desire to increase sales.

Fluency of translation as an ideology produces what Venuti calls the invisibility of translators. By the invisibility of the translator he refers to a dominant ideology that disguises the creative

role of the translator as a re-writer of the source text through giving the impression that the translated text is an original text and not a translation. This illusion is also constructed by the reader and evaluator of translation who demand readable and fluent translations, as well as the translators themselves who participate in creating the ideology that alienates their work:

A translated text is judged successful - by editors, publishers, reviewers, readers, by translators themselves - when it reads fluently and thereby gives the appearance that it is not translated, that it is the original, reflecting the foreign author's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text. (Venuti, 1991: 126).

Venuti's main concern is not the source text but the status of the translator who has been alienated through the regime of 'fluency'. For, "If readers are not conscious of the fact that they are reading a translation, they are no longer conscious of the work of the translator, and they have no reason to appreciate the translation profession" (Pym, 2012: 97).

Foreignizing translation can take the form of choosing to translate a foreign text excluded by target culture literary canons, maintaining source text features in the translation, or using a marginal target language discourse or a heterogeneous mix of discourses (Brownlie, 1998: 79). By signaling the foreignness of the translated text and/or disrupting dominant target discourses, these strategies challenge the status quo in the target culture (*ibid*: 80). Milton summarized what is involved in Venuti's foreignizing translation:

Venuti recommends that other tactics be used: the translator should appear and intervene in the text and show that it is a translation. A language which upsets the norm should be adopted. It might be archaizing, a non-standard form; it might contain polyphonic effects, neologisms, foreignizing syntax, upsetting the status quo and be accompanied by footnotes, prefaces and postfaces and metatexts which should state the translator's position. In other words, it should be obvious that the work is a translation. Venuti hopes that such tactics might open out Anglo American literature to the foreign and give more credibility to the translator and translation. (2002: 2).

In addition to this, Venuti's foreignizing translation requires that the agency of translation, mainly the translator, highlights the fact that the translated text is a sort of co-authorship work

through theorizing the conditions and problems of translation in the introduction or notes to his/her translation of a given text. This goes against the invisibility of the translator who is required by the ideology of 'fluency' to "remain silent about the condition of translation" (2013: 77). On the foreignizing effect of translator's notes, for example, Buendia (2013) points out that:

Although the source text author certainly cannot be responsible for the messages contained in the translators' notes, one could state that in some cases the explanatory notes add information that the source text author would have liked the target reader to possess in order to fully comprehend the text, and that the author would have probably added if he or she had anticipated the prospective reception contexts of his/her work. The translator makes him or herself visible in order to bring the reader closer to the original text via a *foreignising* approach, the result of which is a source-text-oriented translation. (158, italic original)

Pym (2014) rightly remarked that the relationship between translation and politics as viewed by some translation studies including Venuti has its root in a specific kind of morality. As he points out:

Some translation scholars want us all to be political activists, as is their right and perhaps obligation. The moral connection between politics and translation usually concerns two kinds of observation: first, only rich and powerful groups tend to have their messages moved between languages (the poor and powerless rarely determine which messages are sent); second, translators habitually modify messages in the interests of one group or another, thus meddling in power relations beneath a cloak of default invisibility. In both those ways, translation helps shape the relations of belonging that in turn form the polis, the basis of any politics. (1)

However, Venuti's conception of foreignizing and what it involves is not without its problems. Firstly, as opposing strategies, foreignizing and domesticating translation were developed in the work of Venuti largely with reference to literary translation. Even if one extended literary translation to include other texts (for example, religious and philosophical texts), large parts of

translated texts (for example, scientific and technical texts) remain outside foreignizing translation as conceived by Venuti. This is why most research on foreignization and domestication has been undertaken in the field of translation studies on literary texts and religious texts. These texts are generally seen as rich in formal features, aesthetic values, layers of meanings, and cultural elements, and thus ‘prone’ to be explored in terms of foreignization and domestication. This is so especially when these texts are translated from minority or less prestigious languages into dominant languages and cultures or when they belong to a fundamentally different time such as in the case of the Bible. The Bible, for example, already contains much material with foreign origins which even the original readers of the Bible found difficult to be understood (Cheung, 2012: 259).

However, the political and ethical considerations that Venuti assigns to foreignizing translation and domestication are highly problematic (see Myskja, 2012: 8-22). For example, it is not clear how translators can challenge asymmetrical relations between major languages and cultures and minor languages and cultures as well as dominant interpretations and marginal interpretations within the same culture itself by adopting a foreignizing textual strategy of translation in the sense outlined by Venuti. In fact, this major claim, as Myskja pointed out, has not been supported by good evidence (*ibid*, see also notes by Pym, 2012: 99-100). The problem here is that even if foreignization and domestication in translation are well-defined, and reliable methods to identify translations as domesticating or foreignizing are constructed, there is doubt about relating particular strategies in translation and textual features to political and cultural effects, i.e., relating foreignizing translations as such to resisting cultural and/or political domination, and relating domesticating translation as such to subverting the cultural and political dominance. The problem here, as Shamma (2009) rightly remarks, is that Venuti “confuses the strategy of translation (which is confined to the textual level) with its effect, which is realized only in its socio-political and intertextual dimension” (cited in Chittiphalsri, 2014: 52). Whether a translation would maintain or challenge cultural domination (dominant interpretations) is something that is difficult to be established as domestication or foreignization by the general description of that translation, because this would likely depend on the cultural and political context of translation, and on how that translation was received and used by different readerships, something that is difficult to be predicted a priori (Myskja, *ibid*: 17).

Moreover, while foreignizing translation may be appropriate in dominant cultures, the same cannot be said for cultures that are already much ‘foreignized’ and are trying to strengthen their own language and culture (Tymoczko, 2007: 211).

In addition, Venuti’s foreignization and domestication does not escape binary thought in the field of translation studies. Thinking of foreignization and domestication as two opposite methods could mean that translators have only to choose either method at the expense of the other, whereas in practice translators have used both to different degrees, depending upon a myriad of factors. As pointed out by Tymoczko (2000):

“He [Venuti] suggests that he is offering a conceptual tool for analyzing translations, a kind of absolute or universal standard of valuation, with a sort of on/off quality rather than a sliding scale, but where and how the lines are to be drawn in applying his concepts are nowhere articulated for the scholarly community”. (12).

The fact that translation, actual translation, is a unique site for different and contradictory methods or strategies of translation has been emphasized by Lane-Mercier (1997), who argued that:

Translation is not an operation that entails *either* a foreignizing strategy that is designed to contest hegemonic target-culture values or a domesticating strategy designed to incorporate them; rather it is a contradictory, dialectical process that engages *at once* questions of difference and sameness, Self and Other, appropriation and resistance. (cited in Harvey, 2003: 129, italic original).

Thus, it is more useful to consider foreignizing as a general concept that “does not incorporate the ethical and political associations Venuti assigns to it, but, nevertheless, it can thus be used as a strategy of translation” (Cheung, 2011: 168-9). It is more useful to think of domestication and foreignization not as binaries but rather as “part of a continuum” and to relate them to “ethical choices made by the translator in order to expand the receiving culture’s range” (Munday (2014) quoted in Nilsson, 2014: 45).

It is also important and more productive to think of foreignization and domestication not as good and bad translation but as a function of what the translation aims to achieve in the translating culture. If the translation aims to inform the reader of the source culture and emphasize the remoteness of the translated text, then foreignizing is the appropriate choice. If the aim of translation is to make it possible for the reader of the translated text to understand easily the message contained in the text, then domestication is the appropriate choice (Cheung, *ibid*: 258). Thus, and from a functionalist point of view, “the advantage of foreignisation is that it offers another alternative function for a target text” (Cheung, 2011: 165, see also notes by Van der Watt, 2002: 255- 56). Foreignizing translation can be seen as a useful means of “introducing aspects of the source culture into the target culture without compromising the reader’s enjoyment and understanding” (Nilsson, *ibid*: 44).

In addition, and apart from defining foreignizing translation as the retention of the linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the source text and the use of marginal styles in the target language in translating that text, Venuti left much of his conception of translation without sufficient illustration. For example, Tymoczko remarked that:

Venuti does not make it clear how much would be sufficient to characterize a translation overall as being resistant or foreignizing. That is, how much resistance must there be in a translation for it to count as a resistant translation? How many instances of abusive fidelity or foreignizing or minoritizing language are necessary for a translation as a whole to be counted as foreignizing, and so forth? (*ibid*: 12).

However, in his later writings, Venuti seems to show much attention to these critical points, acknowledging, for example, the fact that foreignizing is a matter of degree and the fact that domesticating is not always a sort of submission to the dominant ideology in the translating language (Koskinen, *ibid*: 54-5).

Drawing on Venuti, Koskinen (2000) emphasizes the importance of looking at the visibility of translation in light of what she called textual visibility, paratextual visibility and extratextual visibility. The visibility of the translator can be seen in the methods of translation adopted by the translator to register the foreign nature of the source text (for example, through maintaining linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the

source text in translation). As with regard to paratextual visibility, it is argued that the translator may add materials to the translated texts such as an introduction or footnotes in order to highlight the translated text and the role of the translator as a cultural mediator in translation (9). In translations with paratextual visibility, “one actually hears two voices or sees two hands – that of the author of the original and that of the translator” (Veisbergs, 2013: 77). Chesterman (1997) argues that the translator should appear paratextually visible in translation. This should involve, at least, typing his/her name on the front cover of the translated text (cited in Lahtinen, 2012: 46).

The paratextual visibility increases when the translator uses footnotes not only to explain specific points or issues in the source text (for example, explaining a particular concept), but also to theorize translation (see Koskinen and Paloposki, 2015: 36) by commenting on translational issues (for example, problems of translating a single term). As with regard to extratextual visibility, this kind of visibility can be measured through examination of social ‘facts’ outside the translated text that are related to the work of the translator, i.e. press releases, criticism, interviews dedicated to the translation or translator (Koskinen, *ibid*).

These three categories can, in fact, be rooted in Venuti’s work because the latter emphasizes the importance of registering the foreign text through textual strategies within the target text itself or through the texts published with it (paratextual materials) as well as in social life or the socio-cultural context in which translators work.

The distinction between foreignization and domestication as two heuristic methods or strategies of translation is still valid and widely used in Translation Studies. This study will make use of these two methods of translation, especially in the context of discussing the translation of cultural references (CSIs). In addition, Koskinen’s concept of paratextual visibility is also a useful tool for measuring the ‘presence’ of the translator in old and new translations, which is relevant to the discussion on the validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis.

Also, the current study takes it for granted that explaining translations and the features related to them is better undertaken when a myriad of factors are taken into consideration. The hermeneutic approach to translation as developed in the work of Venuti is mainly used in this study to account for translation. First, this approach permits studying translations in their socio-cultural and historical context in which they are produced and received. Second, it pays close attention to

the creative role of the agency of translation (e.g. translators and publishers) in shaping translation. Third, it permits studying the effects of translations on both source and target culture.

2.6 Summary of Chapter Two

The chapter reviews the major schools of thought in the field of translation studies. Early linguistic approaches to translation focused on translation as a linguistic process, and as a comparison between source and target text in terms of equivalence, particularly on the level of words and sentences.

With the increasing awareness of the fact that translators in practice deal with texts that have specific features that affect translation, the need to include the genre and text typology of the translated text in translation was thought to be necessary.

Skopos Theory constituted the first step toward shifting translation research from focusing on the source text and equivalence toward focusing on the target culture, particularly the *skopos* or function of translation (the translated text) and how it affects the selection and the method of translating a given text. But it was with the Polysystem and Norm Theory that the shift toward the target language and culture in translation reached its maturity. Both theories regarded translation as a system (a body of literature) in the target culture rather than as isolated texts to be compared with the source text in terms of faithfulness or unfaithfulness. Both sought to explain translation and the features related to them by referring to laws or norms of translation. These norms can be used to explain why a particular text, or a group of texts, was chosen to be translated into a given language at a specific time and why it was translated in a certain way.

But a new wave of thought in the field of translation studies emerged in the 1990s and called for more attention to be paid to 1) the role of the agency of translation, particularly translators, publishers, patrons of translation as individual creative agents who can play a tremendous role not only in constructing norms of translation but also challenging them, partially or wholly, and 2) the influence of ideology and ethical considerations on the final product of translation as well as on the reception of translation. Venuti, for example, emphasized the creative role of the individual translator in shaping translation in significant ways, advocating what he terms as foreignizing translation. Foreignizing translation aims to register the ‘foreign’ nature of the

translated text through resisting assimilating translation practices in the target language, particularly into dominant languages and cultures such as the Anglo-American culture, hence the political and ethical dimensions of translation. Although studying foreignization and domestication as two heuristic methods of translation can shed light on the creative role of the translator, the political and ethical considerations attributed to them by Venuti have been essentially questioned.

Although all of these approaches to translation have their strengths and weaknesses, it can be argued that translation is a complex phenomenon that is better understood with reference to multiple sources of explanation including, among other things, the nature and text typology of the source text, the languages and cultures involved, the purpose of translation, the norms of translation, power relations and ideology, and the active role of the translator as an individual (social actor) whose work can carry political and ethical connotations. Which of these factors comes first will depend upon the research data and questions, but it is important to keep in mind that more than one of these factors can be used to account for a translational feature.

This study will make use of various kinds of approaches and theories to account for translations and the features related to them. Those models and theories cover all levels of explanation or causes: 1) material causes (source text and language); 2) functional causes (purpose (*skopos*) of translation in the target language); 3) formal causes (e.g. norms of translation); and 4) efficient causes (e.g. the role of translators and publishers). (for more details see O'Driscoll, *ibid*: 3-4). Also, it could be argued that translation is a complex phenomenon that is not only about languages, but also about the socio-cultural context in which it is produced and achieved. Thus, it would be more productive to combine linguistic (e.g. text typology) and socio-cultural tools and concepts (e.g. ideology) in accounting for translations and the features related to them. These two major approaches to translation, reviewed in this chapter, should be seen as complementary rather than as mutually exclusive.

CHAPTER THREE: CULTURE-SPECIFIC ITEMS IN TRANSLATION

This chapter aims to give an account of the phenomenon known in Translation Studies as culture-specific items (CSIs), the problem these terms pose in translation and the most common models of procedures within Translation Studies which have been designed to render them.

The chapter starts with clarifying what is meant by CSIs, why they are important in translation, and then moves to the evolution in the ways translators and researchers have handled them. Two typologies of the translation of CSIs will be reviewed in this chapter: the typology of Ivir (1987), and the typology of Aixelá (1996). The procedures developed in the work of these researchers will be outlined, discussed and assessed in light of their advantages and disadvantages, with reference to domestication and foreignization as two general strategies of translation.

3.1 Culture-Specific Items

The notion of culture has been understood in different ways in the literature, and it is beyond the scope of this chapter to go through a detailed discussion of it. However, culture is commonly understood as a system of beliefs, values, customs and behaviours that a group of people share and use to cope with the world and to evaluate reality. These beliefs, values, customs and behaviour that characterize a given community are “associated with a given language community” and “provides added meaning to the basic linguistic, referential meaning of words” (Palumbo, *ibid*: 31). Thus, although the dictionary meaning of the English word ‘Sunday’ is “the day that comes after Saturday”, the word ‘Sunday’ carries religious connotations that are specific to Christians but not, for example, to Muslims.

Language and culture are closely related to each other as the definition outlined previously indicates. This is because language is considered as the mirror of culture and its expression. As Ivir points out, the reason for this is that “the integration of one element into a culture and into the conceptual framework of its members and individuals cannot be said to have been achieved unless and until the linguistic expression of that element has been integrated into the language of that culture” (quoted in Branco, 2001: 145). Languages express what is common to cultures and

what is distinctive to each culture, and can thus be considered as the best evidence of the reality of culture.

A given language may contain words and expressions that refer to things peculiar to culture X but unknown to culture Y. In English, for example, the expressions “10 Downing Street” or “St. Valentine” refer to things that have no direct equivalents in Arabic or Persian. But this is not the only dimension through which cultural differences express themselves in language. Sometimes, two words or two phrases in two languages may be used to refer to the same thing, but still differ significantly because of the added cultural meaning these words and phrases have in these two languages. This is the case, for example, with words such as “owl” or “pig” in English and Arabic. Owl in Arabic is a symbol of death, whereas in English it is a symbol of ‘wisdom’. The same can be said about the word ‘pig’ which in Arabic and Muslim culture is seen as ‘filthy, ‘unclean’ and is ‘prohibited animal’ whereas in the West it is not seen in the same way. Words and expressions that belong to these two categories are usually referred to as being CSIs, which is the term adopted by this study. Thus, Schwarz (2003) defines CSIs as “concepts in any language that are unique to that language or to the culture associated with that language” and which “create a cultural gap between speakers of different languages” (quoted in Pirnajmuddin, 2012: 73). Along similar lines, Palumbo defines CSIs as those terms that refer to “elements or concepts that are closely associated with a certain language and culture, i.e. *sarong* in Malay, *tortilla* or *siesta* in Spain, *five o’clock tea* in English and other terms referring to geography, traditions, institutions and technologies [...]” (*ibid*: 31). However, it is important to take into account that the conception of CSIs is better understood with reference to the languages and cultures involved in communication. It is for this reason that Aixelá (1996) emphasizes that a CSI can be considered so only in relation to another language, in which that item is unknown or has a different value, and that CSIs can also change their status over time because objects, habits or values once restricted to one community can come to be shared by others (in Pirnajmuddin *ibid*: 58).

CSIs can take the form of common nouns or terms (for example, *single mum* or *open park market* in English), proper names of persons or things (*Romeo* and *Juliet* and *Hyde Park* in English) or more complex phrases that take the form of proverbs, idioms, metaphors, puns, and

the like. For the purposes of this study, CSIs will be taken to mean common nouns and proper names only. These CSIs can be categorized into several categories. Newmark, for example, categorized them into:

- 1- Ecology: flora, fauna, hills, winds, and plains (for example, *honeysuckles* and *savanna*).
- 2- Material Culture such as food and clothes (for example, *apple sauce* and *gumbaz* (a traditional Arab cloth).
- 3- Social Culture: work and leisure (for example, *dabka* (a popular dance in the Levant).).
- 4- Organizations, Customs, Activities, Procedures, and concepts (for example, *Gulf Cooperation Council*, *Christmas*).
- 5- Political institutions and religious concepts (for example, *duma* and *Ramadan*).
- 6- Gestures and Habits (for example, *Cock a snook*).

Although CSIs contained and expressed in a given culture and language are part of the cultural identity of a single community, they are not on the same level in terms of familiarity in source and target culture.

Pederson (2005) categorized CSIs into three categories: 1) trans-cultural references known to many cultures, though originally emerging from a certain culture; 2) mono-cultural references known to the translating language and culture; and 3) micro-cultural references which are so specific that only a small proportion of people in the source culture are aware of them (in Laurea, 2012: 55)

Finally, it is important to point out that religion constitutes an integral part of culture, and that the cultural differences in terms of religious thought and practices that can be found in two different cultures are a rich source of CSIs. Arabic as a language is often seen as a language that is fundamentally shaped by religion, mainly Islam, and this is not without justification. Islam plays an important role in shaping the culture of Arabs, and dozens of the concepts or practices that are found in Arabic, and a variety of Islamic languages, do not have direct equivalents in other languages such as English. It is true that Christianity and Islam have common elements in terms of beliefs, traditions, values, and rituals, but they have also significant differences that express themselves in Arabic and English. On this point, Al-Saidi (2013) states that:

It is beyond dispute that Arab culture is basically reshaped by Islamic religion, while English speaking world is dominated by Christianity. This difference in culture has its impact on the peoples' spoken as well as written language. Consequently, vocabulary used in Arabic and English will be affected according to the principles of culture and religion in these two languages. Thus, religious culture-specific words and expressions are used to express feelings and moral tradition that manifest the socio-religious system of the Arab and English culture. (33)

Islam is a rich source of CSIs, and this fact is reflected in Arabic as a language. There are dozens of examples of CSIs that can be attributed to Islam. One example is the word سحور (*suḥūr*) which refers to “a meal that is eaten before the dawn for fasting”. A second example is the word تيمم (*tayammum*) which refers to “the use of sand for ablution when water is unavailable”, and a third example is the term صلاة الاستسقاء (*ṣalāt al-‘istisqā’*) which refers to “a special prayer in Islam that consists of two cycles (*rak’ah*) performed during the times of drought to ask God for rain”. These expressions and other similar ones refer to religious concepts and practices that are specific to Islam and, generally speaking, unknown to the West. These and similar items pose problems in translation given the fact that the designated concepts and practices have no direct counterparts in the target language. However, translators and translation scholars have developed particular procedures to deal with the problems the translation of CSIs pose for translators as will be seen in the following section.

3.2 Translation of CSIs

The main problem in the translation of CSIs stems from the fact that these words might be used to refer to concepts or practices that the target audience is completely unfamiliar with or refer to particular concepts that have no analogous concepts in the target culture (Palumbo, *ibid*: 33). But not all CSIs are of this kind. For two cultures may share a concept or practice, but nonetheless differ in the way they conceptualize it. As Ivir (1998) pointed out:

The failure of the two cultures to match may be due to different extratextual realities (with the source culture having and the target language lacking a particular material

object, social institution, or pattern of behaviour), or it may be due to different lexical mappings of the otherwise shared extratextual reality [...]. (137)

Thus, a CSI such as ‘single mother’ in English refers to ‘an extratextual reality’ that is lacking in Arabic, whereas a CSI such as fasting is a ‘shared extratextual reality’ in Christianity and Islam, but with different mappings, i.e. the conceptions associated with them and the cultural connotations they have may differ in significant ways in these two cultures.

Ivir points out that the treatment of CSIs in translation demands working on these items on two levels. The first is the level of reception, where the translator is required to fully understand the cultural features of the source text, including those that are implicit in it, and the second is the level of production, where the translator, like any sender, must find the appropriate linguistic expression in the target language for the cultural content at hand (*ibid*: 117-8). But finding the appropriate linguistic expression in the target language to match the CSIs in the source text also means that, first of all, the translator needs to determine if the target text reader is familiar with these items and then to what extent (Författare, 2009: 4).

In fact, the main problem translators face in the rendition of CSIs from one language and culture into another language and culture is the problem of non-equivalence, that is, the fact that CSIs in a given text or culture have no equivalents in the target language. This problem is complicated when CSIs are completely unknown in the target culture. However, translators and researchers in the field of translation studies have developed particular solutions or procedures in order to deal with the problem of translating these items. Procedures denote, as Chesterman (1997) points out, “forms of textual manipulation” that are “observable from the translation product itself, in comparison with the source text” (quoted in Kylä-Harakka, 2008: 26). These procedures, the term adopted in this study, are designed to deal with the problems translators may encounter in translating CSIs. But these procedures might not be the product of a conscious process, because the practice of translation is largely done unconsciously, where particular procedures are taken for granted in the actual practice of translating, especially when it comes to professional translators. The fact that a particular translator did not stop to think about the different procedures of translation available to him/her in rendering a CSI does not mean that his/her decision was not a problem-oriented decision (Lindfors, 2015: 90).

The procedures that can be used to render CSIs are multiple and varied, and it is the responsibility of the translator to choose the best procedure in a particular communicative situation from them:

In trying to achieve cultural transfer, that is, to translate a cultural content which is a feature of the source but not the target culture, the translator faces two problems: 1) the problem of finding possible procedures for the translation of the unmatched element of culture, and (2) the problem of strategy or choice from among the possible translational procedures (since not all of the possible procedures are equally suitable for each act of communication). (Ivir, 1998: 118)

But this is not the whole story, for as Ivir points out, the translator, faced with a cultural element that is a feature of the source text or culture rather than the target culture, needs not only to find the appropriate procedure of translation to render a single CSI for each act of communication, but also to think of the overall strategy of translation that dictates the selection of the suitable procedures of translation. This is so because these procedures differ in the ‘effect’ they generate in translation as some of them can be considered as closer to the source text and culture, whereas others can be considered as closer to the target reader and culture. Still others can be considered as ‘neutral’. As Majhuti put it:

The majority of recent studies of the rendering of CSIs in translation also examine the global orientation of the translated text, starting from the assumption that the choice of a solution type has an effect on the text-level, and the other way round. The global orientation of the text is viewed as a scale ending in two poles, [...] spanning from “exoticism” to “cultural transplantation” at the two ends of the continuum. (*ibid*: 53)

The distinction between the concept of ‘procedure’ as a local method of dealing with an individual segment of the source text and ‘strategy’ as a global method that is designed to deal with the whole text is common in the literature of translation studies. For example, Dai (2015) points out that a strategy of translation is “systematic” and “macro”, whereas procedures of translation are concrete, specific, and practicable steps subsidiary to “strategy” (92). Procedures

of translation cover individual decisions on how to translate linguistic items and segments (words and phrases, for example), whereas strategies of translation refer to “the translator’s initial decision” to stay closer to the source text and culture or not (see Lindfors, *ibid*: 87-8). From this point of view, the selection of a global translation strategy (for example, to stay closer to the source text and culture) is first chosen and then dictates what kinds of local procedures the translator will use in the translation of lower-level textual segments, from phonemes to sentences (*ibid*: 89, see also Kalédaitė, 2015: 264).

The concept of the global strategy of translation that the translator used in the rendition of CSIs in a given source text is a necessary step for determining whether the translator leaned more toward source-oriented translation (foreignization), target-oriented translation (domestication in translating these items in a given text), or preferred to strike a balance between these two poles of translation in the rendition of these items in a given text. The arrangement of the procedures that can be used to translate CSIs along the axis of foreignization and domestication makes it possible to determine which strategy the translator preferred in translating a given text and, thus, what the nature of his/her attitude is toward the foreign culture.

However, it is important to keep in mind that the distinction between foreignization and domestication in translation should always be dealt with cautiously even in the case of the translation of CSIs, because the distinction between these two strategies is sometimes blurred:

The boundaries between foreignising and culture-neutral, and between culture-neutral and domesticating are ‘fuzzy’: we cannot always be sure whether a particular element of translation is better defined as foreignising or culture-neutral, or culture-neutral or domesticating. Even within a single language cultural identity is complex: is curry an Indian dish because that is where it originated, or is it now also a British one because Indian restaurants and take-aways are extremely popular in Britain, and millions of people in Britain have curry for tea every night? (Dickins, 2003:44)

It is also important to bear in mind that the selection of a particular strategy in translating these items should always be seen as the product of a complicated practice that can be shaped by a myriad of factors including the nature of the CSIs, the nature and status of the source text, the

languages and cultures involved, the function of translation, the socio-cultural and ideological factors that conditioned the production of a particular translation into a single language, and the role and attitudes of translators toward foreign cultures, among many others.

3.3 Typologies of Translating CSIs

This section reviews two of the most common typologies of procedures that have been designed for the rendition of CSIs. These are the typologies of Ivir (1987) and Aixelá (1996). The procedures they proposed for the rendition of cultural references will be explained and discussed with reference to the two major strategies of translation outlined previously, i.e. source-oriented translation and target-oriented translation. The two typologies are strikingly similar, but it is Aixelá that can be considered more suitable in the translation of CSIs, for reasons presented latter in this section. However, it is important to remark here that some of the major procedures reviewed such as borrowing or omission “figure also in classifications of generic translation strategies” as they “cover basic textual operations at the translator’s disposal” (Majhut, 2012: 32). In other words, some of these procedures can be used for other items such as technical terms or proverbs...etc.

3.3.1 Vladimir Ivir

Different theorists have suggested different procedures for the translation of cultural items. For example, Vladimir Ivir (1987) whose typology has “served as the basis for many later classifications” has proposed the following seven procedures:

3.3.1.1 Borrowing:

This procedure involves borrowing the cultural reference into the target language. Ivir seems to take it for granted that this procedure applies regardless of whether the borrowed term is part of a well-established term in the target language or not (Dickins, *ibid*: 50). From this point of view, the words ‘Islam’ or the word ‘*Ash’arīte*’ can be considered as examples of borrowing (from Arabic), despite the fact that only the former is lexicalized in English. According to Ivir (1987), borrowing of a cultural reference ensures a very “precise transmission of cultural information” (Ivir, *ibid*: 39). The procedure involves a translation that can be considered as the complete or

highest degree of resemblance to the original. According to Ivir (1998), the “borrowed expression fills the lexical gap and assures cultural transference, provided that the necessary cultural information has been transmitted, previously or simultaneously, in some other way (for instance, by means of definition, by visual representation, through direct experience, etc.)” (137). Thus, this procedure is better used when the reader can recognize the borrowed term or deduce its meaning from the context. Borrowing may be used with other procedures such as literal translation or definition to be discussed below.

3.3.1.2 Definition

By definition Ivir means that the source term is replaced by a definition which the translator may give inside the text or outside the text in the form of footnote or endnote. It is usually used with borrowing. Definition depends upon the translator’s knowledge about what the target readers know and what they do not know. Ivir pointed out that “definitions are also communicatively too heavy, resulting in overtranslation and drawing attention to themselves in a way that the corresponding non-definitional source-language expressions do not” (Ivir, 1987: 38).

3.3.1.3 Literal Translation

The CSI is literally translated in the target language. It involves the translation of CSIs by using a word or phrase in the target language which is a regular part of the target language but lacks a standardized meaning. In English, the idiom “go up the wall” has a literal meaning (climb the vertical partition) and the figurative meaning ‘get very angry’. If a translator chose to render this term into Arabic as *صعد الجدار* (literally, climb the wall), this translation can be considered as a literal translation of the original idiom, because the phrase *صعد الجدار*, although a regular part of Arabic, it does not standardly used in this language to mean ‘get very angry’ (Dickins, *ibid*: 53). As Ivir (1998) points out, literal translation is a frequent procedure for filling cultural and lexical gaps in translation (141), and seems to be faithful to the original CSI and transparent for the target reader, but it has the disadvantage of causing difficulties of comprehension for the target reader. This is because linguistic transparency does not necessarily guarantee cultural transparency. This is clear, for instance, from the previous term ‘go up the wall’ and its translation into Arabic as *صعد الجدار*. The Arabic reader will find this term difficult to understand

or might misunderstand it as it stands, unless, of course, he or she is informed about its cultural sense in some means (a footnote or the context). Thus, it is not uncommon that this procedure is used with other procedures such as borrowing or definition.

3.3.1.4 Addition:

This procedure involves the addition of cultural information within the target text of information that is only implicit in the source text and culture. It is combined with lexical creation, borrowing or substitution. For example, if an Arabic text has *وقد حولت الثلاثية إلى أفلام* (literally, the trilogy was adapted to cinema). The word *ثلاثية* (trilogy) will remain unintelligible for the target reader because it is difficult to recognize that it is a reference to three novels by the Nobel-prized novelist Najeib Mahfouz. The translator can add further information within the text in order to bring it closer to the target reader's understanding. The translator can say, for instance, "the trilogy of Najeib Mahfouz was adapted to cinema".

3.3.1.5 Substitution

This procedure is used when a CSI is replaced by a cultural reference in the target language that has the same cultural function as the original cultural reference, though its meaning, semantically speaking, is not equivalent to that of the original CSI. Ivir (1987) describes this procedure in this way:

Typically, in fact, a source cultural element finds not an empty slot, but something that is like it – though not quite like it – in the target culture. The translator is then tempted to exploit that similarity and use the corresponding target-language expression as a full equivalent - the case with which he makes the decision depending on the cultural closeness of the two elements (42).

An example of the use of substitution in translation can be found in an English-Arabic translation. The English verse "Shall I compare thee to a summer's day" has often been translated into Arabic as *هل أشبهك بيوم من أيام الربيع* (literally, shall I compare you to a spring's day). Although *ربيع* (spring) and *summer* do not have the same meaning or denotation, in this context they have the same function (both refer to something beautiful). The problem with this procedure

is that it erases the foreign nature or flavour of the source item, replacing it with a target flavour in translation (*ibid*).

3.3.1.1 Lexical Creation

This means that the translator produces a new vocabulary or non-lexicalized words to render a CSI in the target language. As long as they are acceptable, there is no restriction on how translators invent these new words. However, this procedure is used less than the other procedures because it needs much effort from the translator and the reader (for comprehension). One example of this is the translation of the English term “prime minister” into Arabic as الوزير الاول (literally, the first minister) which is a neologism that is only used in Tunisia and Maghreb.

3.3.1.2 Omission

By omission Ivir means deleting a CSI in translation. This procedure is appropriately used for communicative purposes such as when the deleted CSI does not need to be preserved in translation.

Each of these procedures can be used for the translation of a CSI, but it is important to bear in mind that a combination of any of these procedures can also be used in translating one and the same CSI, depending on the particular communicative act (Ivir, 2003: 118). In fact, Ivir is aware that one or more of these procedures cannot be used without considering a myriad of factors relating not only to the nature and status of a CSI in a single text but also to the process of translation itself:

[...] no uniform treatment of unmatched elements of culture in translation is possible which would be valid for all such elements and for all communicative situations. No blanket decision is possible for a particular text type or an individual text either.

Finally, no unique solution exists for a given cultural element that could be utilized by the translator each time that it appears. Instead the translator chooses from among the possible procedures by considering the nature of the cultural term to be translated and the nature of the communicative process in which it appears. . . He is guided in his choice by a consideration of the status of that cultural element in the source

culture and of the status of its linguistic expression in the source and the target language [and text]. (quoted in Mailhac 1996, 132).

3.3.2 Aixelá's Typology

Aixelá's (1996) typology builds upon Ivir's typology as well as previous typologies such as that of Newmark (1988). He proposes seven procedures for the translation of CSIs, and a scale of what he calls "cultural manipulation", i.e. a scale that shows how these procedures fit into the domestication and foreignization axis. The procedures he proposed belong to two major categories of translation. The first is called 'preservation' and contains the following: repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic (non-cultural) translation, extratextual gloss, and intratextual gloss. The second category is termed "substitution" and includes synonymy, limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization, deletion, and autonomous creation. Preservation and substitution are just two different terminologies for foreignization and domestication respectively. These two categories and the procedures that belong to each are outlined in this section.

3.3.2.1 Preservative procedures

Preservative procedures include the following procedures: repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic (non-cultural) translation, extratextual gloss and intratextual gloss.

3.3.2.1.1 Repetition

Borrowing a cultural word and using it as it is in the target language. This procedure is common between languages that have the same or nearly the same alphabet such as English and German (for example, Design (a term in Heidegger's philosophy) is translated into English often as *Design*).

3.3.2.1.2 Orthographic Adaptation

By this it is meant borrowing the source term and writing it according to the alphabet of the target language (Aixelá, *ibid*: 61). This is common between languages of different alphabet

systems such as English and Arabic (for example, مكة is translated into English as *Mecca*). This procedure is often referred to as ‘transliteration’ which is the term used in this study.

3.3.2.1.3 Linguistic (non-cultural) Translation

By this he means that in translating a CSI the translator “chooses in many cases a denotatively very close reference to the original, but increases its comprehensibility by offering a target language version which can still be recognized as belonging to the cultural system of the source text” (1996: 62). The example given in Axeilá is the English word *inch* which could be rendered in Spanish as *pulgada* or *Grand Jury* as *gran jurado* (Aixelá, *ibid*: 62). This procedure is common in the translation of measures and currencies, and when there is a well-established tradition of translation between the source and target language involved, or when the linguistic translation is transparent enough to communicate the cultural meaning of CSIs (*ibid*).

3.3.2.1.4 Extratextual Gloss

The translator translates a CSI via a particular procedure, for example transliteration, but adds an explanatory note outside the text in the form of an endnote or footnote in order to bring it closer to the reader’s understanding. This procedure is generally used when the translator feels that the previous procedures are not sufficient, or when he or she feels that further information should be added outside of the text to help the target reader understand the original CSI. Thus, this procedure is important, although it is only used alongside other procedures.

3.3.2.1.5 Intratextual Gloss

This is similar to extratextual gloss, but differs as the added information is placed within the target text itself (*ibid*: 62). The source term or its constituents are preserved in translation through transliteration or literal translation, but the translator chooses to add a few words within the text to bring the source term closer to the reader’s understanding. This procedure involves making what is implicit in the source text and culture explicit in the target culture. This is similar to Ivir’s ‘definition’. Both ‘intratextual gloss’ and ‘extratextual gloss’ make what is implicit in the source text and culture explicit in the target text and culture. They serve to preserve and

highlight a certain CSI, and are thus considered as falling under the category of ‘preservation’ or source-oriented translation.

3.3.2.2 Substitutive Procedures

Substitution procedures include the following procedures: synonymy, limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization, deletion, and creative autonomous creation.

3.3.2.2.1 Synonymy

A CSI is translated by synonymy when it is rendered by repetition or orthographic adaptation in its first occurrence in the target text, but by a synonym in its second or third occurrence in the same text. This procedure is only used for stylistic reasons, that is, to avoid redundant repetition and keep some variation in the text. A translator of a CSI such as “Rum” might translate it into Arabic in its first occurrence as رُم (*rumm*, a term originally borrowed from English), and then used other words that can be considered synonymous to it in Arabic such as مسكر and خمر (both used to refer to alcoholic drinks in general and thus have brought the original cultural reference closer to the target culture).

3.3.2.2.2 Limited Universalization

By this it is meant replacing the source term for another in the source culture that is considered less specific and closer to the target reader’s understanding. The example given by Aixelá is that of *five grand* which can become *five thousand dollars* (Aixelá, *ibid*: 63). The term قاهرة نجيب محفوظ is used in Arabic to refer to Cairo as portrayed in the work of the Nobel prized novelist Najeib Maḥfouz. A translator might translate this item as Cairo, which is less specific but closer to the target reader understanding than “Cairo of Najeib Maḥfouz”.

3.3.2.2.3 Absolute Universalization

This involves replacing the source term for a neutral term in the target language, deleting any cultural connotation of it in translation. An example from English-Arabic translation is the translation of the term قاهرة نجيب محفوظ as *city* which involves a deletion of all cultural connotations in the original.

3.3.2.2.4 Naturalization

This aims to replace the source item specific to the source culture with an item specific to the target culture. This is the same as ‘substitution’ in Ivir’s typology.

3.3.2.2.5 Deletion:

This is similar to omission in Ivir’s typology. It involves the deletion of a CSI in translation. This can be done because the translator considers the cultural reference unacceptable for ideological or stylistic reasons or irrelevant or unimportant enough to make the effort to translate it for the target readers. One example of this is the translation of ‘Lord Bertrand Russell died in 1977’ into Arabic as *توفي رسل عام 1977* (the CSI ‘Lord’ is deleted in translation).

3.3.2.2.6 Creative Autonomous Creation

This involves the addition of a CSI in the target text that is not in the source text. This is something that one might expect in children’s literature, for example, when additional CSIs are sometimes added into the target text for stylistic reasons. This procedure is, as Aixelá points out, “a very little-used strategy in which translators (or more often translation initiators) decide that it could be interesting for their readers to put in some non-existent cultural reference in the source text” (*ibid*: 64).

In addition to these procedures, Aixelá mentions other procedures which he seems to consider as applicable only to a particular genre (for example, children’s literature) such as: compensation (a combination of the two procedures of ‘deletio’ and ‘autonomous creation’ at another point of the text with a similar effect), dislocation (changing the place of a CSI within the same text reference’), and attenuation (replacing an ideologically ‘too strong’ or ‘unaccepted’ reference for a ‘softer’ and more acceptable reference in the target culture). These procedures are not included in the scale suggested by Aixelá, and are not relevant to the purposes of this study.

Each of Aixelá’s eleven procedures of translation can be used in translating a CSI, but two or more procedures can also be used in translating one and the same term. As previously stated, the aforementioned procedures belong to two major categories, preservation and substitution.

Preservation includes transliteration, orthographic adaptation, linguistic (non-cultural) translation, and intratextual and extratextual gloss, whereas substitution includes limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization, and deletion. Preservation is closer to the source text and culture, while substitution is closer to the target reader and culture. The former is foreignizing, because it aims to conserve something of the original meaning in translation, whereas the latter leans more toward helping the target text reader understand the meaning of the original CSI (Keuninckx, 2011: 14). Whether translators should select preservation or substitution is a subject of debate in the field of translation studies, as pointed out in chapter two of this study. But the important thing is to describe and explain why translators have swayed toward one strategy or another in practice, that is, with reference to particular texts and particular situations or communicative actions. As pointed out by Halloran (2000):

These two strategies [preservation or substitution] show conflicting definitions of what translations are meant to achieve and opposing visions of the role of target texts in target cultures. Translators must choose between “sending the reader abroad” and adapting the CSI to the target cultural environment. Whether translators should go for domestication or foreignization is an open debate. It will thus be most instructive to assess in practice, during the descriptive comparative analysis, when and how translators use these strategies. (Halloran, *ibid*: 9)

Aixelá is aware of this, and refers to a myriad of factors that he thinks would affect the selection of preservation or substitution in the translation of CSIs, including, among other things, the nature and function of the translated text, the translator’s background and status, and the tradition of translation in the target language.

3.3.3 Discussion of Ivir’s and Aixelá’s Typologies

It is not surprising that Ivir’s and Aixelá’s typology of the procedures for the translation of CSIs share some common procedures and differ in others, given the fact that both might have worked on different data. The procedures they share and those they do not share are illustrated in Majhul (*ibid*: 5), and presented here with slight modification in the following table:

Table (1) Typologies of Ivir and Aixelá

No.	Ivir (1987)	Aixelá (1996)
1	Borrowing	Repetition
1a	-	orthographic adaptation
2	-	Linguistic (non-cultural) translation
3	Addition	Intratextual gloss /Extratextual gloss
4	Definition	-
5	Literal Translation	-
6	-	Limited universalization
7	-	Absolute universalization
8	Substitution	Naturalization
9	Lexical Creation	-
10	Omission	Deletion

As can be seen from table (1), Ivir and Aixelá share three procedures. The procedures Ivir calls (*addition, substitution, and omission*) correspond to *intratextual and extratextual gloss, naturalization and deletion* in Aixelá’s typology respectively. The procedures that are in Ivir but not in Aixelá are: *literal translation, lexical creation, and definition*, whereas the procedures that are in Aixelá but not in Ivir are *orthographic adaptation, limited universalization, absolute universalization, and linguistic (non-cultural) translation*.

Although some researchers have considered Ivir’s model as “a neat model that focuses on the translation of culture-bound elements and seems to cover all the translation procedures suggested by the above-mentioned theorists” (Pirnajmuddin, *ibid*: 72), others still think that it suffers from a number of problems. For instance, Mailhac argued that Ivir’s typology has two flaws. First, the procedure he calls addition involves the preservation of a CSI through borrowing or literal translation and the addition of further words in the target text to help the target reader understand the original cultural reference. But this “will often be indistinguishable from a combination of procedures” (*ibid*: 139). Secondly, Ivir includes the procedure which he terms ‘definition’ in his typology. This procedure includes the definition of a CSI being included in the target text itself or outside it. But the definition that can be given outside of the text in a form of footnote, for

example, can be used by the translator when he or she feels that the translation given within the text is insufficient. This means that the procedure is important and should be treated as “a separate type of procedure and not as a mere variation of the definition procedure, which is what Ivir does” (*ibid*: 140). In addition, Ivir’s typology does not include a category of “generalization” or “universalization”, i.e. of the replacement of a CSI with another, less specific item (Majhut, 2012: 50), despite the fact that this category is common in the translation of CSIs.

Although Ivir considers ‘borrowing’, ‘lexical creation’, literal translation, and definition as source-oriented translation, and ‘substitution’ and ‘omission’ as target-oriented translation (Ivir, 1987: 41), he does not detail the rationality behind this categorization. The procedure he calls ‘addition’ belongs to the first category, but Ivir seems to be hesitant to include it within this category for reasons that he does not explain (Ivir, 1998: 137-8). This is why some researchers accept that the typology developed by Ivir is not suitable as a tool for research into the levels of domesticating and foreignising qualities of a single translation (target text) (Olk, 2001, in Majhut, *ibid*: 51).

Aixelá’s typology seems to be more workable and flexible in comparison to Ivir’s. The procedure of generalization which is lacking in Ivir’s typology is included in Aixelá’s, and divided into limited and absolute universalization. Although some have found that the distinction between limited and absolute universalization is, occasionally, blurred (Dukmak, 2012: 55), it can sometimes be useful. The procedure Aixelá calls ‘synonymy’ is used only for stylistic reasons, and would be redundant when dealing with CSIs that occur only once in a given source text. But the most important defect in Aixelá’s typology is that it lacks a category for the literally translated CSIs. This procedure Ivir includes under the category of ‘literal translation’ is commonly used in the translation of CSIs.

For the sake of this study, the following procedures which Aixelá developed are adopted: *orthographic adaptation* which will be referred to in this study as *transliteration*, *intratextual gloss*, *extratextual gloss*, *limited universalization*, *absolute universalization*, *naturalization*, and *deletion*. In addition to these procedures, this study will make use of Ivir’s literal translation. The latter procedure is commonly considered as a source-oriented procedure, and will be placed within Aixelá’s scale, under the category of ‘preservation’.

In summary, CSIs are words and expressions that refer to concepts and practices that culture X has, and culture Y lacks, or that culture X defines differently from culture Y. When the two cultures are compared or when translation takes place between them, translators face the problem of how to render these items from the source culture into the target culture. This is the problem of non-equivalence in the translation of CSIs. In order to deal with the problems that these items pose in translation, translators and translation scholars have developed particular procedures. These procedures are often categorized in terms of their effect, that is, in terms of how closer to the source or target culture they are. Two typologies have been discussed in this chapter, the first was developed by Ivir (1987) and the second by Aixelá (1996).

CHAPTER FOUR: RETRANSLATION THEORY

This chapter is a literature review of retranslation. It aims to define what is meant by retranslation and to outline and discuss the explanations that have been suggested by different scholars to account for this phenomenon, in order to determine which of these explanations can be considered the most accurate and productive ones in approaching retractions and the features related to them.

Section one defines retranslation and outlines its importance in the field of translation studies as a topic in its own right. Section two sets out the traditional explanation of retranslation as exemplified in the work of Berman (1990) and the so called Retranslation Hypothesis. This section contains a criticism of these traditional explanations. Section three reviews the explanations given to retranslation by Pym and Venuti, who deal with this phenomenon from a broader perspective, taking into consideration the complex nature of this phenomenon as well as the many causes that can best explain it. Section four reviews the studies that have theorized the retranslation of non-literary texts, including Susam-Sarajeva; (2003), Flotow (2009), and Song (2012), among others.

4.1 What is Retranslation?

Retranslation is the translation of a given text into the same language, or as Koskinen and Paloposki put it, “a second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language” (2010: 294). If Shakespeare’s Hamlet is translated into Arabic in the 19th century, and then a new translation of the same play appears later in the 20th century in the same language, the first is called ‘first translation’ and the second is called ‘retranslation’. The process through which a new translation is produced is also called ‘retranslation’, and the context should tell whether the word ‘retranslation’ is used to refer to the retranslated text or to the process of retranslation. But the concept of retranslation is not clear-cut. For example, are the translations that appear at the same time or nearly the same time in the same language to be categorized as ‘first translation’ and ‘retranslation’? Is the new translation that was produced in a single language, without the translator being aware of the existence of a first translation, a retranslation in the sense outlined above? These questions are difficult to answer, and it would be useful as a

starting point to adopt an open and broad definition of retranslation such as that given in the first few lines of this section.

With the dominance of prescriptivism in Translation Studies, retranslation was ignored as a topic in its own right. Retranslations, as pointed out, “often serve as case studies illuminating other aspects of translational research rather than drawing attention onto themselves as a topic in itself” (2003: 2). But with the demise of prescriptivism and emergence of Descriptive Translation Studies and cultural approaches, retranslation has been seen as an important topic in its own right, opening the door for new questions and new areas of research.

The research on retranslation revolved around understanding the motivation for this phenomenon as well as the complex relationships between retranslation on one hand, and the source text and first translation on the other hand. According to a common explanation, retranslations are undertaken to "restore" first translations which tend to be assimilated and defective (Berman, 1990). Another common explanation states that translations emerge to reintroduce the foreign text because first translation(s) of the same text have become obsolete. These two explanations have their roots in the traditional thought of retranslation, but have recently become a subject of criticism (Venuti, 2003; Susam-Sarajeva 2003, Brownlie 2006, Hanna 2006; Song, 2012; Flotow, 2009). A new wave of research on retranslation has emphasized its complicated nature, and the need for more sophisticated explanations for it in light of the agency of translation as well as the socio-cultural and political factors in which retranslations are produced. The following sections review these developments.

4.2 Berman on Retranslation

Developments in Translation Studies since the 1980s and 1990s have not only resulted in formulating and developing a wide range of approaches to translation, but also in broadening the range of issues discussed in this field by researchers from all over the world. Retranslation is one of the most recently discussed issues, despite the fact that the practice itself has a long history. Like other topics, retranslation has been approached from different perspectives that reflect the status and development in Translation Studies itself. Prior to the 1990s, thoughts and reflections on it were brief and impressionistic. It was thanks to the work of Berman (1990) that the issue

started to receive the recognition that it deserves in Translation Studies. Because Berman's work on retranslation is seminal, it is appropriate to start with his contribution.

Berman's thought on translation in general and retranslation in particular is impacted by German Romantic thought as exemplified in the work of Schleiermacher, Benjamin, Heidegger, and Gadamer, among others. In chapter two of this study, we see that the notion of translation as an act of foreignizing or resisting domesticating translation in the target language was the core of Berman's thought (see chapter two of this study, section 2.5.2). For Berman, retranslation is closely linked to foreignizing translation as well as to the plurality of meaning and interpretation. Rather than thinking of retranslation as a mere reproduction of stable meanings or linguistic and textual practice, retranslation for him is a way to reconsider the foreign text in the translating culture. It is, as he puts it, "a major concern of a reflection, and a path that reopen the authentic access of a thinking" (Berman, 1992: 277). Retranslation as a phenomenon is significant because it is closely linked to the question of identity and difference. Retranslation involves complex relations between the translated text and the foreign text on one hand and the relationship between the retranslated text and previous translation(s) on the other hand. Two major explanations of the phenomenon of retranslation are given in Berman's work. The first is referred to in this study as "the Progress Argument", and the second as "the Updating Argument".

4.2.1 The Progress Argument

The Progress Argument refers to Berman's contention that retranslations mark a progress in translation because retranslations 'restore' the deficiencies in first translations by bringing the translated text closer to the source text. What this means in the case of the co-existence of several translations of a single text is that retranslation is a process of improvement from one (re)translation to the next [...]" (Skibińska, 2015: 1). This argument is rooted in the history and practices of translation because it is one of the common justifications for new translations that translators or publishers use.

Berman distinguishes between the time and place of first translations and the time and place of retranslations. This might seem trivial but, in this case, it is significant because it sheds light on the complex relationships between source text, first translation(s), and retranslation(s):

[I]t is absolutely essential to make a distinction between two spaces (and two times) of translation: one for translations, and one for retranslations. This distinction constitutes one of the crucial bases for a reflection on the temporality of translation. [...]. The retranslator is no longer confronted by one text, the original, but by two, which creates a specific space-original, first translation, retranslations. (translated and quoted in Vanderschelden, 2000: 16n)

Berman suggests that it is within this "specific space-original" that the masterpieces of translations are produced. For, "first translations are not (and cannot be) the greatest" (*ibid*). First translations differ essentially from retranslations in that the former tend to be assimilative (domesticating) compared with the latter which tend to be closer to the source text. First translations serve to introduce the source text to the foreign culture, but no more than this. Thus, retranslations emerge because of the assimilated and defective status of first translations. They are closer to the source text because they "do not need to address the issue of introducing the text: they can, instead, maintain the cultural distance" (Paloposki and Koskenin, 2004: 27). Therefore retranslations tend to be closer to the source text than first translations. This is because retranslation is more "efficient in conveying the previously assimilated 'otherness' of the foreign material, because the target audience will have become acquainted with the text through the 'introduction-translation'." (Mathijssen, 2007: 17). Motivated by ethnocentricity, target cultures generally resist foreign works. This tendency is stronger when the foreign text is introduced to the target culture for the first time. This argument is also adopted by Bensimon (1990) who argues that:

[A]culture initially is often reluctant to embrace a text which is very foreign to it, so in order for the foreign text to be accepted into the new cultural sphere, it has to be adapted to the target culture. Later on, since the text has already been introduced, it is really no longer foreign, and translations can return to the original and be more source-oriented. (cited in Brownlie, 2006: 148)

Thus, first translations are not 'true' or 'good' translations because they serve to introduce the foreign work at the expense of the peculiarities of the foreign text.

What motivates retranslation is a movement toward more source-oriented translations of the foreign text with the increasing awareness of the assimilated and defective nature of first translations. However, Berman (1986) posits that retranslations do not completely delete the assimilation and defection in first translations, only manages relative success in this regard:

Every translation is deficient, that is to say, entropic, whatever its principles. This means that any translation is marked by "non-translation". And first translations are those which are most affected by non-translation. It is as though the anti-translating forces which cause deficiency were in that case most powerful [...] retranslation is a result of the need, not to surpass entirely, but at least to reduce previous deficiency.
(translated and quoted in Vanderschelden 2000: 16n)

Berman places much importance on translation criticism because it sheds light on the defective and assimilated nature of first translations, paving the way for retranslations. The reason for this is that "the revelation of the essence of a foreign work to the target culture is accomplished after a historical process of a series of rewritings including commentaries and translations..." (Brownlie, 2003a:100-1). The commentary and criticism of the foreign work and its translations in the receiving culture help to pave the way for more literal translations of the foreign text. This is only possible if there is a distance between first translations and retranslations. This distance is necessary for Berman because it permits a new interpretation of the foreign work and could be used in "support of a more literal translation..." (Vanderschelden, *ibid*: 10). From this viewpoint, first translations tend to be target-oriented, whereas successive retranslations tend to follow a linear development toward source-oriented translation.

Therefore, the Progress Argument, as developed in Berman's work, states that retranslation is a process that occurs in time to restore the deficiencies in first translation(s). In his opinion, first translations are mere introductions of the foreign text into the target language because they are assimilated to dominant norms and publishing agendas in the translating language and culture. For Berman, each translation has an essence that "reveals" itself in the process of retranslation as

it comes closer to the unique texture, and accordingly the unique meaning, of the foreign text. For this reason, retranslation constitutes a progress, an accomplishment. This accomplishment is made possible because of the increasing awareness of the defects and assimilated aspects of a first translation which become clear through translation criticism as well as through the process of retranslating itself. Retranslations, as Berman argues, are themselves a form of translation criticism because they shed light on the poor status of the first translation.

Berman does not base his explanation of retranslation on empirical studies, that is, he does not arrive at his explanation of retranslation in terms of the poor quality and domesticated nature of first translations, but rather upon adopting an essentialist point of view, taking it for granted that first translations are 'defective'. Berman's argument is not only a highly generalized statement about retranslations, but also an implicitly prescriptive presupposition that says that retranslation should be produced in a specific way to 'restore' first translation(s). Thus, it is not surprising that such a scheme of thought has been seen as untenable in Translation Studies. And it is for this reason that some scholars of Translation Studies have preferred to turn Berman's position into an empirical or descriptive hypothesis that can be tested. Chesterman, (2000) was the first to formulate this hypothesis naming it Retranslation Hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, retranslations are or tend to be closer to the source text than first translations (15).

Since its first formulation, the Retranslation Hypothesis as an empirical hypothesis has generated some theoretical discussions including how to construct "reliable methods for measuring 'closeness' or determining which 'units of comparison' should be used (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010, Deane 2011). Koskinen and Paloposki posit that adopting different criteria of closeness or units of comparison "makes it hard to compare the results of existing studies" (*ibid*: 296). This is, in fact, true because key words such as "assimilated" "closer" can be understood in different ways and measured against different units of comparison (culture-specific items, grammar, style, lexis, dialects...etc).

However, apart from the aforementioned difficulties, it is argued that the Retranslation Hypothesis has been confirmed by some studies and denied by others (*ibid*). Rodriguez (1990) also remarks that "some retranslations are much closer to being adaptations of the source texts, succeeding the initial [more] literal translations" (cited in Susam-Sarajeva, 2003: 4). Referring to

research by Brisset (2004), Brownlie (2006), and Koskinen and Paloposki (2004), Koskinen and Paloposki (2010) claim that recent studies provide "ample evidence both in support and in opposition to the Retranslation Hypothesis" (295, see also Feng, 2014: 73). What this simply means is that "first translations cannot always be said to be domesticating and subsequent translations cannot always be said to be foreignizing" (Damanhoury, 2015: 9-10).

In addition to the Progress Argument, Berman presents another explanation for retranslation based on the notion that retranslations sometimes emerge to update existing translations in the target language. This explanation will be explained in the following section.

4.2.2 The Updating Argument

Language is not a static phenomenon. It changes over time. Translations produced in a particular time and place may later become unsuitable for the new generation who seeks either a revision of first translation(s) or a new one. This argument has been used to justify retranslation (Vanderschelden, *ibid*: 4-5). Accordingly, "it is often assumed that translations age more than the STs [source texts] and that it is normal to retranslate a classic for each generation, that is every twenty or thirty years" (*ibid*). The former explanation is traditionally associated with the notion that language changes and hence the need to "update the wording and terminology used in earlier translations" (Hanna, 2006: 198, also Susam-Sarajeva, *ibid*: 2).

Berman seems to follow this line of reasoning. However, he reformulates the argument into his own language and thought. According to him, translations 'age' and this leads to new translations. Original works, says Berman, remain 'young' whereas translations, with few exceptions, age with the passage of time' (Gürçağlar, 1998: 234).

The few exceptions that Berman has in mind when he talks about translations that 'age' with the passage of time are the 'great translations' which are the true retranslations that "fall from the tree of the text in its autumn" (Berman, 1999: 104). These translations 'reveal' the essence of the original text and become an original themselves. However Berman argues that even a canonical translation does not completely halt the cycle of retranslations (Brownlie, 2006: 101). This argument or explanation has its root in the practice of translation, and some researchers still think of it as a possible explanation for retranslation (Wenjie, 2014: 195-6). However, it should not be

considered a general explanation for retranslation because of the simple fact that retranslations may occur in a short time span (Gürçağlar, *ibid*).

In summary, Berman proposed two explanations for retranslation. The first, known as the Retranslation Hypothesis, states that retranslations emerge to 'restore' first translation, bringing them closer to the source text. The second attempts to account for retranslation by claiming that retranslations emerge to update first translations as they become outdated with the passage of time. Although these two explanations are simple and seem to be rooted in the practice of retranslation, both have become a subject of criticism. Almost all translation scholars who have studied retranslation subsequent to Berman have questioned his account, either explicitly or implicitly. The research done in this regard tends to reject Berman's account, replacing it with a more accurate and sophisticated account that takes into consideration the agency of translation and the socio-cultural and political settings of retranslation:

This view [Berman's view] has recently been questioned in a number of publications that suggest alternative explanations such as the agency of the actors involved (Collombat 2004), the power struggles and conflicting interpretations (Susam-Sarajeva 2006), or the economic reasons such as the marketing potential of retranslations (Koskinen & Paloposki 2003). The idea of deficient first translations also tacitly assumes a view of linear progress, that is, a modernist world view which many commentators have found untenable (Brisset 2004; Susam-Sarajeva 2006; von Flotow 2009). Retranslations may actually capitalize on the status quo: preserving rather than improving or progressing on earlier translations of a canonized classic. (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2010: 296)

The following section gives more detail about the new schemes and explanations of retranslation as mentioned by Koskinen and Paloposki in the previous quotation.

4.3 Retranslation as a Challenge

Subsequent to the work of Berman, a large part of the research done on retranslation explains the occurrence of retranslations and the features that differentiate them from first translations by reference to a complex network of factors, textual and socio-cultural. Pym (1998) and Venuti

(2004) point out that retranslation is better explained by reference to the target language and culture more than by the quality or the strategy used in translating first translation. Central to these two theorists and to subsequent researchers is the notion of rivalry, that is, the fact that retranslation is deeply motivated and shaped by competition and conflict between different agencies in the translating language and culture regarding accurate translation of the source text.

4.3.1 Passive and Active Retranslation

In his *Methods in Translation History* (1998), Pym distinguishes three types of retranslations. The first is “periodical retranslations” by which he refers to those retranslations that are the product of the passage of time such as some retranslations of the Bible. These retranslations “would seem to be responding to long-term processes of linguistic and cultural changes in the target culture” (82). In addition to periodical retranslation, Pym talks about ‘passive retranslations’. These retranslations are “separated by synchronic boundaries (geopolitical or dialectological) where there is likely to be little active rivalry between different versions, and knowledge of one version does not conflict with knowledge of another” (*ibid*). The two former types of retranslation share the same logic because they constitute little challenge, if any, to first translations. Following Pym, Gürçağlar defines ‘passive retranslation’ as those retranslations which are separated from first translation by “geographical distance or time” (*ibid*: 235). Gürçağlar treats ‘periodical retranslation’ as a sub-category of ‘passive retranslation’ because they share the same logic, that is, they constitute little or no challenge to first translation. For the sake of simplicity, Gürçağlar’s definition of ‘passive retranslation’ will also be adopted in this study.

Pym does not pay much attention to ‘passive retranslations’. This is because it is possible to study how a particular language and culture has evolved without studying the history of translation itself, and still arrive at the same conclusion as if a full translation history had been studied. For instance, to compare two or more passive retranslations in order to discover how linguistic and cultural changes in the translating culture have resulted in changes in translation studies is a redundant procedure that “can only affirm the general hypothesis that target-culture norms determine translation strategies” (Pym, *ibid*: 82).

In contrast to ‘passive retranslation’, Pym talks about ‘active retranslation’. Active retranslations are the product of disagreements between agents of translation (translators, publishers, patrons of translations) about the correct way to translate a particular text. These retranslations share “virtually the same cultural location and generation and must respond to something else”(ibid). The ‘something else’ is the existence of different points of view of how to translate the foreign text.

Active retranslations have more explanatory power as their comparison and analysis tend to locate causes of their existence and features “far closer to the translator, especially in the entourage of patrons, publishers, readers and intercultural politics” (ibid: 83). However, Pym does not delineate the motivations for retranslation that are “closer to the translator” apart from suggesting that “active retranslation” challenges previous versions"(see Hanna, 2006: 195).

However, the examples of active retranslations that Pym briefly mentions and discusses may be a starting point for understanding his thought process on the subject. The first example was the *Elements* of Euclid which was directly translated from Arabic into Hispania for the first time in 12th century. The first retranslation of the same text later appeared with a commentary with many of the proofs omitted. The second retranslation included the omitted proofs. Pym argues that the three versions were intended to carry out different pedagogical functions for different readers, pointing out that retranslations here come closer to the target readership. The second example is a new translation of *Al-Zarkali's Acafea (Al-Safi'ha)*. The text was first translated in the 13th century from Arabic into Castilian (a Spanish vernacular at that time) for King Alfonso X. Twenty years later, the king asked another translator to retranslate *Acafea*. The king seems to "have returned to the translation business with renewed enthusiasm for correcting his translators' Castilian..." (ibid: 83). This example shows the impact of sponsorship on undertaking the retranslation and why it looks the way it does. The third example is more interesting as the text, *Arbre de batailles*, was translated twice into Castilian in the 15th century at approximately the same time. The two translations are very similar. What matters is "the book content, to which neither rival patron wanted the other to have exclusive access" (ibid). Similarly, this example shows the impact of the patronage of translation on motivating different translations of a single text at approximately the same time, and how the political conflict between patrons can influence

the selection of a single text to be retranslated and used even if the strategies used in translating it are similar.

These three cases “prove no general causality behind active retranslations” (*ibid*). The first is motivated by educational reasons, the second by the patron of translation, and the third by political competition between the patrons of translation. The insistence on plural explanations of retranslation will become a major premise for subsequent research in approaching this phenomenon. The three previously discussed cases also reveal why the translator is not the only agent responsible for the selection of a text to be retranslated, as well as the strategies used in the translation process. Pym highlights another important feature of active retranslation as exemplified in the previous examples. This is the ‘negativity’ that marks the retranslation moment. For although active retranslations are taken to be reproduced in order to bring a single text closer to the original or the target readers, at the same time they strongly challenge the validity of previous translation(s). He highlighted this feature by comparing a retranslation with re-editing a previous translation. For it is only the latter that is marked by negativity in the sense elaborated above (*ibid*).

Although the distinction between ‘passive retranslation’ and ‘active retranslation’ is useful in explaining why some retranslations constitute a challenge to first translations while others do not, it is not clear why a text needs to be retranslated in the same generation or for the same market to constitute a challenge to first translations. A retranslation can be motivated by linguistic and cultural changes in the translating language and still constitute a challenge to first translations.

Active retranslation is a useful concept because it locates retranslation in a complex network of factors that are related to the agency of translation as well as the socio-cultural context of translation as Pym’s previous examples show. Pym, as outlined before, places much attention on retranslation as a challenge, that is, the rivalry between those who are involved in translations such as translators and patrons of translation over the proper translation of the foreign text, but it is Venuti who takes this notion further. The next section expands upon this.

4.3.2 Venuti's Perspective

In his *Retranslations: The Creation of Values* (2004), Venuti presents one of the most sophisticated and universal accounts of retranslation that has shaped the subsequent research on this phenomenon on a variety of ways. According to Venuti, retranslations are mainly motivated by the existence of different and competing interpretations of the foreign text in the translating culture. These interpretations can occur in a particular place at the same or different time, but in both cases they are essentially related to the emergence of a new interpreter, a new conceptual framework, a new function of a particular text, and a new group that has particular values and interest in retranslating a single text. Moreover, he shows how retranslations, especially those which are housed within an institution, can have cultural and ideological "effects" on the translating language and culture, affirming or challenging dominant interpretations and ideologies. As Deane-Cox (2014) rightly points out, Venuti delves deeper than Pym into the extratextual cause of retranslation, "situating motivating factors on the levels of canonicity, ideology, economics, and the subjectivity of translator" (13). The following paragraphs detail Venuti's account.

4.3.2.1 Retranslation: Making the Difference

As outlined previously, Pym claims that retranslations that are produced in a single language a long time after previous or first translations will present little or no challenge to them. Contrary to this, Venuti contends that any retranslation has the potential to rival its predecessors, regardless of the time span separating them. Retranslations "deliberately mark the passage of time by aiming to distinguish themselves from a previous version through differences in discursive strategies and interpretations" (Venuti, *ibid*: 35). As Deane says "whereas Pym's passive retranslation and the updating of linguistic norms go hand in hand, Venuti highlights alterations to the discursive texture of a retranslation as indicative of a deliberate act of differentiation" (Deane, 2011: 14).

According to Venuti, retranslations are a special kind of translation because they are not only determined by the new interpretations that the translator inscribes in the foreign text, but also by the interpretations inscribed in the foreign text by previous translators. The difference that

retranslations create reflects this double relationship with the foreign text as well as with first translations (Venuti, *ibid*: 25). This means that Venuti assumes that retranslation applies only to those retranslations that are produced with the translator being aware of first translation(s), a point of view that Berman and Pym also seem to share. This awareness is crucial for retranslation because it “certainly influences the translator’s strategies because if there are previous versions, one of the very motives for retranslating will be to replace or outdo the previous version” (Taivalkoski-Shilov, 2015: 62).

Venuti points out that retranslation is a complex phenomenon that is better understood against a myriad of factors in the translating language. The main motivating factors are the agency of translation, particularly the role of the individual translator, the role of dominant interpretations in the translating language, ideology the role of readership and economic reasons. These factors will be explained in the following sections.

4.3.2.2 Retranslation and Agency of Translation

The translator’s work is conditioned by the socio-cultural and political context in which he or she works. The translator’s decision to translate and to retranslate a certain text by certain methods of translation can be part of a dominant practice or set of norms in the translating language and culture. The interpretations that the translator inscribes in the foreign text from the very selection of a single text to be retranslated to the discursive strategies he chooses to inscribe in it are themselves shaped by and part of dominant intelligibilities, beliefs, and interests, in the translating language and culture. But as individual creators, translators can also choose to retranslate a certain text in a certain way even if this is not aligned with dominant interpretations or norms in the translating language and culture. This is why the role of the agency of translation, particularly the subjectivity of the translator, cannot be ruled out as one of the most motivating factors for retranslation. Although this applies to translators in general, the translator who is working on a retranslation is in a special position because he has greater opportunity of reflectivity on the different conditions and consequences of translating:

Retranslations typically highlight the translator's intentionality because they are designed to make an appreciable difference. The retranslator's intention is to select

and interpret the foreign text according to a different set of values so as to bring about a new and different reception for that text in the translating culture. The retranslator is likely to be aware, then, not only of the competing interpretations inscribed in the foreign text by a previous version and by the retranslation, but the linguistic and cultural norms that give rise to these interpretations, such as literary canons and translation traditions. A retranslator may aim to maintain, revise, or displace norms and the institutions in which they are housed. (Venuti, *ibid*: 28)

However, and despite the important role of the translators in selecting certain texts to be retranslated or in selecting certain methods of translation to be used in translating them, translators cannot previously and absolutely determine how these texts will be received, read, or used in the translating language and culture. The retranslator's awareness "can never be omniscient, nor can it ever give the retranslator complete control over transindividual factors" (Venuti, *ibid*: 27).

Venuti also highlights the importance of texts published with retranslations, the so called paratextual materials, as a site for expressing and making the difference the translator seeks to achieve through the new translation. These paratextual materials such as the translator's preface and notes, which are published with the new translation "signal its status as a retranslation and make explicit the competing interpretation that the retranslator has tried to inscribe in the foreign text" (Venuti, *ibid*: 33). This is why these materials are important and why they should not be taken at face value:

[T]ranslators' or publishers' claims of achieving "greater adequacy, completeness, or accuracy should be viewed critically [...] because they always depend on another category, usually an implicit basis of comparison between the foreign text and the translation which establishes the insufficiency and therefore serves as a standard of judgment. This standard is a competing interpretation. (*ibid*)

In other words, Venuti argues that the differences a given translation seeks to make to establish his/her translation as the proper translation of the foreign text are "guided more by social or ideological premises than by linguistic or literary lack in the previous translations" (Feng, *ibid*:

73). The same point is highlighted by Koskinen and Paloposki (2010: 296) who suggest that claims of deficiency in first translations may be made for the purpose of a strategic repositioning and not due to actual deficiencies in these translations. Paratextual materials of translation in general and retranslation in particular are important because they reveal, as Deane-Cox points out, ‘the strategic (ideological, cultural, economic, etc.) maneuverings via which a given work presents itself to a given readership, while also offering insights into the dynamic of how (re)-translations might interact with one another and how they are positioned in relation to constantly evolving socio-cultural contexts (*ibid*: 26).

4.3.2.3 Canonicity and Economic Reasons

Venuti points out that translation as a cultural practice as well as the way the text is received in the target language can be used as a means to elevate a certain text into the status of ‘a classic’. Retranslation can also work as a means of canonizing certain foreign texts in the target culture. For, as Wenjie states, “the consistent retranslation of a source text (ST) during a period in the receiving culture implies the ST’s capability of inspiring multiple interpretations, which helps to confirm the canonical status of the ST” (*ibid*: 2). Venuti posits that interest in and promotion of the translation of certain texts can lead to their canonization:

[T]ranslation functions as one cultural practice through which a foreign text attains the status of a classic: the very fact of translation not only implies that the text has been judged valuable enough to bring into another culture, but also increases this value by generating such promotional devices as jacket copy, endorsements, and advertisements and by enabling such diverse modes of reception as reviews, course adoptions, and scholarly research. (Venuti, 2008, 28)

Translation and retranslation can be used to render a text canonical or classic in the translating language, and this, in turn, promotes the retranslation of that text.

A close relationship also exists between the canonicity of the retranslated text and the laws of marketing. Thus, it is not uncommon that some retranslations are motivated solely by economic reasons where a publisher’s selection of a text to be retranslated, usually one that has achieved the status of a canonical text in the translating culture, is motivated by creating economic values,

that is, by turning the cultural capital of the text into economic profits. Related to this is Dollerup's remark that "financial considerations (notably concerning translators' copyright) may make publishers commission new translations" (2014: 2).

4.3.2.4 Readership and Ideology

Like all postmodernists and deconstructionists, Venuti highlights the constitutive role of the reader in generating new translations of foreign texts. The reader is no longer a passive receiver or consumer of texts; rather he or she contributes in the construction of meanings as well as in recognizing and re-evaluating new texts including translations and retranslations. Retranslated texts are not only motivated by the emergence of new audiences, but also need to be recognized by these audiences as new or different in order to achieve the intended purposes of the new translations: challenging first translations.

Readers differ in beliefs, values, and interests, and this affects the way in which they respond to texts, especially those texts that have been considered authoritative or culturally important. The translator chooses to retranslate a text and to inscribe it with a particular interpretation to address specific audiences in the translating language in a particular time and place:

The sheer cultural authority of [...] the Bible, for instance, the Homeric epics, Dante's Divine Comedy, Shakespeare's plays, or Cervantes's Don Quixote-is likely to solicit retranslation because diverse domestic readerships will seek to interpret it according to their own values and hence develop different retranslation strategies that inscribe competing interpretations. Here the choice of the text for retranslation is premised on an interpretation that differs from that inscribed in a previous version, which is shown to be no longer acceptable because it has come to be judged as insufficient in some sense, perhaps erroneous, lacking linguistic correctness. (Venuti, *ibid*: 25)

Here the role of readers is important because they may develop different interpretations of certain texts, especially major religious or philosophical texts. The ideology adopted by the new readership plays an essential role in generating retranslations. Retranslations, as Venuti rightly points out, can be "designed deliberately to form particular identities and to have particular institutional effects" (Venuti, *ibid*: 26). For instance, a retranslation, housed in religious

institutions, helps to “define and inculcate orthodox belief by inscribing canonical texts with interpretations that are compatible with prevailing theological doctrine” (*ibid*). Retranslations can thus “maintain or strengthen the authority of a social institution by reaffirming the institutionalized interpretation of a canonical text” (*ibid*) or, alternatively, challenge a canonized interpretation. One well-known example that is presented by Venuti is The King James version of the Bible. The text was retranslated to reinforce the authority of the Anglican Church in England in the 17th century by drawing largely on previously banned English translations, especially Tyndale's translation, which was strongly criticized by the Roman Catholic Church as being closer to Protestant-oriented interpretations of the scriptures (*ibid*).

The same logic applies to retranslations which are housed in academic institutions. Some retranslations can help to “define and inculcate valid scholarship by inscribing canonical texts with interpretations that currently prevail in scholarly disciplines” (*ibid*: 27). This can be done when the retranslated text is used to challenge previous interpretations inscribed in first translation(s). One well-known example is Thomas Mann's fiction in English which was translated in the early decades of the 20th century by Helen Lowe-Porter. Her work was commercially successful and welcomed by critics, and her translations served to establish the canonicity of Mann's fiction in English for decades. In the 1970s, David Luke, a scholar in German literature and language, started a first retranslation of Mann's fiction. Luke , among others, severely criticized Lowe-Porter and accused her of several deviations from the original text. The deviations, according to Venuti, were not “erroneous deviations from semantic equivalence” but interpretations that are related to Lowe-Porter's cultural situation as she was addressing general readers. David Luke's retranslations of Mann have, thus, “asserted the authority of academic specialists in German literature by locating and correcting linguistic errors in Helen Lowe-Porter's earlier versions” (*ibid*). The story does not end here. In 1990s, John Woods then retranslated Mann's fiction again by addressing a new generation of general readers. Wood's version reflects the English of the here and now of the translator, and thus, constitutes a challenge to Luke's version. The English retranslations of Mann “have become the site where two kinds of institutions, the academic discipline and the commercial publisher, have competed over the interpretation of the German texts” (*ibid*). This example is typical of how retranslations

can be used to “assert the authority of academic specialists vis-a-vis non-academic translators” (Hanna, 2006: 197).

4.3.2.5 Retranslation and History

The two examples of the King James Bible and Thomas Mann's fiction in English discussed previously suggest that retranslations are shaped by the context of translation (the dominant interpretations, the conflict between different groups with different beliefs and interests), and that retranslations have implications that go beyond the work of the translator (reaffirming or challenging dominant interpretations). In these two cases, the motivation for retranslations, the conditions that shape them, their social, cultural and political 'effects' transcend the individual translator.

The discussion on the retranslation of the King James Bible and of Mann's fiction is a typical example of the impact of historical developments on why some texts were chosen to be retranslated, and why particular strategies of translation were used in translating them. Not only this, the former examples also show how these retranslations can themselves be constitutive of history and culture at a particular time and place in the sense that they can shape the historical development of particular institutions, identities and ideologies. This means that retranslation and history are closely related to one another.

Venuti highlights the relationship between retranslation and history. On one side, the history of translating and retranslating a particular text in a single language shows that discursive strategies used in the translation of that text reflect different standards of accuracy and even different conceptions of translation (Venuti, *ibid*). Retranslations reflect affinities with historical moments and developments. But retranslations can themselves be used to create their own historiographical picture or account. This is done through constructing and using particular narrations by translators or publishers to signal and rationalize the differences between retranslations and first translations. Drawing on the work of Hayden White (1973), Venuti argues that retranslators highlight the differences in their texts by choosing to impose a plot structure on why and how the new text (translation) emerged and how it relates to previous translations. These plots or stories are themselves culturally determined in the sense that they are part of the

ways specific people in specific times and places use language to account for specific things and events in a way that is not unlike storytelling. The crux of the matter is that these narrations are presented as if they were a description of what has been done, rather than as ‘constructed’ models imposed on specific events to serve the interest of certain people in particular situations.

Therefore, retranslations can be presented and seen from different historiographical viewpoints, depending on who presents them and on how they are presented, i.e. the narrative genre on which they are premised. One example is how retranslations can signal or constitute a ‘romance’ historical discourse when they are presented as progressive:

Retranslations are not merely historical in their affiliations with a specific moment, but historiographical in their effort to signal and rationalize their differences from previous versions through various narrative genres and often through a mixture of them. Perhaps the most common genre here is romance, according to Hayden White's classification, where the historical narrative is evolutionary, or progressive, culminating in some form of transcendence—here a transcendence, not of the difficulties in translating the foreign text, but of the defects that are perceived to have marred an earlier rendering. Thus, retranslations are often presented as a significant improvement because they rely on a definitive edition of the foreign text which was not formerly available or because they employ a discursive strategy that maintains a more strict semantic or stylistic equivalence. (Venuti, *ibid*: 35).

But a translator may choose a different narration to signal the new translation. He or she may criticize a previous translation without maintaining the notion of progress in translation and instead register the new text as a means to “bring the foreign text to a hitherto excluded readership or to cross the cultural boundaries between readerships” (*ibid*). Here, the main point is that retranslations are historically constructed but they can be used at the same time to constitute their own history through the way they are presented by those who produce or receive them.

4.3.2.6 Summary of Venuti's Perspective

In summary, Venuti treats retranslation as an important issue because, firstly, it highlights the fact that translation is a way of interpretation and reinterpretation, of creating different values, literary, cultural, ideological, and economic, depending upon the interpretations inscribed in the foreign text and on the context. Retranslations are the product of rereading texts, but can themselves be a source of new knowledge and thinking in the translating language and a way of redefining the foreign text. To study retranslations as Venuti says is to "realize that translation cannot be a simple act of communication because it creates values in social formations at specific historical moments, and these values redefine the source text and culture from moment to moment" (*ibid*: 37).

From this viewpoint, retranslation is not a mere textual practice that follows one dogma (for example, improving first translations), but a complicated practice where a network of factors that function on different levels and can be rationalized on this view in different ways. In other words, "there actually seems to be a web of multiple causation that explains retranslation: the causes might be linguistic, aesthetic, cultural, ideological, economic, practical, idiosyncratic, and so forth." (Taivalkoski-Shilov, *ibid*: 62).

Even when a translator claims that his retranslation was undertaken to improve on a first translation, this claim should be taken critically because it is more about competition and conflict between different agencies in the translating language over the correct rendition or interpretation of the foreign text. Retranslation, according to this model, marks "a constant struggle between individuals and institutions for the control and production of new interpretation" (Gürçağlar, *ibid*: 235).

Retranslation has effects on the translating language as well as on the source text. A retranslation may challenge not only first translations and the interpretations that were inscribed in them, but also the foreign text through transforming its meaning, function, and value. When a retranslation is housed in an institution such as a church or an academic discipline, it can serve as a pivotal instrument in constructing and consolidating this institution, and in challenging a competing institution or group in the translating language. Retranslation is thus a complex phenomenon that

involves different factors in its causes as well as in its consequences, depending upon the texts chosen to be retranslated as well as on the conditions of retranslating them.

Factors that account for retranslation are situated at different levels of causality including the subjective interpretations of the translator, the existence of different interpretations of the foreign text in the translating language, the emergence of new conceptual perspectives in the translating language and culture, the existence of different and competing readerships of the foreign text (usually culturally authoritative texts), and the political and ideological conflicts and tensions in the translating culture. In some cases it is a new scholarly interpretation of the foreign text that determines the need for retranslation, but in others it is only a matter of investment in the sheer capital of the text, i.e. it is a commercial matter.

Venuti's work on retranslation seems to be one of the most useful and productive approaches to retranslation, and will be mainly adopted by this study. First, his approach takes into consideration the complex nature of retranslation. Second, it permits using various levels of explanation to account for this phenomenon (e.g the role of the individual translator, the targeted audience and ideology). Third, it takes into consideration the effects of retranslations on the retranslated texts, source culture and target culture. In other words, he provides a universal approach to study the production and reception of retranslation, as well as the causes and effects of retranslation.

However, Venuti's arguments are mainly based on the retranslation of literary texts and far less on religious texts (there are only two references to the Bible). Whether these arguments apply to other types of texts (for example, philosophical or scientific) has been a subject of several studies in the field of translation studies. The following section reviews some of the most influential studies in this regard.

4.3.3 Retranslation of non-Literary Texts

The term "non-literary texts" is usually used to refer to all texts that fall outside of literature such as scientific and philosophical texts. As some scholars have pointed out, the retranslation of non-literary texts is seldom discussed in the field of translation studies (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010: 295). This applies to the most retranslated religious texts such as the Bible and the Qur'an.

A recently published research on the retranslation of the Qur'an in Japanese by Damanhoury (2015) is an exception to this. A focus on literary texts can be accounted for by the fact that most research done on retranslations has been undertaken on classical literary texts. It is argued that this is because retranslation and literary canon formation are mutually dependent as retranslation helps texts achieve the status of a classic, and the status of a classic often promotes further retranslations (Koskinen and Paloposki: *ibid*).

This section reviews three important studies on the retranslation of non-literary texts. The first discusses the retranslation of theoretical texts of Barthes and Cixous from French into Turkish and English respectively by Susam-Sarajeva (2003). The second study was conducted by Flotow (2009) on the retranslation into English of the French feminist Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*. The third study by Song (2012) deals with a classical military treatise known as *The Art of War* translated and retranslated from Chinese into English. These three studies deal with different non-literary texts, but share a great deal of common methodology or perspective as they all attempt to locate retranslation in the socio-cultural and ideological settings of translation.

4.3.3.1 Retranslating Barthes and Cixous

One of the most influential studies on the retranslation of theoretical texts is Susam-Sarajeva's (2003) study of the translation and retranslation of the French theorist and literary critic Roland Barthes into Turkish and the translation and retranslation of the work of the French feminist H el ene Cixous into English. In these two cases, the topic of retranslation was part of an overall project that aims to study the migration of different theories (structuralism, poststructuralism, feminism) from one language and culture into different languages and cultures, and how translation operates within these boundaries. Theories do not travel alone, but in the company of influential writers and translators. Translators are part of the receiving system in the translating language and culture. They are part of a major system (the society and culture in which they work) and of a sub-system, that is, a field of research and translation such as literary studies and translation in a particular time and place. The sub-system has its own laws, and it is mainly the product of those who are involved in it such as scholars, critics, translators, patrons of translation and publishers as well as its own history and development. But this sub-system is also affected by the major system (for example, the political situation in a particular culture). Translated

theories and terminologies are not only likely to be affected by the receiving system, but also by the relationship between the receiving system and the source system. Furthermore, Susam-Sarajeva studied the translation and retranslation of Barthes, and Cixous into Turkish and English respectively, in order to understand the motivations for retranslation in both settings, and the impact of the receiving system as well as the relationship between the source and receiving systems on the retranslated texts. The study of two cases of retranslation with reference to two different receiving systems, the Turkish and the Anglo-American, is deliberately designed by Susam-Sarajeva to yield specific purposes:

All resemblances aside, the reception of French feminism in Anglo-America and of structuralism and semiotics in Turkey cannot be too similar; not only because the works, authors, translators, commissioners, publishers, and readers involved are not alike, but also because “the symmetries and asymmetries of linguistic and geopolitical power”, and “the historical-cultural relationships” between French and Anglo-American systems on the one hand, and French and Turkish systems on the other, are “vastly different” (cf. Gupta 1998:182). (Susam-Sarajeva, 2001: 1)

The translation of literary criticism theories from the West in general and from French in particular into Turkish took the form of one way importation, where literary criticism theories and terminologies were imported from French and English and then incorporated into Turkish in order to create a new local discourse of literary criticism in this language and culture. In this context, translation was seen as a key factor in this process, that is, as a means of creating a new theoretical and critical study of literature via the incorporation of Western theories and terminologies into the receiving system (Turkish). The new theoretical and critical discourse was developing in the receiving system, which means that the imported theories and terminologies needed to be created and recreated in order to be neatly incorporated into the receiving system. Thus, retranslation was seen as a natural process because it enabled the developing system to accurately and neatly incorporate the imported theories and terminologies in the receiving language and culture in light of the local efforts of critics, translators, and linguists to re-think and re-create new terminologies of the newly constructed discourse. The translation and retranslation of Barthes’ theoretical and critical works into Turkish comes within this context,

that is, in the context of creating and re-creating a stable local discourse of literary criticism to facilitate the incorporation of Barthes' imported theories and terminologies into Turkish.

Susam-Sarajeva observed that the period from 1975 to 1990 witnessed the retranslation of a considerable number of Barthes' texts, a relatively short time span that renders the idea of the 'aging' of previous translations as a catalyst for the new translations unlikely (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003: 6). The frequency of retranslation of Barthes' work, which is full of new theoretical and critical terms, corresponds to a 'time when suitable counterparts for these terms were being suggested, debated, rejected, and accepted' in the translating language (*ibid*). The retranslated texts were produced intensively in that period not because the previous translation aged, nor because they were defective or domesticated, but rather because of the ongoing process of creating and re-creating a local discourse of literary criticism in Turkey to incorporate the theories and terminologies imported from the French language. She observes that the relationship between first translations and retranslation of Barthes' work does not follow the logic of the retranslation hypothesis but rather the "the spiral-like and vertiginous evolution' pattern of the indigenous literary critical discourse" (*ibid*).

With regard to the Anglo-American reception of Cixous, Susam-Sarajeva found that it is the non-existence or rarity of retranslation which characterizes the importation of Cixous' texts into English. From a relatively high number of first translations of her works into English (65 texts) only five texts were retranslated. The comparison with Barthes' work in Turkish is important because out of 45 texts that were translated into Turkish, 28 texts were retranslated in the same language. Does the non-existence or rarity of retranslation in the case of Cixous mean that the receiving system was static? Were first translations of her work in English so complete or great that they were considered an accomplishment as Berman would suggest? According to Susam-Sarajeva, these two explanations are unlikely (*ibid*: 19). She points out that the rarity of retranslations of these texts seems to be more relevant to the prevailing attitude to translating such texts into the Anglo-American feminist system:

Translations in this system were often seen and presented as unproblematic and 'transparent'. The general tendency was not to be caught up by words, in order to be able to focus on 'what was being told'. A certain 'immediacy' was necessary for the

activist type of feminism prevalent in this system [...]. The wish to do justice to the French texts was strong; however even stronger was the urge to produce ‘good English’, to provide ‘consistency and readability in English [...]’. (*ibid*: 20)

This attitude is apparent when it comes to the imported terms or concepts from Cixous’s work. The introduction of these terms was, relatively speaking, glossed over, and therefore did not generate the discussion that they deserved. This is in spite of the fact that their ‘exotic’ nature has been acknowledged by some translators and critics who “have been reluctant to scare off their readers by introducing or focusing on new terminology *within* the translated texts” (*ibid*: 21, italic original).

Thus, in these two cases of retranslation, it is mainly the nature or feature of the receiving system that governs retranslation and its related features. Here, retranslation seems to be more relevant to what is going on in the translating culture, and not to any intrinsic features of the foreign text or the status of first translations. It is widely acknowledged that in the case of Barthes’ work, it is insisted that the considerable number of Turkish retranslations not only reflects a more open attitude toward the West but also, and more importantly, an ongoing process to re-incorporate the "imported" terms into local discourse following intensive debates and tensions within the field of literary criticism. In the case of Cixous, it is the prevailing notion of ‘transparency’ and ‘readability’ in the translating culture that account for the rarity of retranslation. Hanna (2006) agrees with Susam-Sarajeva that the non-existence of retranslation in a certain system is an interesting field of research, but suggests two different explanations or scenarios for it. The first is that the foreign text is probably seen in the target culture as a minor or irrelevant work that is not worth reinvesting in, and the second is that in many cases the retranslation of particular texts requires enormous 'instruments of production' (for example, deep knowledge of the source text and language and financial supports) which are not always available (199n).

In summary, Susam-Sarajeva argues that retranslation, in the case of Barthes and Cixous, may have more to do with the needs and attitudes within the receiving system than with any inherent characteristics of the source texts or the poor quality of first translations. As she puts it: “to grant a multiple entry visa to a foreigner is totally at the discretion of the receiving authorities” (*ibid*: 5). Contrary to Berman’s model, she argues that retranslations don’t emerge because the first

translations are assimilated or defective nor because they have become outdated, but rather because of particular facts in the receiving system. These facts relate to “dominance, elasticity, tolerance and power of the source and receiving systems involved [which] determine whether travelling theory will be granted a multiple-entry visa into the latter system through retranslations” (Susam-Sarajeva, 2006: 135).

4.3.3.2 The Retranslation of *The Second Sex*

Whereas Susam-Sarajeva uses the case study of Cixous to address the issue of rarity or non-existence of retranslation, Flotow (2009), chooses *The Second Sex* by the French feminist and philosopher Simone De Beauvoir (1908-1986) to shed more light on the phenomenon of retranslation. Like Susam-Sarajeva, she places the translation and retranslation of *The Second Sex* within the socio-cultural and political settings in the receiving language and culture, and some of her results raise valid points that warrant further investigation.

The Second Sex was published in France in 1949, and is regarded as a classic work in modern feminism in general, and particularly in modern French feminism. The text is also philosophically important given the fact that it was largely motivated by Existentialism, the philosophy developed by Sartre and Beauvoir (Holmes, 1996: 149). The text was translated into English in 1953. Since its publication and translation in these two languages as well as all over the world, the text has not only inspired many feminist writers and activists in France and all over the world, but has also had a personal impact on many women (*ibid*, 148-9).

The first English translation of *The Second Sex* was translated in 1953 by Howard Parshley, a retired professor of biology at Smith College. This translation continued to be ‘a point of departure’ until the early 1980s when some critics started to highlight inadequacies and mistranslations in Parshley’s translation. Simons (1983), in an article entitled *The Silencing of Simone De Beauvoir: Guess What is Missing in The Second Sex*, not only refers to considerable omissions in Parshley’s translation, but also to the fact that the translator distorted the true nature of the text by giving the impression that it is about ‘sex’, she writes:

Both the 1968 Bantam paperback edition of *The Second Sex* (the one with a photograph of a naked woman on the cover-after all this is a book about sex)-and the

more demure plain-labelled 1970 Bantam edition brazenly advertise themselves as “complete and unabridged.”. A statement that is a lot less revealing than the cover photo, given the fact that over 10% of the material in the original French edition is missing from the English translation available. (559)

In addition to these omissions, the inaccurate and the inconsistent translations of key philosophical terms in *The Second Sex* result in a misrepresentation of Beauvoir’s ideas and in obscuring her links to a philosophical tradition (*ibid*: 563). This point is emphasized by another critic who highlights what she considers as "the philosophical and theoretical inadequacies of the English text" (Moi, 2002: 1007n). One example of mistranslation, and therefore misrepresentation of Beauvoir’s philosophical thought, was mentioned by Beauvoir herself in an interview in 1985 when she stated that Parshley had mistranslated a key philosophical and existentialist term like “*la réalité humaine*” rendering it into English as “human nature”. The French term expresses a Heideggerian conception of human reality that is related to “man’s place in the world” rather than an essentialist “human nature” as Parshley’s translation would have us believe (33-34).

These and similar critical points on the first translation of *The Second Sex* were then sharpened by the work of other critics who were more aware of the "hidden influence of translation" (Flotow, *ibid*: 36). Thus, some critics noticed the omission of every reference to socialist feminism and "cut descriptions of women’s anger and women’s oppression, while keeping intact references to men’s feelings" in the English translator of *The Second Sex* (*ibid*: 1008).

Criticism of the poor quality of the existing English translation was given more strength by the increasing recognition of the philosophical importance of *The Second Sex* and its author in the Anglophone world since the 1990s, especially in the United States (Moi, *ibid*: 1006). Critical notes on Parshley's translation as well as other English translations of Beauvoir’s work have increased to the extent that the existing translations were “no longer deemed acceptable as material to cite” (Flotow, *ibid*). In a more recent work, Flotow (2012) points out that it is the publisher, more than the translator himself, who is responsible for wanting to "change Beauvoir’s work from a pioneering philosophical feminist manifesto and history of women to what he

wished to sell as an easy-reading, “dumbed-down” sex manual for mainstream American readers” (Flotow, 2012: 131).

The retranslation of *The Second Sex* appeared in English in 2009. What this case study shows is that retranslation was not the result of the poor quality of first translations as such, but of new reading (new waves of feminism since the 1970s), of the role of new approaches in translation studies which further highlights the potential danger of translation in the construction of distorted images of the other (in this case a French writer and a feminist philosopher), and of the increasing recognition in the West of the philosophical importance of the source text and its author. Translation criticism played a vital role in bringing about the new translation of this text proved to be highly important in the context of this text, but here translation criticism is not a matter of attacking some earlier translator/translation because they were poor, but rather it is “a new understanding and representation of the source text, in another time and space and culture, and by another individual - who chooses to, and is able to, read differently” (*ibid*).

On the surface, the catalyst for the retranslation of *The Second Sex* into English follows the logic of the Retranslation Hypothesis, but closer analysis reveals the complex nature of retranslation because of other motivating factors involved in the generation of a new version of this seminal work as shown in the discussion of this section.

The most interesting part of Flotow’s work, which makes it relevant to the purposes of the current study, is that it shows the impact translation and retranslation can have on the source text and its author. Translation significantly contributes to creating particular representations about the source text and about its author in the receiving culture (e.g. how the author of the source text is presented in the translating culture). These representations reflect dominant thoughts (interpretations, interests and values) in the translating culture and can shape the translated text and its author in a significant way. Retranslation may consolidate these representations or challenge them, depending on the context of translation as Flotow’s work show with reference to Simone De Beauvoir and *The Second Sex*.

4.3.3.3 The Retranslation of *The Art of War*

The Art of War is a classical text that was written in the 6th century by a Chinese military genius named Sun Tzu. The text is divided into thirteen chapters each of which contains one element of successful warfare. Although belonging to a different time, language, and culture, the text is still regarded "as essential reading for global entrepreneurs seeking to master strategy and has had a huge influence on military planning both in the East and West" (McCreadie, 2008: 2). The text is considered "the world's oldest thesis on military strategy" (Song, 2012: 182).

In a recent work, Song (2012) attempts to explore, from a sociological point of view, why a variety of translators have chosen to retranslate *The Art of War*, how translators qualify themselves as capable to retranslate it, and what strategies these translators use to challenge the most well-established translators of the same text. The text has been translated into English alone more than twenty times in less than fifty years (1963-2004), something that renders dubious any reference to the Updating Argument as a motivation. What Song instead suggests, is to use notions derived from Bourdieu's work, namely the notion of "cultural capital", to understand the context and motivation of retranslating this classic text.

Using social notions in Translation Studies such as system, norms, and power relations (ideology) is well-regarded as chapter two of this study has shown. But this is different from using frameworks and theories that have emerged and developed in social sciences to account for observations that are related to translation (Inghilleri, 1998: 279). The most influential sociological frameworks and theories that are borrowed and developed by scholars in Translation Studies are those of Pierre Bourdieu, Niklas Luhmann, and Bruno Latour (*ibid*: 279-80). Both the role of the agency of translation (for example, the role of translators and publishers as social actors), and the social space, often presented as a space of divisions and conflicts within which translations are produced, reproduced, and circulated have been the cornerstone notions for many researchers in Translation Studies who present themselves as sociologists of translation (Hanna, 2006, Song, 2012). By focusing on the role of the agency of translation and the field of translation as a social place that is shaped by divisions and conflicts, it is claimed that sociology of translation can provide useful perspectives that surpass not only reductive linguistic

explanations but also the abstract patterns dominant in previous functional approaches such as Polysystem Theory and the Translation Norms Theory (Inghilleri, *ibid*: 282).

Approaching retranslation from a sociological point of view aims to surpass the reductionism of common explanations that treat retranslation as a mere textual relationship between target texts and the original, thus ignoring the cognitive, socio-cultural, and political constraints that shape the very nature of this practice (Song, *ibid*: 176). A sociological point of view fills this gap by taking into consideration the social nature of retranslation through exploration of the conditions that occasioned the re-production of the retranslated texts, the socio-cultural and political functions they serve in the translating culture, the specific social context in which they are embedded, and the motivation of those who produced them (for example, translators). According to Song, this approach "offers the advantage of situating the act of retranslating classic texts not in a simple linguistic framework for the assessment of errors through intertextual comparison but in a more complex and dynamic sociological milieu where the act can be viewed as a social practice" (*ibid*: 177).

This said, and with reference to Bourdieu, it is held that every society is made up of structures (a system of sub-systems). Translation as an activity, for example, is a relatively autonomous structure that is composed of those who participate in it (translators, publishers, commissioners of translations, critics, readers), how they relate to each other, and how they relate to other agencies in other fields (religion, politics). Much focus is thus placed on the relations in a particular field and on what they entail. Agents and their actions are bound by the prevailing laws in a field at a particular time and place including how these agents interact. Field, wherein cultural productions is produced and circulated, is shaped by conflicts and tensions in the sense that cultural reproducers compete over all sorts of capital (profits) including cultural capital. Cultural capital is defined as "the totality of one's knowledge, skills, experience, competencies, and worldview that eventually determines how great a social and financial advantage or status its owner could have in a given society" (*ibid*: 179). The competition for cultural capital is itself a struggle over other sorts of capital (e.g. economic) but also power and prestige:

The field of translation is a battleground on which, according to Bourdieu, cultural reproducers compete over cultural capital synonymous with higher social status and

greater power to control texts and attribute meaning to them. On the surface, the struggles are about defending ideas and satisfying tastes, but they are also about how to control cultural capital and how to eventually convert it into economic capital. (*ibid*: 176).

Given the fact that cultural capital is an “investment of an appropriate kind” every competitor translator needs to have “enough cultural capital” to compete against others (*ibid*). And when it comes to translating a classic text, where sacred texts have high cultural capital (value), the demand becomes higher and investment is appropriate. To guarantee recognition in the market place, the translator has a strong tendency to increase his/her capital by challenging some or even all of the competing versions (*ibid*). In other words, to compete successfully, the retranslator should make a difference and leave his or her own "mark" on the translated text.

Song then shows how this scheme of thought proves useful in the case of the translation and retranslation of *The Art of War*. The text is a typical example of how translators use their capital to “outmatch the competition not only within their textual practice but beyond it in different historical and socio-cultural contexts” (*ibid*). This is done by analyzing how each translator manages to use particular strategies in challenging previous competitors especially the well-established ones.

To start with the retranslations undertaken in the early 1960s, the translator Griffiths, an American army general and an expert in Chinese studies, uses different strategies to establish his version, and thus himself, against previous translations. He presents himself as a more authentic representative of the text by increasing the retranslated text’s cultural capital: turning the translation into an encyclopedia through injecting within the text and its introduction " a huge amount of information that was previously either unavailable or inaccessible to his predecessors"(*ibid*: 184). He resituates the text in the context of the Second World War, enforces his symbolic power through a preface that was written by a well-known American military strategist, and by having "UNESCO’s recognition of the book as part of its Chinese translation series" printed on the cover page (*ibid*).

The second translator Gagliardi produced his version of *The Art of War* in 1994, ten years after the death of Griffiths. He attacks Griffiths' version on textual grounds: for example, accusing him of unnecessary omissions or of using awkward words, and non-textual grounds: for example, claiming that his translation is excellent work if the reader wants to read the *Art of War* from the point view of the 19th century military man (*ibid*: 186). More importantly, to leave his mark on the retranslated text, the translator simplified his version compared to Griffiths' encyclopedic translation (*ibid*) by combining both imitation of the foreign text and paraphrasing it into "more naturally-sound English prose" (*ibid*: 186).

Although Song's explanation for the retranslation of *The Art of War in English* falls into line with Pym's notion of active retranslation and Venuti's argument about the difference each translation seeks to make in order to compete with the existing translation(s), his apparently sociological perspective proves to be more relevant because of the clearly defined, and detailed picture it creates to account for this phenomenon. Perhaps here it is necessary to include further textual analysis of the translated and retranslated texts and the methods of translation adopted in order to see how they relate to the sociology of translation, i.e. how they reflect the agents' struggle to achieve different sorts of capitals.

4.3.3.4 Summary of Chapter Four

Thus, retranslation can be studied from different perspectives. More recent research has focused on the complex nature of retranslation as a linguistic and cultural practice that reaches far beyond reproduction of the original text in the target language in order to 'restore' or 'update' previous translations, although the latter explanations cannot be ruled out a priori. Explaining retranslation and the features related to them by reference only to the quality of first translations reduces the process of retranslating into a mere textual relationship between texts, and ignores the socio-cultural and political context and the role of translators in motivating and shaping retranslations. Thus, Pym and Venuti emphasize the role of the individual translator as well as the divisions and conflicts in the translating language and culture in motivating and shaping retranslations. Venuti argues that reducing retranslation to a mere linguistic improvement of first translation(s) not only results in ignoring the socio-cultural and political context of retranslation, but also the fact that first translations and retranslations are shaped by particular interpretations

in the translating language (beliefs, interests, values). He argues that retranslation can be generated by different factors such as the agency of translation, particularly the role of the translator, the socio-cultural setting of translation, the emergence of a new conceptual framework or different readings of the source text in the target language, the emergence of a new audience, and the laws of the publishing market. One or more of these factors can be used to motivate and shape retranslation.

The chapter also reviews three of the most important studies of the retranslation of non-literary texts in order to show that this phenomenon is not limited to literary texts, and that the field of translation studies can benefit from studying the retranslation of such texts. Susam-Sarajeva, for example, uses the notion of system as a dynamic socio-cultural place to account for the intensive retranslations of Barthes' theoretical works into Turkish and the rarity of the retranslation of the French feminist Helene Cixous into English. Flotow (2009), in a study of the retranslation of Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*, shows the importance of taking into account not only the poor quality of first translation but also other facts in the translating language such as the increasing awareness of the manipulating nature of translation as well as an increasing interest in the source text and its author in the translating language and culture. The third study that this chapter reviewed was conducted by Song (2012). Song studied the retranslation of *The Art of War* in light of Bourdieu's sociological framework, and points out that retranslation is like the translation of a cultural phenomenon that is best explained with reference to the concept of field as a social space: shaped by divisions and conflicts between social actors who seek to establish themselves in this field and who invest their cultural capital to challenge competitors and/or who make use of cultural productions to gain or increase their cultural capital and consequently material capital. Like Venuti, Song takes into consideration that retranslation is better understood in terms of the competition in the translating language and culture between agency of translation over the proper translation and interpretation of the source text. From this perspective, each retranslator strives to make his/her difference on the retranslated text in order to increase the acceptability of translations.

This study will refer to the Retranslation Hypothesis as a possible explanation for retranslation and the features related to them. This hypothesis will be divided into three sub-hypotheses: 1)

retranslations tend to be more literal than first translation(s); 2) retranslations tend to be closer to the source text than first translations; and 3) retranslations tend to be closer to the source culture than first translations. These hypotheses are, in some sense, based on the work of Berman, which was reviewed in this chapter, and will be a main focus of this study.

In order to contextualize retranslations into the socio-cultural context in which they were produced and received, the theories of Venuti, Flottow and Song, reviewed in this chapter, will be used in this study. These theories cover both causes and effects of retranslation. They place retranslation into the target language and culture and show how the socio-cultural and historical context can shape the production and reception of retranslations. Also, they provide a flexible and universal account of retranslation that takes into consideration multiple sources of explanation. This includes, among other things, the creative role of the individual translators, the emergence of a new audience in the target culture, the competition between the agency of translation over the proper interpretation and translation of the source text, and the role publishers play in investing in the success of the source text to achieve economic value. In addition to this, those theorists clearly and convincingly show that retranslation can play an important role in shaping the source text and its author in translation in a significant way. Retranslation can emphasize particular representations about the source text and about its author or challenge them, and this seems to be a promising field of research, especially when the translated text and its author occupy a prestigious status in both source and target culture.

CHAPTER FIVE: AL-MUNQIDH MIN AL-DALAL

This chapter aims to introduce the reader to *al-Munqidh mina al-Dalāl*, its content, structure, and its role in Arabic and Western literature. The text is often presented as a transparent autobiography about the intellectual development and spiritual conversion of its author. However, a recent study of the text in the West has opened the doors to a new debate as researchers challenge these previously accepted ideas.

Section one of this chapter is a general account outlining the historical setting of the book. Section two outlines and discusses the purpose, content, and structure of *Munqidh* as it is often presented in literature. Section three aims to present a new study of *Munqidh* and, consequently, a fresh view of al-Ghazālī's life and work, section four gives a general account of the main stylistic features of the text and section five is a summary of the chapter.

5.1 An Overview

Munqidh is a discourse that was written by Abu Ḥamid al-Ghazālī in the 11th century. The text is often referred to as a description of the intellectual and spiritual development of al Ghazālī and a critical review of different contemporary schools of thought. The fact that it is presented as being an autobiography of one of the most important and influential Muslim theologians and philosophers of its classical medieval time adds to its high status. Al Ghazālī's life, philosophies, experience and work have attracted much attention in the Muslim World as well as in the West, during the past as well as in the present. The text is also important because it reflects the intellectual and religious life of East Islam in the 11th century in which al-Ghazālī lived. Moreover, the text is regarded as a rare intellectual and spiritual autobiography dating back to pre-modern literature.

Although in *Munqidh* al-Ghazālī presents himself and his life as an intellectual and spiritual quest for truth and peace of the soul in the form of an autobiography, this dominant

interpretation of the structure and purpose of the text has been significantly challenged during the past two decades. The following sections will elaborate these notions¹.

5.2 The Times of al-Ghazālī

In order to understand the content and structure of *Munqidh* and how it relates to al-Ghazālī's life and work, it is necessary to outline the social, political, cultural, and historical context in which the author of the text lived and the time and place in which this text was published and received.

In the 11th century, present day Iraq and Iran were part of the Seljuk state which dominated Eastern Islam from the western borders of Afghanistan to Syria. The Seljuks, who established their power in Baghdad, were a Turkish Sunni Muslim dynasty supported by the Turkish army. Although the rulers of the state were largely Turks, the administration was mainly run by Persians, the most renowned and influential of whom was the minister Niẓām al-Mulk (1018-1092) during this period. Al-Mulk was the de facto ruler of the empire who established two celebrated colleges in Baghdad and Nīsābūr which were called *Madrasah Niẓāmiyyah* in his honor (Nicholson, 1998: 276).

Baghdad was the centre of the Seljuk state. It was still the centre of the Caliphate and occupied a prestigious position during this period, although not to the same degree as it did during the 9th or 10th centuries. It was still a cosmopolitan city which attracted noted scholars from different backgrounds who held sessions in its mosques and colleges for innumerable "seekers of legal, philological, and spiritual knowledge". (Hassan 2004: 98).

To the west of the Seljuk states, there was the Faṭimid Caliphate with its centre in Cairo. The Faṭimids were Shiite Muslims, and opponents of the Sunni Seljuks. Faṭimids supported a secret Shiite movement in Iraq and Syria known as the Ismā'īlī sect. Beginning as a secret movement in south Iraq and Khuzistān in south west Iran, and then spreading to southern Syria, this sect supported the imamate of Ismā' īl, the eldest son of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, a decedent of Ali bin Abī Ṭālib, the fourth caliph and the cousin of the Prophet. Like the imam for the mainstream Shiite, the imam for the Ismā'īlī sect is, divinely chosen, infallible, and guided by God to lead the

¹ In this chapter, the quoted texts from *Munqidh* come from the third edition of the text, edited by Ṣalībāh and 'Ayyād (1967).

Islamic community. This movement posed a real threat to the authority of the Sunni caliph in Iraq and Khurāsān (see Hourani, 1991: 40-41). It is an accepted fact that Sunni Muslims recognize Ali's caliphate but do not endow him or any of his descendants with privileged status in religious or political affairs, and thus it is no wonder that the Seljuk state and its supporting Sunni scholars showed little tolerance toward the Shiites in general, and the Ismā'īlī sect in particular.

Although politically divided into two large sects, the Muslim community was already united by "a common religious culture expressed in Arabic language, and by human links which trade, migration and pilgrimage had forged" (*ibid*: 83).

In East Islam, although cultural and intellectual life was influenced by the division between Sunni and Shiite Muslims, it has also been shaped by other developments during past centuries. By the beginning of the 11th century, theology and jurisprudence as well as Arabic were part of the core knowledge in official Sunni schools. School systems were well established so that "the great discussions through which Sunni creed has been defined had largely come to an end" (*ibid*: 166). In fact it is a common belief that Ash'arī theology became the orthodox theology of the Sunni community from the 11th century.

The Greek tradition, namely philosophy and natural sciences, was assimilated into Arabic and became part of the intellectual development in the main centres of the region. However, more than any other Greek science, philosophy was the most problematic and challenging study for traditional Muslims. The methods and conclusions of Greek philosophers seemed out of sync with orthodox interpretations of Islam that had been developed by theologians and jurists (*ibid*: 77). Therefore, some Muslim theologians including the highly regarded al-Ghazālī himself, reacted against philosophy in order to protect and uphold Islamic orthodox teachings.

Initially in Syria and Iraq and then in other parts of the Muslim world, Sufism (Islamic mysticism) was also established as a way of thinking and worship prior to the 11th century. Sufi teachings and practices were "systematized and expounded" in several works at this time (Nicholson, *ibid*: 338). The earlier Sufis, inspired by the Qur'an but also by mystical traditions in Syria and Iraq, developed a philosophy and way of life that was based upon the belief that the

abandonment of materialism and the purification of the heart release it from worldly concerns and prepare it for attaining "a higher intuitive knowledge of God" (*ibid*: 72). Because of this belief, Sufis accepted that the true believer's path reaches far beyond the outward obedience of religious laws. Some Sufis went even further and adopted the notion of self-annihilation in the journey towards God, something that was severely refuted by orthodox Muslim scholars.

The life and work of al-Ghazālī as well as his text, *Munqidh*, are shaped by the socio-cultural and political settings outlined in this section, by the status of religious sciences, Sufism and philosophy, as well as by the division between Sunni Muslims and Shiite Muslims, including the Ismā'īlī sect.

5.3 Al-Ghazālī: Life and Work

The information given about al-Ghazālī's life is mainly based on a biography written by his contemporary 'Abd al-Ghāfir al-Fārisī (d. 1135) as recorded in classical biographical texts. To this, modern scholars have added *Munqidh* as another source of information about al-Ghazālī's life.

Al-Ghazālī was born in Ṭūs in Khurāsān (in the north of modern day Iran) in 1058. But Garden (2011) has recently shown that al-Ghazālī was possibly born in 1057, 1056 or even 1055 (589). Like all Muslim children of his time, he was sent to a local school in Ṭūs to learn basic Arabic and memorize the Qur'an. Al-Ghazālī's pious father died when al-Ghazālī and his brother were still very young. On his death bed, although poor, his father provided some financial means and asked a Sufi friend to care for his children. This his poor Sufi friend from Ṭūs did, until all the money had gone. Then al-Ghazālī and his brother were placed in a local school which provided both board and a stipend, but little more is known about al-Ghazālī's life at this time.

In 1078, al-Ghazālī travelled to Nīsābūr (in Iran) to study theology and jurisprudence with the Ash'arī theologian and jurisprudent Imam al-Jawaynī (1028-1085 CE), where he stayed until al-Jawaynī died. Al-Ghazālī then travelled to a place near Nīsābūr to meet the charismatic minister Nizām al-Mulk. Here, al-Ghazālī "enjoyed the society of the principal doctors, and disputed with his opponents and rebutted them in spite of their eminence" (Nicholson, *ibid*: 340). In 1091, al-

Ghazālī was appointed as a professor by al-Mulk at *Madrasah Nizāmiyyah* in Baghdad where he taught jurisprudence for four years, “lecturing on Islamic jurisprudence and refuting heresies and responding to questions from all segments of the community” (Kamaruddin, 2004: 113). The appointment effectively “thrust al-Ghazālī into the spotlight as a rising star within the Sunni learned community” (Kukkonen, 2011: 387-8). This point is further highlighted by Hourani who points out that teachers in the great schools, judges in the main courts, and preachers in the principal mosques were all part of the urban elite in the major cities of Islam (Hourani, *ibid*: 115).

During this period of his life, in addition to teaching students from all over the Muslim World at this prominent college, al-Ghazālī wrote and published two major philosophical works: *Maqāṣid al-falāsifah* (The Intentions of Philosophers) and *Tahāfut al-falāsifah* (The Incoherence of Philosophers). The first book is taken to be a summary of Greek philosophy as exemplified in the work of al-Farābī (c. 872-950) and Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna) (c. 980-1037), whereas the latter is regarded as a criticism of Greek and Islamic philosophy. In addition to these two important books, upon the request of the reigning Abbasid Caliph al-Mustazhir, he also published a book against the Ismā‘īlī sect which he called *Faḍā’ih al-Bāṭiniyyah* (Scandals of Esoterics) (c. 1094-1118). The book was commissioned to legitimize al-Mustazhir’s reign and show the errors of the Ismā‘īlī sect, which constituted a threat to the Abbasid Sunni caliphate (Kamaruddin, *ibid*: 115).

In 1095, as he was pursuing his career as a teacher in *Madrasah Nizāmiyyah*, al-Ghazālī went through a deep spiritual crisis for six months which, according to *Munqidh*, left him unable to lecture (103-4). A few months later, he left Baghdad on the pretext of making a pilgrimage, but in reality he abandoned his career, home, family, position, and prestige in Baghdad and went into seclusion.

According to *Munqidh*, al-Ghazālī began a new life of self-discipline and meditation when he left Baghdad (*Munqidh*: 105). In Syria, particularly in Damascus, he lived for a time in solitude in its principal mosque, before continuing on to Mecca and Medina via Jerusalem. During his stay in Damascus and Jerusalem, al-Ghazālī started to write his master piece *’Ihya’ ’Ulūm al-Dīn* (Revival of religious sciences) or *’Ihyā’* for short. This most celebrated book has had a lasting

influence on Sunni Muslims for centuries. In *Munqidh* as well as in much of the literature about al-Ghazālī, it is presented as an encyclopaedia in which he gathers, reorganizes, and reinterprets all Islamic teachings and ethics in light of his conversion to Sufism (Garden, 2005: 6).

Two years later, in 1105, al-Ghazālī returned to his native town of Ṭūs devoting his time to worship, teaching and writing in a small mosque or lodge near his home. In 1106, he returned to teaching at the state-sponsored *madrasah Niẓāmiyyiah* in Nīsābūr where he himself had been a student. In *Munqidh*, he justifies this return to teaching by citing pressure from the Seljuk authorities, as well as his mission as a religious reformer in the face of a corrupt society (*Munqidh*: 121). During this period he wrote several books, including his highly regarded autobiography, *Munqidh*, which can be situated as written between the years c. 1106-1109 (Garden, 2005: 6). Al-Ghazālī only spent two years at his new post in Nīsābūr, and then returned to his hometown of Ṭūs where he died in c. 1111.

After his death, al-Ghazālī's work, as some have remarked, "quickly gained currency in the Islamic world, which they have since enjoyed uninterruptedly" (Kukkonen, *ibid*: 383). Although there are more than 400 books attributed to al-Ghazālī, it seems that many of these were later ascribed to him by various people and groups who wanted to use his authoritative name to support their points of view. However, there is evidence that at least 68 works were actually written by al-Ghazālī himself. Except for *The Alchemy of Happiness* and his *Persian Letters*, these works were all written in Arabic. However, as it seems to be a personal account of its author, *Munqidh* is a unique work among al-Ghazālī's books.

5.4 *Munqidh*

This section introduces *Munqidh*, i.e., the catalyst for writing it, the target audience, the major themes raised and discussed throughout the text, its reception in the Arabic and the Western world, and why the text has recently been subjected to critical assessment. Although the text has an autobiographical nature that should not be underestimated, it is also presented as an important philosophical and religious treatise that is plainly rooted in classical Arabic and Islamic thought. The following sections highlight the themes of the text and how they relate to al-Ghazālī's life and work as he presents them in the text. The text portrays al-Ghazālī as a dedicated scholar on a

quest for truth who, unsatisfied with traditional religious thought and philosophy, comes to believe that truth lies in Sufism. The discussion in the following section is divided according to the main themes of each chapter, including the introduction.

5.4.1 The title

The original Arabic title of *Munqidh* has two readings: *المنقذ من الضلال والموصل إلى ذي العزة والجلال* (literally: what saves from straying and the connector to the possessor of power and glory). This is the title of the critical or semi critical edition of the Arabic text that was first published by Ṣalībāh and ‘Ayyād in 1937. The word *الضلال* (*al-ḍalāl*) has strong religious connotations in Arabic. The word is used in the Qur’an, for example, to refer to disbelief (in God, Islam) or “swerving from the path of guidance” (see details in Izutsu, 2002: 134-8). But the word *المنقذ* (literally, deliverer or what delivers) is problematic. The dominant interpretation takes this word to mean or to refer to “faith”, whereas others see it as a reference to al-Ghazālī himself (see section (5.5) of this chapter).

The second reading of the original title of *Munqidh* is *المنقذ من الضلال والمفصح عن الأحوال* (literally: what saves from straying and what states the circumstances). This is the title of the edition which was originally published in Istanbul and which is known as Shahīd ‘Alī Pāshah edition, dating from 509.-510 A.H. (1115-1116 A.D.), five years after the author’s death.

However, in Arabic the title of al-Ghazālī’s autobiography is often used in its shorter version as *المنقذ من الضلال* (deliverer from astray or error) or even *المنقذ* (the deliverer).

The text consists of an introduction (chapter one) in which the author spells out the purpose of writing the text, and eight subsequent chapters. Chapter two describes the scepticism he experienced at an early age and his recovery from it. Chapters three to seven review his quest for truth amongst four groups of people: theologians, philosophers, Ta’līmīyyah (the Ismā’īlī sect) and Sufis. Chapter eight defends prophecy, and chapter nine explains why he returned to teaching in Nīsābūr. Comments are made about each of these chapters and how they fit into the general account of *Munqidh*.

5.4.2 Chapter One: the Introduction

The introduction of *Munqidh* is similar to the introductions of the majority of texts at al-Ghazālī's time in that it starts with praising of Allah, and a supplication to Allah for blessings on the Prophet Muhammad, often extending to include his companions, family and Muslim followers.

In his introduction to *Munqidh*, al-Ghazālī does not clearly state the reason behind writing the text. However, he seems to suggest that it was written upon the request of an anonymous person, who is referred to as his 'brother in religion'. Among other things, this 'brother' asked al-Ghazālī to explain the aims and mysteries of the sciences, how he succeeded in extracting 'truth' from a number of sects, why he left Baghdad and why he abandoned blind faith and sought for independent reasoning. (*Munqidh*: 60).

Al-Ghazālī then points out that the differences, divisions, and conflicts between the different sects and schools of thought is like a 'deep sea' that few people have safely navigated. He explains that despite this fact, he fearlessly searched for truth as this was something that God had implanted inside of him from childhood and it had developed with him into maturity. Then he recounts how the traditional beliefs imposed upon him by his parents and teachers loosened their grip on him as he vehemently started to search for the nature of true faith amid the great divisions between different groups and sects. He states that he initially started by examining the nature of certain knowledge and how to obtain it.

5.4.3 Scepticism

In this chapter which he titled 'Scepticism and the Denial of Knowledge', al-Ghazālī points out that he started to reflect on what certain knowledge is. He says that such knowledge is certain because it is beyond the reach of doubt. Then he describes how he began to reflect upon knowledge that is based on senses and how this led him to the conclusion that senses cannot be trusted. This is because the senses can lead a person to believe things that later, upon logical reasoning and reflection, reveal themselves as false and misleading. Could reason then be the source of certain knowledge? Even reason, he argues, can also be doubted by a higher source of

knowledge (*ibid*: 66). For two months he struggled with confusion and despair until God finally delivered al-Ghazālī from these doubts (*Munqidh*: 67-68).

The scepticism referred to in this period of time should not be seen as a radical scepticism about all kinds of knowledge. It was not, and it could not have been, scepticism about the truth of the main religious beliefs such as the existence of God or the truth of the revelation, for, as al-Ghazālī explains in *Munqidh*, these things were firmly rooted in his mind (*Munqidh*: 120). What this scepticism amounts to is a criticism of knowledge that is based on senses and reason. In other words, it is scepticism about the reliability of these two sources of knowledge. This scepticism took place in al-Ghazālī's earlier life, possibly when he was still a student in Nīsābūr, before his appointment as a teacher at *Nizamiyyah* College in Baghdad. This scepticism is thus referred to as his earlier or epistemological scepticism (Davis, 2012: 100-101).

5.4.4 Chapter Two: Seekers for Truth

Delivered from the epistemological crisis that he went through, in *Munqidh* al-Ghazālī expounds on his search for certainty among what he calls "the seekers for truth", i.e. absolute and certain truth. These four groups are theologians, philosophers, Ta'limiyyah (Ismā'īlī sect), and Sufis. According to al-Ghazālī, truth or certain knowledge should then be found in one of these four groups. He then reviews each group in a separate chapter, starting with theologians, and then moving to philosophers, the Ismā'īlī sect, and finally Sufis.

5.4.5 Chapter Three: Theologians

In this chapter, al-Ghazālī describes how he started to study the work and methods of theologians to see whether they offered what he was looking for, that is, undisputable truth. Al-Ghazālī explains the aim of theology, its merits, and its limitations. He praises theologians' work as it serves to protect Islam from heretics. Then he points out that the method used by theologians is fit for the purpose it was designed to fulfil: that is, to defend faith from doubt. Those involved in this science aim "to reveal the contradictions of their opponents and to blame them for the conclusions of their premises, which is not much good to anyone who does not concede to these necessary premises" (*Munqidh*: 73).

5.4.6 Chapter Four: *Philosophers*

After close investigation of the theologians, al-Ghazālī moves to philosophers. His discussion in this chapter is more sophisticated and extensive than that of all other chapters. He explains that he studied philosophy for three years before arriving at a final assessment of this science. He states that a large proportion of philosophical sciences such as logic, mathematics, natural sciences, ethics, and politics at best support the basic truths of Islam, and at least do not disprove them. Despite this, because many philosophers still adhere to beliefs that are contrary to basic truths of Islam such as the eternity of the world, he deems their methods to be unsatisfactory in the quest for attaining certain truths..

Al-Ghazālī concludes that after studying philosophy, he realized that it did not fully satisfy his aim, as intellect, which is the main basis of philosophy, neither comprehends all it attempts to know nor solves all of its problems. In other words, philosophy does not provide certain knowledge.

5.4.7 Chapter Five: the *Ismā'īlīs*

From the examination of philosophers, al-Ghazālī moves to discuss the views of the *Ta'līmīyyah* (*Ismā'īlī* sect). This group believes that truth is only available to the infallible Imam. The main concept is that if a philosopher's reliance on reason leads to irrational beliefs and insolvable disputes, a solution could be found in an appeal to the infallible Imam, that is, the divinely chosen person who knows the intended 'interior' meaning of the Qur'an. Al-Ghazālī points out that there is no need for teaching from the infallible Imam because Muslims can rely on the teachings of the Prophet himself whom he considers to be the infallible teacher par excellence.

5.4.8 Chapter Six: The Sufis

Finding the method of theologians, philosophers, and *Ta'līmīyyah* unsatisfying, al-Ghazālī moves to an examination of the doctrine or way of the Sufi. He initially began by studying the work of great Sufis of the time. But he found that his life in Baghdad, his position in *Nizāmiyyah*, his fame, and his relationships and worldly goods were inconsistent with the life of a true Sufi whose aim is to purify the heart from anything but God in order to attain certain knowledge and

salvation. Al-Ghazālī carefully considered his life and work, and found himself trapped by a variety of attachments. He recognized that the ‘sciences’ he was teaching were not relevant to the Afterlife (salvation) or an eternal perspective and that his intentions for teachings were motivated by fame and fortune. After deep investigation and some scepticism, al-Ghazālī recognized that his way of life, his teaching, and his motives were not conducive to happiness in the life to come and even exposed him to the danger of hell-fire (*Munqidh*: 103).

After a deep internal struggle that lasted for nearly six months, al-Ghazālī became so ill that he could not speak, let alone teach, so he decided to leave everything behind him and travel to a new place. In *Munqidh* he recalls leaving Baghdad to travel to Damascus and from there to Jerusalem, where he applied himself to worship, meditation, and self-discipline.

5.4.9 Chapter Seven: Prophecy

This chapter examines and defends prophecy as a source of truth. As Greenland puts it: “He [al-Ghazālī] had come to the conviction that reason is not self-sufficient in either theology or philosophy, but it is in a sense subordinate to a ‘light from God’ shed in the heart which is somehow connected with the light given to men by prophetic revelations” (2000: 16). Prophecy is ranked higher than reason and at the same level as mystical or Sufi intuition, because both spring from the light that God casts in the hearts of those who seek Him. Hence his defence of prophecy after clarifying what motivated him to adopt Sufism.

5.4.10 Chapter Nine: Return to Teaching

This is the final chapter of *Munqidh*. It aims to illustrate why al-Ghazālī, ten years after resigning his post at Baghdad to set out on a quest for truth and embrace a life of solitude, decided to return to teaching in *madrakah nizāmiyyah* in Nīsābūr where he had once been a student. As outlined previously in this chapter, al-Ghazālī justifies his return by, firstly, referring to the corruption of society and the need for a religious reformer or revivalist who could combat corruption by presenting a fresh understanding of religion such as that that he outlined in ‘*Ihyā’*’, and, secondly, by the pressure from the Seljuk authorities to take the post in Nīsābūr (*Munqidh*: 121).

5.5 A new Reading of al- Ghazālī's Life and *Munqidh*

As presented in *Munqidh*, the life of al-Ghazālī is an 'interior drama' of a sincere truth seeker who experienced true conversion to Sufism after vehemently and faithfully investigating the major contemporary schools of thought, finally achieving his goal through Sufism. This idealized presentation or image of al-Ghazālī's *Munqidh* is described by Garden (2011) in this way:

In the *Munqidh* he presents a largely decontextualized and disembodied life. The drama of the *Munqidh* is almost exclusively mental and spiritual. Ghazālī weighs different intellectual positions, comes to doubt them, lapses into radical scepticism, recovers, investigates various schools of thought, separates their wheat from their chaff, settles on one of them (namely Sufism), practices it for some ten years in seclusion, and concludes that the unique fruits of this trajectory have made him indispensable to his troubled age. (587-8)

Within this picture, *Munqidh* is often understood as the expression of this conversion or turning point in al-Ghazālī's life and career. The fact that the book was written after his alleged conversion to Sufism, the seclusion he went through in the Levant and in his birthplace, and the fact that the book was written a few years before the death of its author consolidates this interpretation and idealized image. But since the first half of the 20th century, and even earlier, the accuracy and sincerity of *Munqidh* has been questioned. Firstly, it was revealed that the structure or plot the author of this text used is literarily crafted through the use of other styles attributed to different authors including Galen (129-200 A. D.), al-Muḥāsibī (d. 857), 'Umar Khayyām (d. 1131) and Nāṣir Khisraw (d. 1088) (see Garden, 2011: 581). For example, the trope of the four seekers of truth was borrowed originally from 'Umar Khayyām (*ibid*: 593). His narrative that he sought for certain knowledge of Truth, religious truth, through examining the work of theologians, philosophers, the Ismī'īlī group and the Sufis respectively while he was in Baghdad and found only the latter group satisfying was crafted to serve personal and ideological purposes. For example, Garden (2005, 2011) argues that the key to understanding the increasing scepticism toward the idealized image of al-Ghazālī, as portrayed in *Munqidh*, is better seen in the so called 'Nīsābūr controversy'. This was a campaign launched against al-Ghazālī when he returned to teaching in Nīsābūr in 1106. His opponents in Nīsābūr accused him of different

things but the most serious of which was that he held views that were not in accord with the literal prescription of Islam. Al-Ghazālī responded to these accusations by publishing *Munqidh*, criticizing, on one hand, theologians, philosophers and the Ismā‘īlī, and defending a synthesis of Sufism and orthodoxy, on the other hand. Josef van Ess was one of the early scholars who points out that al-Ghazālī “wrote his famous autobiography not in a flight of introspection in his autumn years, but in response to a campaign against him that erupted after his return to teaching in Nīsābūr in 499/1106” (in Garden, 2011: 582). Along similar lines, Garden (2014b: 65) posits: “The *Deliverer from Error*, far from a transparent account of al-Ghazālī’s life and intellectual development, was an effort to deny the very real connection of his thought to philosophical tradition in the face of enemies who accused him of exactly this”. Thus, the image of al-Ghazālī as a fierce critic of philosophy and the Ismā‘īlī thought, and his image as “a solitary seeker whose spiritual motives were unsullied by worldly aims or even worldly connections” (Garden, *ibid*: 64), and his image as “a selfless and otherworldly figure who had interrupted a life of seclusion only to guide his fellow men to the salvation that he, uniquely, had discovered” (Garden, 2011: 595) seem to be crafted and used to respond to these accusations.

Even al-Ghazālī’s claim that he agreed to return to teaching at Nīsābūr to combat the corruption of society is better seen from this perspective. Garden argues that al-Ghazālī presents himself in *Munqidh*, as a revivalist of religion insofar as his appointment to teach at the *Nizāmiyyah* of Nīsābūr “would allow him to promote the agenda of his *Revival of the Religious Sciences*” (2011: 587), that is to say, “to revive a religious scholarly tradition he portrays as dead” (*ibid*: 583).

This different reading of *Munqidh* is supported by a biographical passage in a letter which al-Ghazālī wrote in Persian in the same context in which he wrote *Munqidh*. The brief passage gives differing details about al-Ghazālī that are not found in *Munqidh*. In this passage, details of Ghazālī’s life begin to emerge. There is no reference in this new account to a period of spiritual crisis in Baghdad before finding the resolve in Sufism:

Know that 53 years of the life of this supplicant have passed. For forty of these, he plunged into the sea of the religious sciences, until he reached the point that his words remained closed to the understanding of the majority of his contemporaries.

He lived for twenty years in the days of the martyred sultan (Mālik Shāh), whose favor was bestowed upon him in Baghdad and Isfahan. He was often a messenger in important matters between the Sultan and the Commander of the Believers and wrote some seventy books about religious sciences. Then he saw the world as it was and rejected it utterly. He spent some time in Jerusalem and Mecca, and swore at the grave of Abraham, the Friend of God — may God’s prayers be upon him — no longer to go to any sultan, not to take the money of a sultan, and not to practice theological disputing or fanaticism [...]. He was true to this oath for twelve years and the Commander of the Believers and all sultans knew him to be excused. (translated and cited by Garden, *ibid*: 590)

5.6 *Munqidh* and Modern Literature

Little is known about the reception of *Munqidh* in pre-modern Arabic literature. In modern times, since the 19th century, Arab scholars seem to concur with Western scholars in considering this a unique text in the history of philosophy as both the autobiography of a great thinker and an important philosophical or semi philosophical text. This interpretation of the text is best reflected in the introduction written by Ṣalībāh and ‘Ayyād to the third edition of *Munqidh* in Arabic in 1967.

Munqidh was introduced to the West in the 17th century (Griffel, 2009: 19) but was only rediscovered, published, translated, and studied in the 19th century. It was first published and translated into French in 1842 by Schmölders who wrote one of the earliest scholarly articles on the text and its author. The text was published in the same century in Istanbul, Cairo, and Bombay, following a modern renaissance in the major centres of the Muslim world. The first critical edition of the text only appeared in Damascus in 1934, written by two Arab philosophy specialists: Jamīl Ṣalībāh and Kāmīl ‘Ayyād who, with a long scholarly introduction, highlight the importance of the text historically and philosophically. Later, new critical editions of *Munqidh* appeared in different places some of which were undertaken by Western translators as will be seen in chapter seven of this study. The differences in the critical editions of *Munqidh* are largely linguistic and minor.

Al-Ghazālī was introduced to the West from medieval times through the translation of some of his works, namely *Intentions of Philosophers* and *The Incoherence of Philosophers*, into Latin and Hebrew, and has attracted the attention of Western scholars in modern times, particularly since the 19th century. Griffel argues that in modern times Western scholars have been fascinated by al-Ghazālī's life more than by his teachings. His rapid rise as a scholar, spiritual crises, and sudden decision to become a Sufi all made him the subject of endless interest and research (2009:19). There is no book that can be considered a representation of his life other than *Munqidh*, often taken to be the autobiography that he wrote in later life.

5.7 Some Stylistic and Formal Features of *Munqidh*

This section sheds light on some of the formal features of *Munqidh*. The discussion revolves around the autobiographical nature of the text, the use of specialized terminologies in the text, the rhymed prose, semantic repetition, and metaphors.

5.7.1 The Autobiographical Nature of *Munqidh*

The autobiographical nature of *Munqidh* is probably one of, if not the major feature of the text. The book belongs to a particular type of autobiographical text which has religious and/or philosophical orientation and purpose. It belongs to a tradition of autobiographical writings in classical Arabic that extends from the 9th century up to the early decades of the 20th century (see on this, Reynolds *et al*, 2001, especially pp. 26-27; see also Lunde, 2015, especially pp. 434-35). Philosophers, religious scholars, and Sufis wrote autobiographical texts that have recently attracted the attention of both Western and Muslim scholars. *Munqidh* is without doubt one of the best known and most fascinating religio-philosophical autobiographical texts in classical Arabic. It is widely regarded, as outlined previously, as a personal account in which the author describes his search for truth among different doctrines as well as his conversion or adoption of Sufism. The theme of conversion is central to *Munqidh*, and follows the tradition of autobiographical writing in classical Arabic that is based on this very notion (*ibid*: 194; see also Lunde, *ibid*: 440). Reynolds points out that the conversion narrative of *Munqidh* revolves around a conversion within Islam itself, that is, a conversion from a legalist understanding of Islam to a mystical understanding of Islam (*ibid*).

However, and as outlined previously in section (5.4) of this chapter, some researchers have recently argued that the text should be seen as an apologetic autobiography which was written to respond to the attack on al-Ghazālī when he returned to teaching in Nīsābūr rather than as a transparent introspective autobiography that was written in the autumn of the author’s life to describe al-Ghazālī’s life before and after conversion to Sufism. Whatever the purposes behind writing the text, its autobiographical nature cannot be ignored or downplayed. The fact that the text does not give many details about the age of al-Ghazālī, his family and friends, his ties to his home city of Ṭūs, his career, his relationships with political figures, among other things, should not lead to its dismissal as a genuine autobiography because the Eurocentric or Western concept of individuality imposes criteria that are not necessarily the same as those found in pre-modern and non-western autobiographical writings (Ramy, 2014: 16-7).

5.7.2 The Technical Nature of the Text

Munqidh is not only an autobiography, but also a religious and philosophical treatise that is based on technical or specialized knowledge. Its technical nature is clear from the specialized terminologies appropriated by its author to defend particular religious and philosophical arguments and attitudes. There are at least two hundred and thirty three technical terms in the whole text. These terms can be categorized as religious, that is, terms that are related to Islam itself or to religious sciences, such as باطنيا (esotericist), ظاهريا (literalist), الإمام المعصوم (infallible Imam), إجماع الأمة (consensus of the Muslim community), Sufi or mystical terms such as الخلوة والعزلة (spiritual seclusion), الكشف والمشاهدة (mystical intuition), and الفناء في الله (annihilation in God), and philosophical terms such as الكليات والجزئيات (universals and particulars), الحد والقياس (definition and syllogism), and العلم اليقيني (certain knowledge). A considerable number of religious terms are culturally specific as they are known only to Muslims and are therefore wholly or partially unknown in other cultures.

5.7.3 Semantic Repetition

Munqidh is full of semantic repetition. Arabic uses two kinds of semantic repetition, that is, repeating two words or phrases that have the same or nearly the same meaning (Dickins *et al*, 2002: 59). In *Munqidh*, al-Ghazālī uses both kinds of semantic repetition. For example he says:

العزلة (literally, solitary). Each pair of these examples contains two words that are used together in *Munqidh*, expressing the same meaning in Arabic. Nearly synonymous words and phrases are also common in the text. Some examples of this are: الأديان والملل (religions and sects), أهل المنطق والبرهان (people of logic and demonstration). In these and similar cases it is possible to find a difference in meaning of the two words or phrases, despite the fact that they appear to have nearly the same meaning in the text. For example, الأديان والملل can both mean 'religions' but الملل can also mean 'religious communities' (sects) in Arabic.

5.7.4 Rhymed Prose

A text that is comprised of short sentences which end with the same sound or morpheme is one of the most observable features of *Munqidh*. The rhymed prose created by this style of writing goes hand in hand with parallelism (phrases that have the same or nearly the same structure or grammar). This style of writing was dominant during the Abbasid period, especially in book titles and introductions, and *Munqidh* is no exception. The following text is just one example of this stylistic feature in the text:

أقتحم لجة هذا البحر العميق، وأخوض غمرته خوض الجسور، لا خوض الجبان الحذور، وأتوغل في كل مظلمة، وأتهجم على كل مشكلة، وأتقحم كل ورطة (المنقذ: 62).

5.7.5 Metaphor

Munqidh is full of metaphors. Al-Ghazālī uses metaphors to highlight the themes and structure of *Munqidh*. Some of these metaphors highlight the structure and narrative of his intellectual and spiritual development. For example, his effort to arrive at certain knowledge and truth is conceptualized through the metaphor of climbing a mountain, and diving into a deep ocean (*Munqidh*: 60-2). These metaphors are not formal or secondary, but rather important conceptual blocks that constitute the deep structure or plot of the text. The metaphor of the diver who fearlessly dives into the depths and dangers of the open sea until he safely reaches the distant shore, the metaphor of a person who climbs a mountain until he reaches the summit, and the metaphor of a person who walks the path of the Sufis until he reaches the highest stages, all revolve around and build upon the metaphor of the journey of life (intellectual and spiritual

journey). This means that these metaphors constitute essential feature of the text because they jointly reflect its deep conceptual structure.

5.8 Summary of chapter five

This chapter sets out the purpose behind writing *Munqidh*, its contents, structure, and formal features. The importance of the text mainly stems from its being an autobiography of one of the most influential and controversial figures in the history of Islam and medieval ideologies in general, as well as its conceptual, religious and philosophical content. The text is generally seen as a transparent intellectual and spiritual autobiography of its author, but recently published research has shown that the text was intended to respond to accusations and justify the personal agendas of its author, that is, returning to teaching at a state-run school and the promotion of al-Ghazālī as a revivalist of religion. The most important formal features of the text are its autobiographical form, its technical terms, its rhymed prose, its use of semantic repetition and metaphor as a means of constructing the plot of the text, imagery about its author, and its main arguments.

CHAPTER SIX: MOTIVATIONS FOR THE TRANSLATION AND RETRANSLATION OF *MUNQIDH*

This chapter aims to set out conditions that occasioned the translation and retranslation of *Munqidh* into English through a description of the socio-cultural and political conditions influencing the initial selection of this text for translation into English and the conditions that have influenced the selection of the same text for retranslation into the same language by subsequent translators. This chapter introduces the five English translators of *Munqidh*: namely Field (1909), Watt (1953), McCarthy (1980), Abūlaylah (2001), and Holland (2011), situating the translations in their social, cultural, and political context. Each of these five translations will be discussed separately¹. In addition, the chapter tests the Retranslation Hypothesis with reference to literalism and the visibility of the translator in the paratextual materials.

6.1 An overview

According to Holes (2000), the translation of texts from Arabic into English can be divided into three phases. The first phase begins in 1650 and ends in 1800, the second begins in 1800 and ends in 1950, and the final phase begins in 1950 and continues to the present (139). Only the second and the third phases are relevant for the purposes of this study. According to Holes, the second phase is characterized by a serious academic interest in Arabic medieval literature of all kinds and the third is characterized by the same feature, but is also marked by a considerable interest in translating modern Arabic literature.

In the second phase, specialists in Arabic and Islamic studies edit and study Arabic texts, especially classical texts, and have continued to translate these texts into English up to the present day. This academic interest in Arabic medieval literature is facilitated by: 1) the evident expansion of Britain throughout the Arab and Muslim world including India, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, and Palestine in the 19th and 20th centuries, 2) the efforts of orientalists or Arabists who established and developed the academic study of Arabic and Islamic studies and literature ; and 3) an openness toward non-Western languages and literature, particularly Eastern literature, as

¹ References to these translations will be made using the short title of the source text, that is, *Munqidh*, followed by the name of the translator and then the quoted page number. Thus, if a text is quoted from page 13 of McCarthy's translation, the in-text reference will take the following form: (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 13).

established by the philosophers of European Enlightenment who argue that the West can learn much from the East (Versteegh, 1997: 5). It is within these developments that modern oriental studies, with its more objective and less Christian agenda, emerged and developed (Wokoeck, 2009: 4). Within this tradition, religion such as Islam is analysed using “historical-cultural categories that reflected the secularizing instincts of European Enlightenment scholarship” (Kerr, 2002: 8). It is also true that within this tradition the focus was on major works written by key authors from the ‘classical’ period of Islam” because Islamic Studies was modelled on classical studies (Robinson, 2002: 99).

In this period, collecting manuscripts, making them accessible to students of Arabic, and translating them into English became a priority (Ouyang, 2006: 325). Of course, this does not mean that all translated texts in this period were academically motivated or undertaken by scholars of Arabic and Islamic studies, but rather that translation from Arabic was deeply influenced by academic consideration, i.e. by those in the English-speaking world who worked within the discipline of oriental or Arabic and Islamic studies. Generally speaking, the target audience had an academic background (either as experts or students in Arabic studies). It is important to remember the most noted Arabists of this period such as Edward Palmer (1840-82), Charles James Lyall (1845-1920), Duncan Macdonald (1863-1943), David Samuel Margoliuth (1858-1940), Richard Bell (1876-1952), Reynolds Nicholson (1868-1945), Arthur Arberry (1905-1969), and Hamilton Gibb (1895-1971), among others, who dedicated a large part of their learning to the translation of mainly classical religious and philosophical texts from Arabic into English. Some of these were from a secular academic background, while others came from a religious background.

It is within this tradition of translation from classical Arabic into English that the translation of *Munqidh* can be situated. The translators of *Munqidh* mainly came to the translation of the text from an academic background, especially oriental or Islamic studies.

The first important academic interest in al-Ghazālī and his work, particularly that of *Munqidh*, that exerted influence on the translation of the text into this language, as well as on the way the text was presented, is without doubt Macdonald’s article *The Life of al-Ghazali, with especial reference to his religious experiences and opinions*, written in 1899. Macdonald’s work on al-

Ghazālī in general, and the aforementioned article in particular, was considered by some contemporary researchers as “the beginning at least of English language scholarship on al-Ghazālī” (Garden, 2014a: 62). Garden suggests that Macdonald, “helped to lay the foundation for what became the orthodox view of the meaning of al-Ghazālī in Western scholarship of the 20th century” (*ibid*). Macdonald, a professor of theology, points out that Muslims owe the final and the most important development in the history of Muslim theology to al-Ghazālī. He also argues that al-Ghazālī freed Islam from ‘scholasticism’ and gave the final form of Muslim theology as a “personal religion” by synthesizing mysticism and theology (the orthodox teachings of Islam) (see Macdonald, 1899: 72). *Munqidh* according to Macdonald is highly important because it recounts the history of a remarkable theologian and mystic who, through his unique experience, arrived at the true faith through spiritual conversion, or as Macdonald put it:

Al-Ghazzālī, by training as a theologian and lawyer, bridged the widening gap, took over mysticism with its intuitionism and spiritual life into the dry body of theology, and gave the Church of Islam a fresh term of life. It is this spiritually real and living side of his character and work that constitutes his abiding interest for us. Other theologians of Islam are important as links in an historical chain; he, in virtue of what he was in himself, of the conversion he went through and the experiences he had. (*ibid*: 72)

We are fortunate in that he has left us a book, almost unique to my knowledge in the literature of Islam, in which he tells us about his early doubts and struggles; how at one time all light had died out from his mind, how he gradually came back to some certainty, passed through a slow but real conversion, and reached a faith which nothing could shake. (*ibid*: 73-74).

In addition to Macdonald’s work on al-Ghazālī, one can add the work of the American philosopher William James, in his classical work *The Varieties of Religious Experience: a Study in Human Nature* (1902/2008). In this work, James refers to al-Ghazālī as a philosopher and theologian and as one of “the greatest doctors in the Moslem church” (294). *Munqidh*, from which James cites two pages and translates them from a French translation into English, is considered “one of the few autobiographies to be found outside Christian literature” (*ibid*).

James places *Munqidh* as a work within the stream line of spirituality, particularly among those works which are important for what they reveal about the spiritual conversion of the individual.

This academic interest in al-Ghazālī, *Munqidh*, and the representations associated with them in the work of these two authors are echoed, more or less, in the English translation of *Munqidh* as well as in the reception of the text into Western literature in general. This is the main cultural factor that has influenced the translation of this text into English as will be shown in more detail in this chapter.

6.2 Translation of *Munqidh* by Field (1909)

This section introduces the first translation of *Munqidh* into English by Claud Field. Firstly, it illustrates how and why the translator chose to translate *Munqidh*, the socio-cultural and historical conditions in which the text was produced and received, the general features of the text, and how the translator presented al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh*.

6.2.1 The Translator

Claud Field, the first translator of *Munqidh* into English, is not a well-known British orientalist, and little information is available about him, despite the fact that his work, whether originally written or translated, on oriental and Arabic culture and literature is extensive and rich. He was born in 1863 and died in 1941. His works, listed in the *British Catalogue*, give a general account of his life, work, and affinities with Islam and al-Ghazālī's thought and work. In addition to his translation of *Munqidh* in 1909 and his retranslation of al-Ghazālī's *The Alchemy of Happiness* (1910), he wrote *With the Afghans* (1908), *Tales of the Caliphs* (1909), *Persian Literature* (1912), *A Dictionary of Oriental Quotations* (Persian and Arabic) (1911), and numerous other books. His book *Mystics and Saints in Islam* (1910) contains translations on major Muslim Sufis written by German and French Orientalists.

As can be seen from the cover page of Field's book *With the Afghans*, the author worked for the "Church Mission Society", an evangelical mission that was established in Peshawar (present day Pakistan) in 1853. Although Field worked for this mission in Peshawar for nine years (Field, 1911: v) he does not give details of the exact dates. From the cover page of his book *Missionary*

Enterprise, it is shown that Field studied arts (perhaps Arabic and Persian) at the University of Cambridge. As was well documented, Cambridge, Oxford and London were the only British universities to teach Arabic and Arabic studies at that time. Therefore it can be assumed that he studied Arabic and other oriental languages at Cambridge in the 1880s, and that he was inspired by oriental literature during this time. However, like many of his contemporaries, Field preferred to work on these subjects outside of academic circles. In this regard, he is similar to the renowned orientalist and translator Richard Burton (1812-1890) who is associated with the English translation of *The Arabian Nights*.

The “oriental” languages Field knew, as can be seen from the books he wrote or translated, are Arabic, Persian and Hindustan. It is possible that he developed his knowledge of the latter two languages while he was in India (Pakistan), and that his interest in Islam and al-Ghazālī was deepened by his work and service in India, given the strong presence of Islam in this country. His translation of al-Ghazālī’s two books, *Munqidh* and *The Alchemy of Happiness*, in addition to an article he wrote on al-Ghazālī in 1910, point toward an early interest in al-Ghazālī’s life and his work, especially his religious and mystical works. In fact, Field himself referred in his introduction to his retranslation of al-Ghazālī’s *Alchemy of Happiness* that the latter’s religious and mystical thought or teachings became more important (for the West) in modern times because his image as a philosopher “has been greatly overshadowed by Avicenna, his predecessor, and Averroes, his successor and opponent” (1910: 3).

6.2.2 Motivations for Field’s Translation of *Munqidh*

Field’s translation of *Munqidh* seems to be mainly motivated by a personal appreciation of the text and its author. This is indirectly evident in the introduction he wrote for his translation of *Munqidh*. After explaining the prestigious status of al-Ghazālī within the main stream of Islamic ideology, Field points out that *Munqidh* is significant because it gives a personal account of this remarkable man. The text is also important because, from a literary point of view, it can be ranked alongside important English autobiographical works:

The following short treatise gives the history of the mind of this remarkable man in his pursuit of truth. It might not inaptly bear the title "Confessions of an Inquiring

Spirit." In its intellectual subtlety it bears a certain resemblance to Newman's Grammar of Assent, and in its almost Puritanical sense of the terrors of the world to come, it is akin to Bunyan's Grace Abounding. It is also interesting as being one of the very few specimens of genuine Eastern autobiography. (*Munqidh*, Field: 7-8).

This quotation not only shows the translator's personal appreciation of *Munqidh* and its author, but also a sympathetic reading of the text which Field compares to Western canonical autobiographical texts.

It is also possible that literary and cultural influences might have impacted Field's decision to translate *Munqidh*. Firstly, this includes an academic interest in Arabic and Islamic literature in the West in general and in Britain in particular in the 19th and 20th centuries, and, secondly, the strong Victorian interest in personal accounts or narratives, especially those that portray an individual's struggle to 'maturity' including religious and intellectual 'maturity,' usually presented in terms of conversion (Moran, 2006: 111). Personal accounts or autobiographies as a genre were not only well-established during this period in Britain, but also proved very popular (see Hackett, 1988: 57), and the translation of *Munqidh* can be placed within this cultural and literary trend.

6.2.3 General Features of Field's Translation

Field translates *Munqidh* into English under the title *The Confessions of Al-Gazzali*. The text appeared for the first time in a successful series called "Wisdom of The East" that was launched by the British publisher John Murray. The books that appeared in this series include numerous translations of Arabic classic works that were edited under the supervision of leading scholars and contemporary specialists. The series editors highlight the reason behind publishing these works and translations in English, mainly to promote understanding between East and West, between "the old world of thought" and "the new world of action". From this perspective, translation could promote 'understanding' between these two worlds. The editors of the series in which Field's translation was published further highlight this concept of translation as a means to promote understanding between different cultures by stating that these translations "shall be the ambassadors of good-will and understanding between East and West" (*ibid*). An interest in

‘Eastern’ thought (perhaps religious and moral thought) is evidenced in the editor’s remarks that: "a deeper knowledge of the great ideals and lofty philosophy of Oriental thought may help to a revival of that true spirit of Charity which neither despises nor fears the nations of another creed and colour" (*ibid*).

Field does not mention the original language from which he translated *Munqidh*, but he does mention that the book is translated into English for the first time on the cover of his translation. The reference to the language into which a single text is translated is redundant because “the language of translation” is “a given” as readers understand implicitly that “the language of translation will be the language of their own literature” (Brisset 2000: 346). The phrase ‘for the first time’ on the cover of Field’s translation could be regarded as a means used by the translator or publisher to promote the translation as an important and long awaited event in the target language.

The translator, writing a short introduction to his translation of *Munqidh*, draws on the work of Macdonald as outlined in section (6.1) of this chapter. The text is presented with very few notes, no index, no glossary, and no bibliography. The translator does not discuss or theorize the problems he faced in translating the book.

Field’s translation of *Munqidh* appeared in 1909 under the title *The Confessions of Al-Gazzali*. This translation was the second work of al-Ghazālī in English after the translation of his major theological work the *Alchemy of Happiness* by Charles Homes in 1873. The translation of these two works points toward an early interest in al-Ghazālī and his thought, particularly his religious and Sufi beliefs, as each of these two works deal with particular aspects of Islam and Sufism. In fact, al-Ghazālī was the first Muslim scholar to be translated into English, and *Munqidh* was the first Arabic autobiography to be translated into the same language. Both texts belong to Arabic medieval literature, the main concern of Western translators in this period, as posited by Holes in section (6.1) of this chapter.

Given the fact that Field does not refer to the original language and text from which he translated *Munqidh*, it is difficult to determine which edition he used in translating the text. It is also

difficult to determine whether he translated it from a third language such as French as two French translations of the text appeared in 1842 and 1877.

In fact, Field's translation is incomplete as he omitted two chapters of the book: chapter five wherein al-Ghazālī introduces and discusses the views of the Ismā'īlī sect, and the final chapter, wherein he mentions the reasons that led him to abandon his life of seclusion and resume a teaching position at Nīsābūr. Other references to these two chapters in the translation are also omitted. For example, in chapter two of *Munqidh*, al-Ghazālī informs the reader that he reviews the doctrines and teachings of the four truth seekers (theologians, the philosophers, the Ismā'īlīs, and the Sufis), but in Field's translation the reference to the third group is omitted from the text (*ibid*: 22). In his introduction to his translation of *Munqidh*, Field does not mention the Ismā'īlī sect as one of the four groups discussed by al-Ghazālī. Did the translator translate *Munqidh* from a corrupted edition in Arabic or other languages (Persian or Hindustan) or, instead, did he deliberately omit these two chapters from his translation? These questions are difficult to answer in the absence of any information about this matter. In all events, the omission of the chapter on the Ismā'īlī sect robs the text of a vivid chapter on the religiously polemical debates between Sunni and Shiite Muslims in the 11th century. It could also be suggested that the omission of the last chapter from Field's translation, in which al-Ghazālī explains why he resumed teaching after years in solitude would have consolidated the dominant image of al-Ghazālī as a person who spent later life as a wandering Sufi, after conversion to Sufism.

The original Arabic text of *Munqidh* is divided into chapters or sections and sub-sections. Field, in his translation of *Munqidh*, inserted additional sub-headings for each section which were not in the source text. In the Arabic text, the introduction was likely titled later by the copyists or the editors of the text, توطئة (introduction) with no sub-headings. Field titles the "introduction" with the heading "Ghazzali's Search for truth", and adds the following sub-headings within the introduction; Ghazzali's Search for Truth, The Sea of Doubt, His Thirst for Knowledge, Real Nature of Certitude. Field adds sub-headings within each chapter. These subheadings reflect the main notions of each chapter as interpreted by the translator, reframing the text, modernizing it, guiding the reader, easing the flow of the language and helping to build the autobiographical

narrative . It seems that adding sub-headings within literary texts was common during this period.

Field's translation of the title of *Munqidh* is probably one of the most blatant features of his translation. By translating the title of *Munqidh* as *The Confessions of Al-Ghazzali*, Field in fact renames the original text. The words and the structure of the original title are replaced in this translation by a new vocabulary and structure in the translating language. The English title alludes to a long tradition of autobiographies and spiritual texts that bear the same title such as *The Confessions* of Augustine, the *Confessions* of Jean Jacques Rousseau, and the *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit* by Samuel Coleridge. It is also significant that the English reference to *Munqidh* as being the confessions of al-Ghazālī was mentioned earlier by Homes in his introduction to *The Alchemy of Happiness* in 1878. Homes seems to borrow this description from French Orientalists (see Homes, 1873: 6). This means that the title used by Field was common in the West at that time. It could be said that Field's translation of the title of *Munqidh* follows this interpretation of the text in the West, which is not without consequences. For example, although the word "confessions" could be used, generally speaking, to refer to 'the internal life' of a person, it also suggests that al-Ghazālī, like Augustine and others, wrote the book to "confess" his sinful life in public before his "conversion" to Sufism, which hardly fits with al-Ghazālī's purpose in writing *Munqidh*. The title "The Confessions of Al-Ghazzali" also places *Munqidh* clearly in the tradition of autobiographical writings because the word 'confessions' is often associated with autobiography as a distinct genre in Western languages.

Despite the fact that Field omits two chapters from *Munqidh*, and adds or omits words or phrases throughout the text, generally speaking, his translation is not considered as paraphrasing the source text. To some extent, his translation is literal, although not as literal as subsequent English translations of the same text, as will be shown later in this chapter.

6.2.4 How al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh* are Presented by Field

Field wrote a short introduction to his translation of *Munqidh*. The information he gathers in the introduction builds upon the work of prominent orientalists such as Duncan Black McDonald, discussed in section (6.1) of this chapter, and Edward Granville Browne (1862-1926). The image

of al-Ghazālī and his *Munqidh* which the translator constructs shows sympathy with that created by McDonald. In the introduction, al-Ghazālī is portrayed as being a person who dedicated his life to the pursuit of truth, which he finally found in Sufism. Related to this is the image of al-Ghazālī as a Muslim thinker who synthesized formal Islam with Sufism, bestowing the former with new life. These interpretations ‘ring true’ with the Protestant background of the translator, especially the emphasis on upholding ‘spirituality’ and disdain for ‘formal’ and ‘scholastic’ religion.

In turn, *Munqidh* is presented as an important text because it “gives the history of the mind of this remarkable man in his pursuit of truth” (*ibid*: 8). According to Field, *Munqidh* should not only be seen as “one of the very few specimens of genuine Eastern autobiography” but also as important as some of the most significant autobiographies in the West (*ibid*: 8). Thus, *Munqidh* is important because it not only describes the inner struggle of a remarkable Muslim, but also because it is a genuine autobiography that should be ranked with Western autobiographical texts. Interestingly, as *Munqidh* is unreservedly categorized as an autobiography, this demonstrates a relative openness toward non-western autobiographies in a period where Western culture was seen as superior to all other cultures.

Field concludes his introduction to his translation of *Munqidh* with a quotation from McDonald stating that: "Islam has never outgrown him, has never fully understood him. In the renaissance of Islam which is now rising to view, his time will come, and the new life will proceed from a renewed study of his works." (*ibid*: 10). Despite the included exaggeration about al-Ghazālī's status, it is interesting that the translator regards the ‘renaissance’ in the Islamic World to be of a religious nature, a commonly held belief among Orientalists who often view Muslim societies as ‘religious’ in nature and essence.

6.2.5 The Reception of Field's Translation

To the best of my knowledge, there are no published reviews of Field's translation of *Munqidh* in English. After its first publication in 1909, the text appeared in *The Sacred Books and Early Literature of the East*, a book edited by Charles F. Horne and published in New York in 1917. In this book, Field's translation of *Munqidh* does not appear under its original title *The Confessions*

of *Al-Ghazzali* but instead under the title *The Rescuer from Error*, a seemingly literal translation of the original Arabic title. It is difficult to tell whether the change of the title was made by Field himself or by the editor and/or the publisher of this book. Here, Horne describes *Munqidh* as being the most interesting and useful book for modern readers and as a spiritual autobiography which gives an account of the development of al-Ghazālī's faith (Horne, 1917: 5). The text is further described as "a simple and earnest account" which "profoundly touched modern readers" (*ibid*: 100). It is also interesting that Horne observes that this text appears in this volume 'in full', which means that the text was taken to be a complete English translation of the source text and thus was wellreceived.

Field's translation of *Munqidh* also appeared in volume two of the *University Library of Autobiography* which was edited by Tyler Daniels in 1918. The autobiographies contained in this book retell the lives of renowned thinkers of the Middle Ages, such as Abelard, Avicenna, and Dante, among others. The book cover invites the reader to explore "the great autobiographies and the autobiographical data left by the world's famous men and women". This also shows the distinctive status *Munqidh* accomplished in the West in general, and in the English-speaking world in particular, in the first half of the 20th century. It also shows that the representations which Field made about the text and its author were accepted within the target language and culture. The publication of *The Confessions of Al-Ghazali* in these two widely read books suggests that the text was well received in the language despite the fact that the translator omitted two chapters from the translation.

In the absence of the copyright of this English translation, several commercial publishers have invested in the text and republished it several times. The absence of any critical assessment of this English translation and the fact that subsequent translators of the same text did not even mention that the text was incomplete, may well have encouraged several commercial publications of this translation in English.

6.3 The First Retranslation of *Munqidh* by Watt (1953)

Field's *The Confessions of Al-Gazzali* remained "a point of departure" in English until the publication of the first retranslation of *Munqidh* by Montgomery Watt, a well-known Scottish Arabist, in 1953. Watt's new translation of *Munqidh* differs from Field's first translation in many respects, including the motivations and conditions that direct the translator's work and his translation strategies. Drawing on his background as an outstanding orientalist and the developments of Orientalism in English between and after the First and Second World Wars, the translator offers his translation as a scholarly or academic translation of *Munqidh*. More details about this translation are given in the following few sections.

6.3.1 The Translator

Arabic and Islamic studies in Britain developed considerably after the two world wars due to the establishment of the School of Oriental and African Studies in London during the First World War and the efforts of a new generation of Orientalists at Oxford, Cambridge, and London. Among these prominent Orientalists were Davis Samuel Margoliuth (1858-1940), Richard Bell (1876-1952), Hamilton Gibb (1895-1971), Reynold Nicholson (1868-1945), and Arberry (1905-1969), among others. These orientalists or Arabists continued a long tradition in Britain and other European countries of editing, publishing, translating, and studying Arabic and Islamic texts, particularly classical texts. They worked toward the consolidation of academic studies of Arabic and Islam within the West, and the translations they undertook reflect the climate in which they worked. In other words, the texts they edited, translated, and published were part of the study of Arabic and Islamic cultures by these academics and mainly designed for specialists and students.

William Montgomery Watt (1909-2006) belongs to the second generation of British Arabists who were active in the second half of the 20th century. He worked at the University of Edinburgh under the supervision of the well-known Arabist, Richard Bell, and was greatly influenced by his work on classical Islam including his translation and studies of the Qur'an. In one of his works, he states that: "Richard Bell was my greatly respected teacher under whom I did much of my

study of Arabic and who guided me in the preparation of the thesis which eventually appeared under the title *Free Will and Predestination in Early Islam*" (Watt, 1970: V).

Watt studied classics at the University of Edinburgh and then at Oxford University. In 1934 he completed a short thesis on "Kant's Views of the Relation between Teleology and Ethics", and in autumn 1934 he travelled to Germany and studied philosophy at the University of Jena. On returning to Scotland in the summer, he worked as an assistant lecturer in moral philosophy at Edinburgh University until 1938. According to *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Watt published his first book *Can Christians Be Pacifists?* in 1937. The book "signals Watt's interest in the development of a universal religion that would supersede all previous particular religions" (Thompson, 2010: 1). However, his concept of the challenges and reconciliation of religious dialogue was still in its infancy at that time until he lived with a Pakistani Muslim flatmate and engaged with him in depth religious conversations. These conversations "motivated Watt's interest and proved the beginning of a lifetime of reflection on Islam and its relations to Christianity" (*ibid*).

Following these conversations, Watt contacted Graham Brown, the Anglican bishop in Jerusalem, who invited Watt to join him as a specialist in Arab affairs. This new post required several years of preparation. Watt was ordained in 1939, started to study Arabic at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, and began work on his doctoral thesis about early Islamic Theology under the direction of Richard Bell at the University of Edinburgh (*ibid*).

He arrived in Jerusalem in 1943 and remained a member of the bishop's staff for three years. In 1946, he returned to Britain and was appointed as a teacher of ancient philosophy at the University of Edinburgh in the same year. The following year he continued working at the same university, but as a teacher of Arabic and Arabic studies, and stayed in this post until 1979.

Watt wrote more than 30 books and published numerous articles on the Qur'an, theology, mysticism and Islamic law, the history of the Arab world, Arabic literature, and the relations between Islam and Christianity. His interest and scholarly work at Edinburgh University was concerned with the classical period of Islam rather than modern Islam.

His work on al-Ghazālī began early in 1949 with his article on the author's *Mishkāt al Anwār* (Niche of Lights), followed by his translation of two further of al-Ghazālī's work's: *Munqidh* and *The Beginning of Guidance* in 1953. In 1963 he published a very successful book on al-Ghazālī which he entitled *Muslim Intellectual: a Study of Al-Ghazālī*. In the introduction of his translation of *Munqidh*, as well as in several other books and encyclopaedias, Watt not only promotes the works of this Muslim theologian in English, but also the images created about him, of his life, and of his work, in the West in general.

Watt's early training in the classics and philosophy continued to develop through his interest in al-Ghazālī, and like other Arabists of his time, classical Arabic and the classical texts produced were a part of his training and attitude toward the language. His religious (theological) background may also have played a role in motivating and shaping his work on al-Ghazālī.

His understanding of his role as an Arabist was influenced by his openness toward Islam and his relatively liberal Christian beliefs. He felt that an Arabist should play a pivotal role in promoting understanding of the other and highlighting shared beliefs of different religions and cultures. In 1976 he wrote:

Islamists, and more generally orientalists, have functions to perform for their own society. They have to help their fellows to understand more fully the cultures of the orient, to learn their weaknesses and their strengths and the ways in which they differ from our own culture, and above all to appreciate the universal human values they enshrine. (41)

Thus, Watt not only approached al-Ghazālī's philosophy and autobiography from an academic background, but also from his own philosophical and theological training and openness toward other religions including that of Islam. He translated *Munqidh* in 1953, six years after his appointment as the head of Arabic studies at Edinburgh University.

6.3.2 Why a New Translation?

Watt does not say why he opted for a new English translation of *Munqidh*. Atypical of a scholar who had trained as a historian of philosophy and as an Arabist, the translator did not even refer

to Field's first English translation of *Munqidh*. As previously mentioned, this first translation was not only available in a variety of highly influential English collections and editions, but was also "a point of departure" in English for more than four decades. It is unlikely that Watt was unaware of the existence of this translation, although there is no corroborative evidence to prove this. Another possible explanation for Watt not mentioning Field's translation, if he was indeed aware of it, is that Watt did not feel it sufficiently important to mention it in his own translation because of the simple fact that his translation of *Munqidh*, unlike that of Field's, was complete and consequently needed no justification. In other words, the new translation would challenge the first translation by virtue of this essential difference between them.

Watt's personal appreciation of *Munqidh*, as can be seen from his English introduction (see section 6.3.4 in this chapter) can be also seen as motivation for his retranslation of the text. The increasing Western interest in al-Ghazālī's autobiography as contrasted with any other work by the same author or even by other Muslim authors, is clearly articulated by Watt in his introduction to *Munqidh*: "No other work on Islamic religion has the same appeal to Westerners as the autobiography, and this has led to far more attention being paid to al-Ghazālī, both by Western scholars, and by modern Muslims, than to other Muslim theologian" (*Munqidh*, Watt: 12). Watt goes a step further when he points out that "Christians, too, in a cultural melting-pot, must be prepared to learn from Islam, and are unlikely to find a more sympathetic guide than al-Ghazālī" (*ibid*: 13).

6.3.3 General Features of Watt's Translation

Watt published his translation of *Munqidh* alongside another book of al-Ghazālī known as *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* (The Beginning of Guidance), which he also translated from Arabic, in a publication entitled *The Faith and Practice of al-Al-Ghazālī*. *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* is mainly concerned with the duties or rules of conduct each Muslim should adhere to. It book informs the readership of al-Ghazālī's philosophy of the ideal 'practice' of Islam, whereas *Munqidh* is mainly concerned with his 'faith'. This explains why the title *The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazālī* was chosen.

Watt's translation of *Munqidh* appeared in a series known as *Ethical and Religious Classics: East and West*. The editors wrote an important keynote about each book published within the series that gives an account of the context of the retranslated text, because the translator said little about it. The editors explain that the texts were published after two devastating wars, World War I and II, to promote "a deeper understanding and appreciation of other civilizations, especially their moral and spiritual achievements" on one hand, and to achieve "a clearer insight into the fundamentals of ethics and religion" on the other hand (*Munqidh*, Watt: 5). This emphasis on the Eastern spirituality comes in line with the remark that "Since the second half of the twentieth century, Western thinkers have sought to turn colonialist stereotype about the condition of underdevelopment and soullessness of the Middle East, by proclaiming the East as the home of spirituality and mysticism, and the West as the home of soulless and materialism" (Klinkhammer, 2009: 211).

The editors of Watt's translation also point out that these books aim to "place the chief ethical and religious masterpieces of the world, both Christian and non-Christian, within easy reach of the intelligent reader who is not necessarily an expert [...]. The texts are reportedly prepared by "scholars of distinction, who will try to make them, not only scholarly, but intelligible and enjoyable" (*ibid*).

The phrase 'not only scholarly, but also intelligible and readable' means that the translated text should be both accurate and easily read or understood by the target reader. The word 'scholarly' could also be understood as a reference to the 'critical apparatus' which the translator adds to a translated text in order to create a reliable translation that can do justice to the content of the source text and the author's ideas. The critical apparatus includes things like the translator's introduction, annotation of terms and expressions, textual analysis, and even criticism of the work in translation. This critical apparatus emphasizes "the academic environment in which the source text is produced" (Chan, 2004: 200). The phrase 'scholarly' could also mean producing a precise and clear translation.

Thus, it could be said that Watt's translation was influenced by this norm of translation which seems to be prescribed by the editors of the series in which the text was published. The translator wanted to create an accurate and easily read translation of *Munqidh*, as well as whatever

paratextual materials that the translator felt necessary to provide a deep understanding of the source text. Watt developed particular strategies in translating the text to match this criterion or to give the impression that his translation is 'scholarly' in nature. Among these are the following:

Firstly, unlike Field, the translator produced his translation of *Munqidh* using a critical edition of the Arabic text which only appeared in Arabic for the first time in 1934. As previously mentioned, this edition was prepared by two well-known Arab scholars of philosophy, based on a critical comparison of different editions of the Arabic text, and greatly appraised in the Arab world.

Secondly, Watt writes a long introduction to his translation of *Munqidh* in which he amalgamates all available knowledge on al-Ghazālī in English and other languages over more than five decades, shedding more light on the text in particular, and al-Ghazālī's philosophy in general. The translation undertaken by Watt also comes with notes and an index. The notes on the translated text are given in the form of footnotes, where Watt explains particular points relating to the teachings of Islam, sayings of the prophet, some stylistic issues in *Munqidh*, and references to other books by al-Ghazālī and their English translations. In all of these notes Watt creates the image of himself not only as a competent translator but also as a qualified scholar of al-Ghazālī and Islam.

Thirdly, to further highlight the difference that his translation makes, the translator uses a footnote to point out that he received help and encouragement from Hamilton Gibb and Arthur Arberry, probably the most important British Arabists of the time, during his preparation of the new translation. Arberry, in particular, was well known for his successful and celebrated translation of the Qur'an. Watt seems to invest in the cultural capital of these two big names to highlight the 'scholarly' nature of his translation of *Munqidh*. It is not clear to what extent these two prominent Arabists were involved in his decision to retranslate *Munqidh*.

Fourthly, Watt points out that he relied on the critical edition of *Munqidh* that was published for the first time in 1938/9, but deviated from it at three points. These points are minor issues, but the note itself is revealing because it creates the impression that the translator's deep knowledge of the source text, language, and culture even enables him even to "correct" the standard critical

edition of the source text in translation. This strategy was used by some translators of the Qur'an including Watt's teacher and supervisor, Richard Bell, who in his translation of the Qur'an, deviated from the standard edition of it by re-organizing the *suras* (chapters) of this text.

Watt published his translation of *Munqidh* under the title *Deliverance from Error and Attachment of the Lord of Might and Majesty*, a seemingly close translation of the original long title of *Munqidh*. However, the translation of the key word المنقذ as deliverance is problematic, and shows how translation, even close translation, can be based on a specific interpretation in the target language and thus shape the source text in significant ways. For example, Gutas (1994) argues that the main title المنقذ من الضلال should be rendered as "What Saves from Straying" in order to "emphasize the proleptic dimension implicit in the Arabic". Gutas justifies this by arguing that the function of the text is to guide the readers, mainly Muslims, to the true path of faith which means that "one does not need to have actually committed an error in order to be "delivered" from it, as suggested by the translation by Watt" (237-8n). In fact, Watt deliberately chose to translate the Arabic word المنقذ as *deliverance* rather than using its more literal meaning *deliverer* or 'what delivers' as he himself acknowledges (Watt, *ibid*: 9). According to Kenneth Garden (2014a), this decision has significant consequences on how the text has been interpreted in English in particular, and in Western scholarship in general. Garden argues that one important implication of this translation is that it suggests that al-Ghazālī presents the story of one who is passively saved by God in *Munqidh*. This mistranslation, which is also echoed also in later translations of the same text "suggests a purely personal concern with salvation and casts al-Ghazālī as an Augustine figure, a parallel made plainer in the title of the first English translation of the *Deliverer* by Claude Field in 1909: *The Confessions of al-Ghazzali*" (69).

6.3.4 How Watt presented al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh*

The representations that Watt gives about al-Ghazālī and his *Munqidh* are not significantly different from that presented by Field, although he presents them in more realistic terms. Al-Ghazālī is regarded by Watt as an outstanding theologian who captures the imagination of Muslims and Westerners past and present, but it is his conversion to Sufism that is seen as the turning point in his life and career, which is described and explained by Watt in this way:

Four years later, however, he had to meet a crisis; it had physical symptoms but it was primarily religious. He came to feel that the one thing that mattered was avoidance of Hell and attainment of Paradise, and he saw that his present way of life was too worldly to have any hope of eternal reward. After a severe inner struggle he left Baghdad to take up the life of a wandering ascetic. Though later he returned to the task of teaching, the change that occurred in him at this crisis was permanent. He was now a religious man, not just a worldly teacher of religious sciences (*ibid*: 9).

Watt also points out that the greatness of al-Ghazālī stems from the fact that more than anyone else he was responsible for defending orthodoxy against Greek philosophy, and synthesized orthodoxy and mysticism (*ibid*: 13).

Watt presents *Munqidh* as a “spiritual autobiography” (*ibid*: 8), a description of the spiritual crisis he experienced in Baghdad and his conversion to Sufism. He suggests the importance of the text stems from the fact that it is a personal account of a great Muslim theologian whose personality attracts Muslims and Westerners alike, and that it is “the source of much we know about al-Ghazālī’s life” (*ibid*: 9). However, Watt throws some doubt on considering the text as an autobiography in the full sense of the word, because of its emphasis on conceptual issues and because it does not follow a chronological order in telling the intellectual story of its author:

[...] *Deliverance from Error* [...] is autobiographical, yet not exactly an autobiography. It presents us with an intellectual analysis of his spiritual growth, and also offers arguments in defence of the view that there is a form of human apprehension higher than rational apprehension, namely, that of the prophet when God reveals truths to him. Moreover close study shows that al-Ghazālī does not always observe strict chronology, but has schematized his description of his intellectual development (*ibid*: 9-10).

This is a more realistic representation of *Munqidh* than that of Field, but is still within the dominant interpretation of the image of al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh*. The accuracy and sincerity of al-Ghazālī is not questioned by Watt, and his narration is accepted as a faithful description of the intellectual and spiritual development of al-Ghazālī by the translator.

6.3.5 The Reception of Watt's Translation

As previously stated, Watt does not record the problems that he encountered when translating *Munqidh*. The same can be said about the reviews of his translation in English. Margret Smith (1953), a scholar in Arabic and a specialist on al-Ghazālī, wrote a review of Watt's translation, pointing out that it is desirable that "the West should know something of the life and writings of the great Muslim theologian and mystic al-Ghazālī" (1953: 176). According to Smith, Watt's translation serves to fulfil this end. Although she mentions that the text was previously translated by Field, she does not raise the question of the need for a new translation of the same text in the same language or the differences between Watt's and Field's translations. However, she described Field's translation as being 'old'. Smith, like Field and Watt, emphasizes the importance of *Munqidh* as an account of al-Ghazālī's spiritual journey toward Sufism. She concludes her review by praising the translator for the good introduction and index that he wrote about the translated text (*ibid*: 177).

In another review, Robson (1953) remarks that Watt has made a valuable contribution by publishing a translation of the work of the famous Muslim theologian and mystic al-Ghazālī with an explanatory introduction. Robson then comments on the translation in one line saying that Watt's translation is not only "reliable but is also readable" (1953: 220), reemphasizing in different terms the norm of translation that was also mentioned by the editors of Watt's translation.

A third review of Watt's translation was published in 1956 by Richard Walzer who described this translation as being 'excellent translation'. The importance of introducing or re-introducing this text to Western readers stems from the fact that it is a kind of 'spiritual autobiography' that tells the story of a remarkable Muslim theologian and mystic who "initially abandoned the tradition" and searched for certain truth amongst the schools of thought of the time (speculative theology, philosophy, the authoritative view of the Ismā'īlī sect) until he found it in Sufism. This makes the text "one of the most attractive and most impressive works by Al-Ghazzali" (181). In other words, Walzer adopts Watt's interpretation of *Munqidh* as being a spiritual autobiography that tells the story of al-Ghazālī's conversion to Sufism.

Thus, the reviewers do not focus on the translation per se, but on the source text, the life and work of the author of the source text, and the importance of making such texts available in English. By focusing on the original text, its author, the importance of introducing the text into the translating language and ignoring translational issues, Smith, Robson and Walzer seem to reduce the role of the translation to a mere communication of the content of the original text in the target language. No technical terms, no problematic portions of the text, and no stylistic issues are mentioned and discussed in these two critical reviews. The accuracy of translation is briefly mentioned but other aspects of translation are ignored, something that accords with Venuti's remark that:

On those rare occasions when reviewers address the translation at all, their brief comments usually focus on its style, neglecting such other possible questions as its accuracy, its intended audience, its economic value in the current book market, its relation to literary trends in English, its place in the translator's career. (1995: 2)

The fact that the three English reviewers of Watt's translation are scholars in Arabic and Islamic studies indicates the fact that the text is confined to academic circles, particularly Islamic studies. It is still seen as a religio-philosophical text of an important Muslim theologian rather than as a literary text or autobiography that might influence or be of interest for others (for example, critics or historians of literature).

Watt's translation of *Munqidh* was received well in English as shown by those reviews. Watt's welcomed English translation is even evidenced in later references to the text after the publication of a second retranslation of the same text in 1980. For example, Rebecca Skreslet and Paula Skreslet (2006) describe Watt's translation as being a "sound and readable translation" (158): the same description as that found in Smith's, Robson's and Walzer's reviews.

Watt's retranslation of *Munqidh* as well as his scholarly works on al-Ghazālī, especially the *Muslim Intellectual: a Study of Al-Ghazālī*, played a significant role in familiarizing western readers with al-Ghazālī and his philosophy. The image of al-Ghazālī as a scholar who abandons worldly goods in search of personal salvation (peaceful faith) was also one of the interpretations that Watt popularized in English and throughout the West. On the other hand, the translation of

Munqidh in particular and the literature on al-Ghazālī in general, adds Watt's cultural capital as an expert in al-Ghazālī in particular and Islamic theology and philosophy in general. This is verified by the fact that the entry on al-Ghazālī in the new edition of Encyclopaedia of Islam (1965) was written by Watt.

Watt published a second edition of his translation of *Munqidh* in 1994 and 2000. This demonstrates the success that the text achieved in the target language. The second edition of Watt's translation of *Munqidh* which he reissued in 1994 and 2000 was published by *Oneworld*, a new publishing house which is based in the United Kingdom. In his forward to the new edition of *Munqidh*, Watt points out that the publication of this new edition is to be welcomed given the fact that "al-Ghazālī is one of the Muslim writers best able to help Westerners toward a positive appreciation of Islam; and that is something very necessary at the present time". What makes the introduction of al-Ghazālī "necessary" in the 1990s is probably the distorted image of Islam and Muslims in the West following the rise of conservative and radical Islamists all over the world, including the West. This gives a clear indication about a political reading or 'use' of the text in its new English context. It again emphasizes the impact of the target language and culture on the source text, i.e. how specific interpretations (ideas, values, interests, concerns, etc) in the target language can determine how the text is or should be read and used.

Since its publication in 1953, Watt's translation of *Munqidh* was, unrivalled until the 1980s, when a new English translation of the same text by Richard McCarthy appeared. The following section introduces this new translation. The translation of McCarthy was followed by two other translations of the same text by Muhammad Abūlaylah (2001), and Muhtar Holland (2011) respectively. The first two translations of *Munqidh*, by Field and Watt, were mainly produced for the British market, whereas the last three translations of *Munqidh* by Richard McCarthy (1980), Muhammad Abūlaylah (2001), and Muhtar Holland (2011) were mainly produced for the American market, a fact that points toward the increasing role of the United States in shaping Arabic and Islamic studies as well as translations from Arabic into English. For, since the second half of the 20th century, the United States had started to politically and culturally replace the British and French empires: an important catalyst of the increased interest in Arabic and Islamic studies in the United States during this period which coincided with the expansion of the United

States in the Middle East (see Rafiq, 2014: 291). These three translations are reviewed in the following sections.

6.4 McCarthy's Translation 1980

As stated in section (6.3.5) of this chapter, Watt's English translation of *Munqidh* was well received. Following the publication of Watt's translation, Field's translation not only became an "old translation", as noted previously, but also an unreliable translation. This is evidenced by the academic books and articles in which the reference to *Munqidh* lacks any reference to Field at all.

In 1980, the American orientalist Richard Joseph McCarthy retranslated *Munqidh*. How he came to translate *Munqidh*, how he presented his new translation and how it differs from previous translations are issues that will be discussed in the following sections.

6.4.1 The Translator

The second retranslation of *Munqidh* appeared in English in 1980, 27 years after Watt's translation. The new translation was undertaken by Richard Joseph McCarthy, a prominent orientalist who, like Watt, came to Islam and Islamic studies from a mainly theological and philosophical background. McCarthy was born in Chicopee in the United States in 1913. He studied at the Cathedral High School in Springfield/Massachusetts and then at the Holy Cross College in Worcester. In 1933, he entered the Jesuit order at Shadowbrook in Lenox, and after preparatory studies at Shadowbrook and Weston College, where he read philosophy (1936-38), he went to Baghdad where he completed a three-year program of Arabic studies (1938-41). It is not clear why McCarthy chose to study Arabic and Islamic theology at this point, but it was and still is a very common phenomenon for many Western scholars to combine missionary activities and scholarship on Islam. As Kerr points out:

For many professionals the combination of Christian mission and Islamic studies is anathema [...]. Historically, missionary scholars pioneered the study of Islam. In addition, missionary scholars were the first to examine Islam in the cultural context of Muslim societies. In the sense of the outworking of a theological vision,

missionary scholars were also the first to explore the possibility of an ecumenical relationship between Christianity and Islam, bequeathing a more varied legacy of interreligious concern than is generally credited. (*ibid*: 8)

After completing his studies at Baghdad University, McCarthy returned to Weston College to read theology (1941-45), and in 1944, he was recognised as a Jesuit priest. That same year he attended Gregorian University (1946-47) to improve his knowledge of Arabic. Then he was sent to the Faculty of Oriental Studies (1947-51) at Campion Hall, Oxford, to study for a doctorate in Islamic theology (Latham, 1981: 76). In 1951, he returned to Iraq where he worked at Baghdad College, a secondary school established by the American Jesuit mission for Iraqi students. In addition to his post at Baghdad College, he taught Islamic philosophy at the University of Baghdad. In 1953, he published his most important scholarly work on Islamic theology which he called *Theology of al-Ash'arī*.

Baghdad College was a great success and in 1957, McCarthy alongside some other Jesuits, established the first private university in Iraq known as *al-Hikmah* University. McCarthy's great interest in Arabic and Islamic studies motivated him to initiate the establishment of the Oriental Institute at *al-Hikma* University in 1968, hoping to "draw students and scholars from all over the world to create a better understanding and friendship among those of diverse cultural background" (*ibid*).

However due to political reasons, the Jesuits were expelled from Iraq by the Ba'th regime in 1968. Some Iraqi nationalists launched severe attacks against the Jesuit school as well as the university, urging the Ba'th regime to "Iraqise" the College and the university. They capitalised on the increasing hatred toward America after the Arab-Israeli war in 1967 (Latham, *ibid*: 77). McCarthy, who was the president of *al-Hikma* University at that time, "never fully recovered from this blow", as he "had seen the fruits of all his labours in promoting and maintaining high academic standards at *Al-Hikma* reduced to nothing overnight" and "had had to leave without the greater part of the rich Arabic and Islamic library he had built up there" (*ibid*).

In 1969, McCarthy was invited to teach Islamic philosophy at Oxford University, where he worked until 1977. He died in the United States in 1981 after suffering from poor health and

partial paralysis. David Burrell, in his introduction to a new edition of McCarthy's translation that was published in 2000, remarks that McCarthy follows in the tradition of French Catholic Islamists such as the great Orientalist Louis Massignon and Louis Gardet. Burrell explains that these Christian scholars were fascinated by Islamic thinkers, which led to an even greater appreciation of the spiritual riches in their respective traditions. They paved the way for later generations of various faiths to discover and share traditions (12-3).

A year before his death, McCarthy completed a translation of *Munqidh* and other works of al-Ghazālī which he published in one volume entitled *Freedom and Fulfillment* [sic]: *An Annotated Translation of Al-Ghazālī's al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl and other relevant works of Al-Ghazālī*. In 1999, the book was published by Fons Vitae under the title: *Al-Ghazālī's Deliverance from Error: Five Key Texts including his spiritual autobiography al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl*. In 2000, Fons Vitae republished McCarthy's translation of *Munqidh*, but in this new edition the text appeared independent of al-Ghazālī's other books. The new edition appeared under the title *Al-Ghazālī's Path to Sufism: his Deliverance from Error (al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl)*.

Through his pioneering work on Islamic theology, as either an author or translator, McCarthy established himself as an authority in classical Islamic thought. His mastery of Arabic is another distinctive feature that must have played a role in the way his translations and works on Islamic theology were received in the West. His classical Arabic was so impressive that "Muslim listeners used to swell the otherwise Christian audiences where he preached in Baghdad, because they had heard he spoke splendid Arabic, a tongue whose speakers prize for its sounds as highly as its substance" (Renard, 2011: 230). Rassam (2005) points out that McCarthy was not only an "outstanding scholar" and a master of Arabic and oriental languages, but also an "authority on Islamic philosophy and theology" (151).

His affinity with Islamic theology, as a Christian theologian with openness to other traditions, has led him to a fascination with al-Ghazālī, a noted, if not the most noted Muslim theologian. Renald posits that McCarthy dreamt of undertaking a complete translation of al-Ghazālī's major work the *'Ihyā'*, which is comprised of more than ten volumes, each of which is more than two hundred pages in length, but he died before accomplishing this huge project (*ibid*: 54). Renald also argues that contemporary concerns and interests, mainly religious, led McCarthy to al-

Ghazālī and his work. Referring to al-Ghazālī's masterwork *Ihya'*, Renald quoted McCarthy as saying:

To sum it [the *Ihya'*] all up, I have...found, and I believe others can find, in the words and example of al-Ghazālī a true *ihya'* [quickening, revivification, bringing back to life, causing to live]—an *ihya'* from the dark, dead coldness of atheism, or, more accurately, 'without-Godness'; an *ihya'* from enervating, debilitating, and crippling sinfulness; an *ihya'* from lifeless and spiritless intellectualism; an *ihya'* from the tepidity and listlessness and uncaring of social and moral mediocrity. (*ibid*: 231).

6.4.2 Why a New Translation?

In the previous section, it states that McCarthy's interest in al-Ghazālī is evidenced through his openness toward Islam and Islamic theology. His translation of *Munqidh* and other works of al-Ghazālī in general are situated within the same context. It is his appreciation of al-Ghazālī and his work as well as openness toward other theological traditions, particularly Islam, that might have attracted him to this Muslim theologian and his work. This is something that can be seen in the following quote from McCarthy's introduction to his translation of *Munqidh* which was published in his *Freedom and Fulfilment*:

My reading of al-Ghazālī has incited me to be, a better practicing Catholic in the fullest sense of the term. It has not moved me, despite my real admiration, and even veneration for al-Ghazālī to embrace Islam. Rather it has made me more aware of the great spiritual riches in my own Catholic tradition. My experience has been, though on a lesser level, like those of Louis Massignon and Harvey Cox. (*ibid*: Iviix-lix)

Someday, be it close or distant, I hope to sit down with al-Ghazālī in a quiet corner of heaven. We shall have many things to talk about, if indeed in heaven one can be 'distracted' from the Vision of God. I shall want to thank him—him and so many others of his coreligionists. (*ibid*: Iix)

But why did McCarthy opt toward a new translation of *Munqidh* despite the fine and well-received translation of the same text by Watt? In his introduction to *Freedom and Fulfilment*,

McCarthy clearly states the reasons that motivated him to undertake a new translation of *Munqidh*. He points out that he retranslated the text for three reasons. The first is because he developed his own translation of the text over several years as he was teaching it to his students at Oxford University. The new translation is the product of reading and re-reading the text for years:

It is obvious that no two translations from Arabic into English-a fortiori from English into Arabic! - are ever in perfect agreement on a translation. Then, over several pleasant years, it was part of my duty to teach the *Munqidh* to fine groups of students at Oxford. In the course of repeated readings of the text I made my own personal translation which, understandably, I personally preferred to others. (*Munqidh*/McCarthy: xxv)

As can be seen from this quotation, McCarthy believes that translation from two different languages such as Arabic and English will probably result in differences in translation that might not appear if the involved languages are fundamentally similar. The other important point here is that McCarthy seems to put very little emphasis on the superiority of his translation over other translations of *Munqidh*. This is because of his insistence that he prefers his translation for ‘personal’ reasons.

The second reason that McCarthy mentions as being a motivating factor behind his new translation of *Munqidh* is that he came across a new manuscript of *Munqidh* which was written five years after the death of al-Ghazālī and ten years after its composition. This manuscript was given to McCarthy by Father Poggi. It is "an almost perfect manuscript" of *Munqidh*, and is different from the text used by Watt "in hundreds of places", although "most of the differences are minor" (*ibid*: xxv). Although McCarthy mainly relied on this “precious manuscript” to undertake the new translation, in his notes it is clear that he also worked closely with the Arabic edition on which Watt based his translation of *Munqidh*. He claims that “the difficulties found in the printed text [the edition used by Watt] are cleared up by the manuscript readings” (*ibid*: xxvi). Although the edition used by McCarthy is historically older than the printed edition of the same text used by Watt, this does not necessarily mean that the older edition is more authentic or closer to the source text than other editions. Independent objective evidence is needed to justify

any claim of authenticity in this regard. At any rate, justifying a new translation by reference to the discovery of a new edition or manuscript of the source text is common in the history of retranslation, particularly when it comes to ancient and historical texts (for example, sacred or philosophical books).

McCarthy also mentions a third reason for his new translation of *Munqidh*, arguing that classic texts deserve to be retranslated over time. As he put it: “I may observe that acknowledged classics deserve to be translated over and over for the sake of new generations and to benefit from the growing body of knowledge about distant time and authors” (*ibid*). This reason, as shown in chapter four of this study, is commonly used by translators to justify the undertaking of retranslations of a particular text, especially those texts that are considered as ‘classics’ (see section 4.2.2 of chapter four of this study).

McCarthy’s remark about the need to retranslate ‘classics’ and the inclusion of *Munqidh* within this category is an important consideration when assessing the success this text has achieved in the target language. However, it is important to remark here that classical texts are categorised as such because of translation and retranslation and/or by the way they are received in the translating language (see section (4.3.2.3) of chapter four of this study). This applies to *Munqidh* which was not so highly valued until it was re-discovered in the West, that is to say, before its being translated, retranslated, and studied by Western and non-Western scholars. The so called ‘classic’ texts are created partially by those who produce and receive them in the target language. As Venuti (2008) rightly points out:

[T]ranslation functions as one cultural practice through which a foreign text attains the status of a classic: the very fact of translation not only implies that the text has been judged valuable enough to bring into another culture, but also increases this value by generating such promotional devices as jacket copy, endorsements, and advertisements and by enabling such diverse modes of reception as reviews, course adoptions, and scholarly research. (Venuti, 2008: 28)

McCarthy’s translation does not directly compete with that of Watt’s chronologically nearest translation. He quotes Father Poggi’s claim that Watt’s translation is the best English translation

of *Munqidh*, when this translation is compared with that of Field, something that he also seems to acknowledge, without explicitly stating it (*ibid*: xxvii). McCarthy does not seek to undermine or directly criticize Watt's translation. Even the examples he cites in his notes which can be considered as criticism of Watt's translation are few and far between and thus, do not constitute much of a challenge to Watt's translation. Although he does not seek to undermine the existing translations (particularly Watt's translation), McCarthy uses specific strategies to establish his translation as a proper, if not the proper, translation of *Munqidh*. These strategies proved successful and resulted in establishing McCarthy's translation as a faithful translation of *Munqidh* in English. First, McCarthy presents his translation of *Munqidh* as being the product of much research at Oxford University, giving the impression that the new translation is a 'scholarly' life-long project. Through his notes, particularly the comparison he establishes between his translation and others' translations in English as well as in other languages, McCarthy creates the impression that his translation is also the product of working closely with the different translations of the same text which were undertaken by prominent Arabists in English, French, and Italian. These two features must have played a role in establishing his translation as one of, if not the most accurate, translation of *Munqidh* in English. The paratextual materials he published with his translation of *Munqidh*, that is his introduction and extensive notes, also play a role in this regard because they contain the most scholarly work or research on the text in English. Moreover, McCarthy came to the field of translating *Munqidh* with his prestigious position not only as a respected scholar of Islamic theology and philosophy, but also as an excellent master of classical Arabic.

McCarthy's decision to retranslate *Munqidh* by working closely on previous translations of the same text in English as well as in other European languages is, without doubt, a strategy used by him, consciously or unconsciously, to highlight the difference he sought to achieve through benefiting from the different renditions of the text in these languages. On several occasions he mentions their translations to let the reader know how the translations they propose are similar or different from his own. On other occasions he directly criticizes the translations they propose (see for example notes 6 and 25). Although *Munqidh* is, generally speaking, written in idiomatic and clear language, some parts of this text are obscure in meaning. McCarthy's notes refer to this, and it seems that he worked closely with the different translations of *Munqidh* to overcome

these difficulties and obscurities in the source text (see for example, note 206). The use of different translations to solve difficulties in translating a foreign text that is considered to be fundamentally different in language, culture, and time was highlighted by André James with reference to retranslating Chinese texts into English (see James 2003). This also follows Berman's argument that the time of retranslation should differ significantly from that of first translation for subsequent translators of a given text to benefit from existing translation(s) (see section (4.2.1) in chapter four of this study). McCarthy's use of different translations of *Munqidh*, in English and in other European languages, is evidence of the intertextuality of retranslation, i.e. the fact that the retranslator is not working from only the source text, but also from other texts or translations. It can also be assumed that his translation, which is based partially but essentially on previous translations in different languages, is an indirect sort of "collaboration on translation". Such collaboration probably results in a more careful and sensitive translation, especially when it comes to philosophical texts which require deep knowledge or specialization (see Brownlie, 2003b: 116-17).

6.4.3 Some Features of McCarthy's Translation

McCarthy's translation of *Munqidh* can be described as being more literal than Watt's translation, and therefore, than that of Field's. However, his translation is not extremely literal as it is written in idiomatic English. This is something that seems to have been requested by the publisher who "plans to present readable and enjoyable versions which, though cast in idiomatic English, will remain true to the author's own thoughts" (*Munqidh*, McCarthy, *ibid*: vii).

The new translation of *Munqidh* by McCarthy begins with a long introduction of nearly 50 pages (compared to only three pages introduction in Field's translation and six pages introduction in Watt's translation), and two hundred and thirty five notes (compared to two notes in Field's translation and only twelve notes in Watt's translation). This means that McCarthy's translation is the most foreignizing translation when it comes to the presence or visibility of the translator as exemplified in the paratextual materials, i.e. the translator's introduction and notes. The introduction has a brief biography of al-Ghazālī, a description of the historical, religious, and intellectual context in which he lived, the influence he exerted on Islamic thought, a literature

review of the English and Arabic scholarship on *Munqidh* and a long discussion of the sincerity of al-Ghazālī in telling his own story. The introduction is the richest and most sophisticated work on the text in English since its first translation in 1909. It constitutes a genuine contribution to al-Ghazālī's studies in particular and Islamic studies in general. Through extensive discussion on different aspects of al-Ghazālī's work and life, especially *Munqidh*, McCarthy uses the introduction to promote studies done on al-Ghazālī and his work in the West, and to establish himself as an authority on these issues.

Regarding the notes McCarthy provides at the end of his translation of *Munqidh*, it could be said that the majority are related to the translation of specialized terms in *Munqidh*. Others aim to clarify the textual differences (or readings) between the printed edition of *Munqidh* and the manuscript on which McCarthy based his translation. Some notes are directly related to translation while others are comments on the content of the source text. The fact that McCarthy, as he himself states, uses his own translation to introduce *Munqidh* to his students at Oxford is reflected in the fact that the majority of these notes mainly target students, although other notes are addressed to specialists of al-Ghazālī and Islamic thought.

In the endnotes, the translator listed variants or different readings of different parts of the source text and confessed that there are passages in the source text whose meanings are not clear. This increases the presence of translator in the paratextual materials, creating the impression that the translation is not transparent.

The translator also uses his notes to elucidate his own thought or interpretation regarding some controversial debates about al-Ghazālī and about Arabic and Islamic ideas in general. One example of this is his criticism of the common view among specialists about Mu'tazilah as freethinkers (see note 108). Sometimes the translator uses his notes to criticize specific notions in the source text, those that he considers to be obscure points or passages in the source text, and sometimes he criticizes al-Ghazālī himself (see for example notes 138, 165, 169).

However, the majority of the translator's notes are a comparison of the different renditions of specialized terms in *Munqidh*. In these notes, he mentions how other English translators, as well as in other Western languages (French, Italian, and German), translate a given term. However, in

other notes he attempts to assess the proposed translations in order to justify his own translation (see for example, notes 48, 89, 118, 162, 182, 204). He does the same thing with those parts of the text that seem obscure to him. But these notes mainly focus on the content of the source text rather than on other aspects of the text and how they figure in translation such language and style.

Therefore, in McCarthy's introduction to his translation of *Munqidh*, as well as in the notes, the target reader is provided with information about the text, its author and culture, its relevance to the West, a justification of the new translation, and information about the decisions that were made in the translation process.

6.4.4 How al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh* are presented by McCarthy

McCarthy's introduction for his translation of *Munqidh* is important because it gives an account of how he presents the translated text, i.e. how he wishes this text and the life it portrays to be read by Western audiences. In his introduction to his translation of *Munqidh*, McCarthy does not challenge the dominant interpretation of *Munqidh* or the images created about al-Ghazālī by previous English translators and other Western researchers, but rather emphasizes them. The representations he constructs about *Munqidh* and al-Ghazālī are, despite some minor differences, similar to those found in the introductions written by Field and Watt to their translations. Thus, he presents al-Ghazālī's life as "an adventure and quest for truth, where the reader is taken to a review of four schools of thought of which one of them, Sufism, wins al-Ghazālī's critical commitment" (Lounibos, 2009: 386). Al-Ghazālī is presented as a true thinker and mystic whose philosophy and life, as portrayed in *Munqidh*, can be a rich source not only for promoting mutual understanding between East and West, but also for setting an example that can move both Muslims and non-Muslims alike. According to McCarthy, by reading about his life in *Munqidh*, Muslims can deepen and spiritualize their beliefs and practice, while Christians can become more aware not only of the common mystic experience between different cultures and religions but also of the great spiritual riches in their own religion (McCarthy, *ibid*: Ivi-Ivii).

McCarthy considers *Munqidh* as an autobiographical text which portrays al-Ghazālī's crisis of faith, search for intellectual satisfaction, and spiritual meaning. However, he agrees with Watt

that *Munqidh* is not “a straight forward biographical account” (*ibid*: xxvi). According to McCarthy, *Munqidh* “sets forth, in a rather contrived fashion, the stages of the author’s intellectual and spiritual evolution” (*ibid*). However, McCarthy points out that al-Ghazālī in *Munqidh* “does have however something or some agendas to argue for: the promotion of Sufism” (*ibid*).

The short title that McCarthy chose for his translation of *Munqidh*, that is *Freedom and Fulfilment*, reflects these presentations. The word ‘freedom’ indicates al-Ghazali’s freedom from ‘blind faith’, whereas the word ‘fulfilment’ indicates his conviction that Sufism is the only way of thought and life he found satisfying and fulfilling. Thus, the title chosen imposes a particular reading on the translated text that comes in line with the dominant reading of it in the translating language and culture.

6.4.5 The Reception of McCarthy’s Translation

There are two reviews of McCarthy’s translation of *Munqidh* by Fadlou Shehadi and Norman Calder, both are specialists in Arabic and Islamic studies.

Shehadi praises McCarthy’s translation as being a “very readable and reliable translation”. He rightly remarks that McCarthy’s translation “tends to be more literal than Watt”, although it is “not too literal”. The emphasis on ‘fluent’ and ‘idiomatic’ translation is clearly emphasized by the reviewer in his criticism of what he calls “a few elephant-footed instances” in McCarthy’s translation such as "cogniscibles," "fruitional experience” and "interiorists". This remark consolidates Venuti’s comment about the dominance of the ideology of domestication or ‘fluency’ in the English-speaking world (see in this study chapter two, section 2.5.2). However, McCarthy’s deviation from idiomatic translation in these “few elephant-footed instances” emphasizes the fact that the work of the translator can be too complex, contradictory and idiosyncratic and only partially conditioned by the general norms of translation (Jansen and Wegener, 2007: 12).

Regarding McCarthy’s decision to retranslate *Munqidh* despite Watt’s “fine translation”, Shehadi repeats McCarthy’s reasons or justifications for conducting a new translation of the text, agreeing with him that a text such as *Munqidh* deserves to have a new life in the translating

language through “the attention implicit in another translation” (*ibid*: 376). However, he lightly criticizes McCarthy because of what he considers to be problematic renditions of some of the key terms of *Munqidh* such as the term *ذوق* (literally *taste* but technically, *direct experience of truth*) which Watt renders as ‘direct experience’ whereas McCarthy translates it as ‘fruitional experience’.

With regard to Calder’s review, it is noticed that he repeats the description of McCarthy’s translation as being both ‘accurate’ and ‘readable’ (124). However, he criticized McCarthy’s translation of the title of *Munqidh* as ‘freedom and fulfillment’ as being far from reflecting the content of the original title (*ibid*). Apart from these two brief comments on the translation, the main body of Calder’s review focuses on the significance of McCarthy’s translation for the Western reader, as well as about the best way to read or interpret it in the translating language. Calder partially challenges McCarthy’s interpretation of the text as being an autobiographical account of its author, which is the most common interpretation of the text as can be seen from our discussion of Watt’s and Field’s translations of *Munqidh*. Rather than seeing the text as a spiritual or intellectual autobiography, Calder suggests that the text is better seen as “an introduction to Islamic epistemology” in which al-Ghazālī presents what he takes to be the conditions of certain knowledge (*ibid*). From this point of view, the autobiographical structure is used only to argue for “an account of Islamic epistemology” according to which direct or mystical knowledge is regarded as the highest level of certitude. Saying this, the text, Calder hopes, will now be read widely as an introduction to Islamic epistemology as developed by one of the most important theologians in Islam rather than as an autobiography of its author.

The good reception of McCarthy’s translation is also echoed three decades later by Lounibos (2009) who points out that “McCarthy’s translation, introduction, and notes are classics in themselves” (385-86).

Although the translation of *Munqidh* by McCarthy is used, like that of Field and Watt, to give the Western reader, particularly but not exclusively specialists and students of Arabic and Islamic studies, an account of classical thought in Islam in general and al-Ghazālī’s life and philosophy in particular, the translated text has been used to serve other functions in the translating language and culture. These functions and uses are dictated by the new context within which the text was

produced. Thus, the editor of the series under which McCarthy's translation appeared, considers the text to be useful to understand a political situation in the late part of the 20th century. Firstly, the editor notices that the text was published weeks after the Islamic Revolution in Iran. This revolution bewildered Western politicians and thinkers. The editor points out that *Munqidh* can facilitate understanding of Muslim spirituality, that is, how religious figures have developed a powerful role over the Muslim society, and what the differences are between those who belong to a Sunni and Shiite tradition. Referring to al-Ghazālī's work, especially referencing *Munqidh*, the editor says:

The present book was prepared for the press during the weeks of the Islamic Revolution in Iran. The religious frenzy of the masses, stirred by the "holy man," the Ayatullah Ruhullah Khomeini, bewildered the Western observer who watched millions of men and women follow him as if in a trance, unquestioning, declaring themselves to die for him and for the cause he represented. We wondered whence he received his power-not only over the masses, but also for himself. Perhaps the following pages transmitting the thought of a twelfth-century Muslim spiritual leader-philosopher as well as mystic- may help to explain in a certain measure the phenomenon of Muslim spirituality in the twentieth-century world, the difference between Al-Ghazālī's Sunni convictions and the Ayatollah's Shi'ism notwithstanding. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: viii)

Interestingly, this remark reflects an orientalist view of Islam and Muslims because the editor assumes that to understand the Iranian revolution one needs to understand the nature or essence of the relationship between religious men and the Muslim community rather than looking for the socio-cultural, historical and political conditions that led to the revolution.

A similar political reading of McCarthy's *Munqidh* is later presented by Lounibos. Lounibos describes the text, first, as "valuable and timely work", before he points out that he has used the text to "introduce Muslim spirituality, Sufism, to U. S. students whose media perceptions of Islam are shadowed by contemporary 'Jihadist' terrorists, the "Great Satan" or adversary of our time" (*ibid*: 385). For him, if a good title is to be added to the existing titles of *Munqidh*, it could be "My non-violent *Jihad*" (*ibid*).

These political readings of *Munqidh* show that a text that was written in the source language and culture to address a specific audience (Arabs and Muslims) for specific purposes (to promote Sufism or to respond to criticism against the author) is now taken to serve not only new audiences but also fundamentally different purposes and uses. These political readings transcend even the purposes the translator of the text originally sought to achieve, i.e. to give a full account of al-Ghazālī, his life and work. This emphasizes Venuti's remark that the retranslator's awareness "can never be omniscient, nor can it ever give the retranslator complete control over transindividual factors" (Venuti, 2004: 27, see section 4.3.2.2 of chapter four of this study).

McCarthy's well received translation as well as Watt's previous translation did not stop the cycle of retranslation of this text into English as can be seen from the new translation by Muhammad Abūlaylah to which we now refer.

6.5 Abūlaylah's Translation 2001

In 2000, the Egyptian scholar Muhammad Abūlaylah issued the fourth translation of the text. How he came to translate this text, why or how he justifies the undertaking of this project, what distinguishes his translation from other translations of the same text, and how he presents al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh* will be discussed in the following sub-sections.

6.5.1 The Translator

The information on Abūlaylah mentioned here is gathered mainly but not exclusively from the website of *The Cultures and Civilizations Interaction Society* (CCIS) (<http://www.cultures-interaction.com/ar/page/v/i/16>) which was created by Abūlaylah himself.

Abūlaylah was born in 1942 in Cairo. His religious training started when he was sent to *kuttāb* (a single classroom for young children where the basics of Arabic and Islam are taught) and memorized the Qur'an. In 1966, Abūlaylah attended *Azhar* University in Cairo, where he read Islamic theology and philosophy. *Azhar* University is the oldest and most prestigious university in the Muslim world. It teaches all subjects, but is well-known for its specialism in Islamic studies and the relative worldwide tolerance the graduates of this institution show. Abūlaylah might have been interested in al-Ghazālī and his philosophy during his study at this university

because al-Ghazālī's work in jurisprudence, theology, ethics, and Sufism was and still is considered to be an important part of the training of specialists in Islamic studies in the Arab world and Sunni Islam. In addition, Abūlaylah mentions in his introduction to *Munqidh* that he was lucky to have had 'Abd al-Halīm Maḥmūd, the grand Imam of *Azhar* between 1973-78, as his teacher and mentor. Maḥmūd was a Sufi scholar and a great admirer of al-Ghazālī to the extent that he was known sometimes as the "al-Ghazālī of the twentieth century". In 1967, Maḥmūd edited *Munqidh* and published it with an extensive introduction about the man and his ideas. Abūlaylah may have become interested in al-Ghazālī during his studies at al-Azhar, and due to his acquaintance with Maḥmūd.

In 1978, Abūlaylah was sent to Exeter University in the United Kingdom, where he completed his doctorate on comparative religion. His dissertation was titled: *Ibn Ḥazm on Jews and Judaism*. His academic career started when he was appointed a lecturer of comparative religion and Islamic Studies in English at *Azhar* University in 1992. From 2001 to 2007, he worked as a head of English Language and Literature at the university. He is currently a professor emeritus of comparative religion and Islamic studies in English at the same university.

As can be shown from his academic career, books and articles, Abūlaylah intellectually belongs to the new wave of Islamic or fundamentalist thought as expressed by the Muslim brotherhood in the Arab world. These groups aim to reform Muslim society, generally seen as corrupted, by using a somewhat literal interpretation of Islam and Islamic law.

His interest in al-Ghazālī and his work seems to be motivated by his training and Islamic background and, perhaps, by his postgraduate studies in comparative religion at Exeter University.

6.5.2 Why did Abūlaylah Retranslate *Munqidh*?

In chapter four of this study, in accord with Venuti, a significant relationship between retranslation and history is demonstrated. On one hand, the history of translating and retranslating a particular text in a single language shows that the discursive strategies used in translating that text reflect different standards of accuracy and even different concepts of translation (see section (4.3.2.5) in chapter four of this study). Retranslations not only reflect

affinities with historical moments and developments, but they themselves are also used to create their own historiographical nature. The retranslator, or anyone involved in the production of a translated text such as the editor or the publisher, tends to construct and use particular narrations to signal and rationalize the differences between the new translation and the existing or old translations of the source text. The retranslator may choose to highlight the differences of his/her translation by choosing to impose a plot structure on why and how the new text emerged and how it relates to previous translations. These plots or stories, as pointed out in chapter four of this study, are themselves culturally determined in the sense that they are part of how specific people at specific times and places use language to account for specific happenings and events in a way that is not unlike storytelling. The main point is that these stories or narrations are presented as if they were a description of what has been done, rather than as ‘constructed’ models to serve the interest of certain people who might use them to shape the history of a given text in a specific way.

The way Abūlaylah presents his new translation of *Munqidh* fits neatly into a “romance” narration as understood by Venuti (see section (4.3.2.5) of chapter four of this study). It involves the presentation of the new translation as being an improvement on previous translations. It is presented as being an attempt to overcome the ‘defects’ and ‘shortcomings’ of previous translations. Abūlaylah points out that Field’s translation “reads well for the most part, but could be more faithful and precise” (18). Then he states that Field’s translation was followed by Watt’s translation who “tried to improve on Field’s translation” (*ibid*). These two translations, he points out, were outgrown by McCarthy’s translation which “reads better and gives a more fair reflection of al-Ghazālī’s life than do previous versions” (*ibid*). But McCarthy’s translation, Abūlaylah continues, is not as good as it should be, hence the necessity to undertake a new translation of *Munqidh* in English. Abūlaylah’s translation is presented within this “romance” narration as being the natural conclusion of a long process of translating and retranslating *Munqidh* in English and as the peak of the linear development of this text.

It is significant that Watt does not say that his translation was undertaken to improve on Field’s translation. Watt, as shown previously, does not even mention the first translation of *Munqidh* at all, and there is no point in comparing his translation to Field’s given the simple fact that Field’s

translation is incomplete. McCarthy, on the other hand, did not criticize Watt's translation as being defective or inaccurate in any essential sense. It is also significant that Abūlaylah describes Field's translation as a translation that "reads well for the most part, but could be more faithful and precise" (18) without noticing that Field did not translate two chapters of *Munqidh*.

Abūlaylah relates the history of the English translation of *Munqidh* as if it was the life of the translators and not as a type of storytelling that he borrows from the arts and imposes on particular events. In doing this, he behaves like a story-teller who organizes events as if they were leading up to an actual conclusion (the promotion of his own translation of *Munqidh*).

By the time Abūlaylah's new translation of *Munqidh* was published, McCarthy's translation was not only the newest translation of this text in English, but also the most common and acclaimed translation in this language. It could also be assumed that it was the most common translation in the American market because it was published and re-published for this market several times (1980, 1999, 2000). Abūlaylah was aware of this, and to establish his new translation in the same language, he created a romantic historiographical narration in which his translation is presented as the perfect translation in a long process of improvements on the translation of this text in English. This narration enables Abūlaylah, on one hand, to launch criticism on McCarthy's translation, and at the same time to justify working closely with it in his preparation for a new translation of *Munqidh*. This is because within this narration McCarthy's translation is presented as being superior to Field's and Watt's translations, but inferior to the new translation by Abūlaylah. The self-serving and self-presenting image and role created by the translator through this romantic narrative is succinctly described by Koskinen and Paloposki:

In the story of retranslation, the first translator is the 'bad' guy, who is, however, often generously regarded as having tried his best but who was unable to produce anything with lasting value. The *retranslator*, in turn, is the hero: the modern, well-read, balanced and cultured translator who 'finally' gives the readers the unbiased, faultless, faithful rendering of the original. (2015: 29)

Abūlaylah points out that McCarthy's translation is "still not perfect". The truth-value of this claim will depend on what he means by 'perfection' in translation, for it is widely held in

Translation Studies that no translation is ever perfect not only because of the differences between languages and cultures, but also, and more importantly, because a translator's decisions in translation are always shaped by particular interpretations (ideas, values, and interests) in the target language including how notions such as a 'good' or 'perfect' translation are defined and understood. This means that perfection in translation, and perhaps in other human activities as well, should always be conceived in relative terms.

However, Abūlaylah mentions specific points which he considers as 'defects' in McCarthy's translation. For example, he criticizes McCarthy's introduction to his translation of *Munqidh* because it is longer than the translated text itself. He also criticizes the notes McCarthy writes within his translation of *Munqidh* as occasionally being "too bulky, incorporating irrelevant material, and addressing the general reader rather than the specialist" (18-19). Whether these critical remarks are well-justified will depend on whether one shares Abūlaylah's presumptions and criteria. For example, those who found McCarthy's introduction and notes to his translation of *Munqidh* 'classic' and 'useful' (see section (6.4.5) in this chapter) would find the first two critical remarks by Abūlaylah unjustified.

In addition to this, Abūlaylah points out that on several occasions McCarthy failed to identify al-Ghazālī's sources, and that he occasionally confuses his reader when he refers to the authority of a certain hadith (*ibid*: 19), but he does not give examples to support this claim.

He also points out that McCarthy mistranslates a hadith (a tradition attributed to the Prophet) in *Munqidh*, but when we compare his translation of this hadith to that found in McCarthy's translation, we discover that both are full and accurate. The hadith occurs in the Ṣalībah and 'Ayyād edition of *Munqidh* in this form: "ستفترق أمتي ثلاثا وسبعين فرقة الناجية منها واحدة". Abūlaylah translates this hadith as "My nation will divide into seventy three sects- and only one of them will be saved" (*ibid*: 61-2), whereas McCarthy translated it as "My Community will split into seventy-odd sects, of which one will be saved". The only difference of these two translations lies in the translation of the phrase ثلاثا وسبعين (seventy three). But this phrase only occurs in one of the readings of this hadith, because in others the number of sects is not precisely determined. Thus, in one of the readings of this hadith we read تفترق أمتي نيفا وسبعين، واحدة منها هي الناجية. Perhaps this is what McCarthy found in the manuscript of *Munqidh* on which he based his translation. If

this is the case, McCarthy's translation of the phrase **نيفا وسبعين** (literally means seventy plus an indeterminate few) as 'seventy-odd' is accurate, and Abūlaylah's criticism becomes baseless.

As stated in a previous section, McCarthy justifies his translation by referring, among other things, to a new manuscript of *Munqidh* which dates back to five years after al-Ghazālī's death. Abūlaylah, motivated by establishing his own translation in the field of the translation of *Munqidh* in English, downplays this justification by pointing out that "McCarthy is fully aware that there is no serious difference between this early manuscript and the one used by previous translators (*ibid*: 18).

In addition to the use of the previous strategies to undermine McCarthy's translation, Abūlaylah uses religion to promote his own translation, pointing out that this translation, that is his translation, is "the first by a Muslim who stands very close to al-Ghazālī's personality and spirit" (*ibid*: 29). The fact that Abūlaylah's translation of *Munqidh* is the first by a Muslim is true, but this 'fact' is used to serve the translator's own agenda, that is, to promote his translation as being 'faithful' to the source text and its author in terms of the alleged privileged access that he has to the source text and its author because of his religious background.

Probably feeling that the justifications he uses to undertake a new translation of *Munqidh* are not sufficient reason for a retranslation of the text, Abūlaylah states that:

We therefore intend to introduce our own translation, feeling that it is needed and will prove useful. *I will not try to justify* this decision, beyond saying that *Allah directed me to produce this translation* which is directed wholly and sincerely to Him. (*ibid*, italic added)

This remark shows how difficult the justification of a new translation of a given text is when the existing translations are still regarded as 'proper' and 'reliable'. It also clearly shows that Abūlaylah's decision to undertake a new translation of *Munqidh* in English was his own. His statement that "I will not try to justify this decision, beyond saying that Allah directed me to produce this translation" disguises his agenda to invest in the success that *Munqidh* has achieved in the target language, and the competition between his own translation and the previous translations over the 'proper' representation of the source text in English.

To increase the acceptability of Abūlaylah's version, three patrons, including UNESCO, commissioned his translation. In addition, his translation was published with a new critical edition of *Munqidh* in Arabic, which was prepared by the translator and his wife, Dr. Nurshīf Rifʿat, and a professor of religious studies in the United States and the chair of *Council for Research in Values and Philosophy*, George McLean, was invited to write an introduction for this English translation.

6.5.3 General Features of Abūlaylah's Translation

Abūlaylah published his translation of *Munqidh* in English under the title *Al-Ghazālī's Deliverance from Error and Mystical Union with the Almighty, Al-Munqidh min Al-Ḍalāl*. The text was published by the *Council for Research in Values and Philosophy* with the support of both the *International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Sciences* and UNESCO. This also shows the extent of success the text has achieved in English to receive patronage from these academic institutions in the United States and from an international institution such as UNESCO.

Abūlaylah's translation comes with two introductions, by the translator and the editor, Professor George McLean, which equals the translated text in length (the two introductions are comprised of nearly sixty pages and the translated text is also approximately sixty pages long). The translation also comes with notes that are mainly produced by the editor and relegated to the end of the text. These notes, about two hundred and twenty seven of them, are mainly explanatory, focusing largely on the meaning of technical terms in the source text. They serve not only to provide a perspective or background for understanding the source text by those who are not experts in al-Ghazālī's philosophy and Islamic ideology in general, but also as an indirect means to support the way these terms are translated by Abūlaylah. The explanatory notes are largely taken from McCarthy's translation, although some notes, especially those which refer to specific traditions of the Prophet into their authentic sources, are compiled by Abūlaylah himself. Of the two hundred and twenty seven notes, only one note is relevant to translation.

Abūlaylah's translation is, generally speaking, less literal than McCarthy's translation. He shows less respect for the form of the source text than McCarthy, and less respect for the nuanced meanings included in the source text.

Although the paratextual visibility of the translator in both McCarthy's and Abūlaylah's translations is evidently superior to that found in Watt's and Field's translations, due to the long introduction and extensive notes the former translators added to their versions, Abūlaylāh's translation is a backward step in this regard, because the notes he dedicates to translational issues in two hundred and twenty seven endnotes are few in comparison to those notes found in McCarthy's translation which includes more than a hundred notes. This also sheds doubt on the applicability of the Retranslation Hypothesis when it comes to the visibility or presence of the translator in the paratextual materials of translation.

6.5.4 The Images of Al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh*

In his introduction to *Munqidh*, Abūlaylah creates two major images of al-Ghazālī. The first is that which is dominant in Western scholarship, where al-Ghazālī is portrayed as a seeker for truth whose search for certain knowledge of the true nature of things led him to Sufism. The second image created is that of al-Ghazālī as a reformer. Although both of these images can be rooted more or less in al-Ghazālī's life and work, they are the product of how modern readers, Western and non-Western, tend to view him.

According to Abūlaylah, al-Ghazālī is an original, independent-minded thinker who sees doubt and independent thought as a virtue and who rejects blind following of others, considering it as one of the diseases of the community:

Al-Ghazālī was familiar with the causes of the confusion and error that had befallen the nation. He says that most of the mistakes of the thinkers of his day came from believing what they had heard and were familiar with from childhood, having received it from their fathers, teachers and people regarded as virtuous. Al-Ghazālī had come to doubt what he had been told, and he urges others to doubt, as the reader of the present work [*Munqidh*] will find. (*ibid*: 4).

This is, of course, one of the most dominant Western and Arabic images of al-Ghazālī as has been seen in the previous translations of *Munqidh* by Field, Watt, and McCarthy respectively. It sways Westerners because it 'rings true' with modern critical thought and

the emphasis on ‘truth’ and ‘doubt’. Related to this image is that of al-Ghazālī as a real, mystical figure whose adoption of Sufism transforms his personality and thought (*ibid*: 11).

The second image that Abūlaylah creates of al-Ghazālī is that of a reformer who becomes sick of the hard times he lived in, political instabilities, theological and sectarian divisions and struggles, and the corruption of religious scholars from all sects:

Great reformers have their sicknesses and sorrows, not because of their own state of health, but because the state of their nation drags them down and makes them feel ill. Their illnesses come from the social, moral and behavioral sicknesses of their society, from the sickbed of the nation, when it strays from the right path. (*ibid*: 2)

But this image is hardly justified by the data of *Munqidh* and the facts known about al-Ghazālī. For it has already been shown that al-Ghazālī’s crisis was caused by his involvement in worldly attachments, mainly political, and his feeling that he was teaching sciences (legal and theological disputes) that were not conducive to those who seek peace of the soul and salvation in the Hereafter. Al-Ghazālī presents himself as a reformer only in the last chapter of *Munqidh*, probably to justify his return to teaching and to answer accusations against him that he deviated from orthodox Islam and adopted philosophical views (see sections (5.4.10) and (5.5) of chapter five of this study). Abūlaylah’s notion of ‘the reformer’ who criticizes the existing situation in a given society and who paves the way for radical reform in religious and non-religious affairs on the basis of a true understanding of religion is a major theme in modern Islamic ideology as exemplified in the work of those in the Muslim world who belong to the modern Islamic movement. Abūlaylah’s background is rooted in modern Islamic thought, and the image of al-Ghazālī as a reformer belongs to contemporary thought more than to al-Ghazālī’s work and setting. The notion of great thinkers who are at the same time great reformers of their societies is also a very common notion in modern Western thought.

With regard to *Munqidh*, Abūlaylah’s presentation of this text agrees with the dominant interpretation of the book as being a truthful description of the life and times of al-Ghazālī. Like other Western researchers, the text is seen as a great source of knowledge of al-

Ghazālī and his time, hence the translator’s defence of the accuracy and sincerity of *Munqidh* (*ibid*: 7-8).

McLean, the editor of the series in which Abūlaylah’s translation of *Munqidh* appears, also wrote an introduction to Abūlaylah’s translation of *Munqidh*. He argues that *Munqidh* is centred on al-Ghazālī’s character and the context of his conversion to Sufism in 1093/1094, and that “all else was chosen and ordered precisely by al-Ghazālī to explain his conversion and the new dimension of knowledge which was opened to him by the Sufi Way” (32-3). *Munqidh* is described by McLean as a “semi autobiographical text” and “a tour of the intellectual horizons of the day” which leads al-Ghazālī to the way of the Sufi, presented in the book as being the best of all ways because it satisfied his search for a life that distinctively combines theory and practice and moves him beyond “speculation to a higher level of experience” (*ibid*: 33). It is “a personal testimony” that calls to mind Augustine’s *Confessions*, Descartes’ *Discourse on Method*, and Newman’s *Apologia pro vita sua*, but because of its complex intellectual structure and purpose it could be considered one of the most important texts in the world (*ibid*: 36). For McLean, *Munqidh* is an important text because of the message it carries to Muslims and, more importantly, to modern Western readers:

Commonly it is noted, however, that in modern times attention to reason has degenerated into rationalism, accompanied by a desiccating lack of adequate attention to the life of the spirit. Indeed, the triumphs of rationalism in the 20th century have been characterized by an oppressive totalitarianism and a deadening consumerism. These deficiencies of rationalism call for Ghazālī’s clear proclamation of the distinctive character of the spirit, and of the Way which leads thereto. Healing our times must begin with the Spirit and the Way, for only in their higher light can we face the unfinished task of working out the relation of reason to the fullness of the human spirit. (*ibid*: 55-56)

This quotation from McLean agrees with McCarthy’s reasons for showing great interest in al-Ghazālī’s life and work. For both, this Muslim thinker and his life is a great source of

spirituality that can be used to deal with the maladies of rationalism and materialism that are dominant in modern Western philosophy.

These common interpretations of al-Ghazālī and his *Munqidh* are adopted by Abūlaylah and McLean despite the fact that since the 1990s serious doubt has been thrown on these dominant images in Western scholarship, especially in Garden's work (2005, 2011) (for more details see section (5.5) of chapter five of this study).

6.5.5 Reception of Abūlaylah's translation

To the best of my knowledge, Abūlaylah's translation has not been reviewed by any English researchers and thus, it is difficult to assess how it was received in this language. It could be said that this translation has been ignored in English since its publication in 2001. One reason for this is the fact that Watt's and McCarthy's translations were received very well in English and are still widely used in secondary literature in this language. It could also be argued that the new translation by Abūlaylah was seen as an unnecessary effort in light of the existence of Watt's and McCarthy's translations which were, and still are, seen as the most accurate translations of *Munqidh*. This is something that is evident in the following remark made by a specialist in al-Ghazālī's philosophy:

In lieu of translating the same texts over and over again, one wonders why more efforts are not made to break new ground. How many translations are needed of Ibn Ṭufayl's *Ḥayy b. Yaqzān*, or al-Ghazālī's *Munqidh min al-ḍalāl*, while many of al-Ghazālī's other philosophical texts await such scholarly attention. (Hozien, 2009: 104)

But Abūlaylah's translation and Hozien's critical remark did not prevent Muhtar Holland from undertaking a new translation of *Munqidh* in English. The following section gives an account of Holland's new translation.

6.6 Holland Translation (2011)

The fifth translation of *Munqidh* into English appeared in 2011 by the translator Muhtar Holland. This section introduces his translation by giving the reader an idea about the translator, how he

came to translate *Munqidh*, the context of his translation including the motivations he might have had for undertaking a retranslation and its general features.

6.6.1 The Translator

Muhtar Holland was born in 1935, in the ancient city of Durham in the North East of England. The name ‘Muhtar Holland’ was given to him only in 1969, after his conversion to Islam. He studied Arabic and Turkish at Balliol College, Oxford, and travelled several times to both Turkey and Syria, probably to deepen his knowledge of Arabic and Islamic culture. Following his graduation from Oxford University, Holland taught Arabic and Islamic studies at different universities including the University of Toronto in Canada and the School of Oriental and African Studies in the University of London in England. He also worked as a Senior Research Fellow at the Islamic Foundation in Leicester, England, and as Director of the *Nur al-Islam Translation Centre* in Valley Cottage, New York. According to Al-Bazz’s website, Muhtar’s freelance activities have mostly been devoted to writing and translating in various parts of the world, including Scotland and California. He translated several works from classical and modern Arabic into English in different subjects, mainly religious and mystical texts (<http://www.al-baz.com/translator.shtml>).

His interest in al-Ghazālī is clear from his translations of selections from al-Ghazālī’s great work *’Iḥyā’*. These selections were published in three separate books in English with the titles: *The Duties of Brotherhood in Islam* (1980), *Inner Dimensions of Worship in Islam* (1983), and *The Proper Conduct of Marriage in Islam* (1998), as well as his translation of *Munqidh* which he produced in 2010, one year before his death.

6.6.2 Background for Holland’s Translation

Holland’s translation can be understood better if seen through the emergence and increasing involvement of Western Muslim converts during the last few decades As Lofti (2002) points out:

Three distinct groups, each of its own goals and tradition, concern themselves with translating Islamic texts into European languages. The first and oldest tradition is represented by Orientalists, the second by the various Muslim countries who

launched translation programs designed to advance their own religious and political agendas, and the third, and more recent, by immigrants and Muslims living in America and England. (15)

The religious and evangelical agenda behind the translation of Islamic texts by converted Muslims, particularly into an international language such as English, is illustrated by Lofti who points out that:

Muslims are using a number of languages in addition to the Arabic to call to Islam and are themselves engaged in the translation of Islamic texts into English, which is the language increasingly used by the diaspora Muslims and International Muslim organizations as a means of communication. (*ibid*: 15)

Translations of this kind are based on the premise that English has already become an Islamic language and that “Islamicized English” will play an important role in the “Islamicization of knowledge” called for by a number of Muslim intellectuals in America and around the world” (*ibid*: 16). It is within this context that one can situate Holland’s translation in general and his translation of *Munqidh* in particular.

The publishing house through which Holland’s translation of *Munqidh* appeared is called *al-baz*. It was established in Florida in 1992 and is almost wholly dedicated to publishing Islamic texts, mainly Sufi texts which are translated from classical Arabic into English (see: <http://www.al-baz.com/aboutus.shtml>). It is one of a considerable number of Islamic publishing houses which emerged in the West, particularly the United States and Britain, in the 1990s (Roald, 2004: 179).

6.6.3 Holland’s Translation: Motivations and Features

The new translation of *Munqidh* by Holland comes with only a two page preface by the publisher. This could be seen as a strong indication of the decisive role of the publisher in the selection of this text for retranslation. To this one can add the fact that the new translation is not significantly different to the previous translations of the text and that no new reading of the text is given in the paratextual materials of the translation, possibly indicating that the new translation is motivated by economic or commercial motivations.

The publisher's preface of the new translation is significant in many ways. Firstly, the publisher remarks that that text was translated by Richard McCarthy, thus ignoring the most recent translation of the same text by Abūlaylah which was also mainly translated for the American market. The publisher also points out that in spite of the existence of McCarthy's translation, the new translation by Holland "would find a warm welcome from the many that have enjoyed brother Muhtar's translations down the year" (*Munqidh*, Holland: vi). What characterizes Holland's translation, the publisher claims, is that his translation reads as if it was the original. His style of translation is "transparent as a pane of glass- it was as if, when reading one of the many works that he translated, the reader felt addressed directly by the original author" (*ibid*: v). These concepts of translation as being a mere channel for communicating the original text intact and unchanged, and the image of the translator as an invisible actor agree with what Venuti, among others, elaborates on and criticizes in his work as being part of the ideology of 'fluency' or 'invisibility' of translation into the Anglo-American world (see chapter two of this study, section (2.5.2)). However, these images are so strong that one can assume that the publisher of Holland's translation uses them as a means to promote the new translation, benefiting from the dominance of the illusion of transparency in the West, i.e. the illusion that the target reader is reading the source text rather than one translation of many translations of the same text, and that the translator does not in fact exist. It is in the interest of the publisher, as Venuti points out, to focus on easily read translations as their readability makes them more consumable on the book market (1995: 15). It is also commonly held that publishing houses tend to "praise the modernity of the new translation for marketing reasons" (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015: 27).

Although the publisher's praise of the translator can be seen as a sort of recognition of the translator's work, it is, paradoxically, the absence of the translator that the publisher emphasizes.

Like Watt's, McCarthy's, and Abūlaylah's translations, Holland's is a close translation that is literal but cast in idiomatic English. There are four important features of Holland's translation that can be highlighted here. The first is that his translation of the title of *Munqidh* as "Savior from Error" is probably the most accurate translation of the title of this text into English. This translation agrees with the new reading of *Munqidh*, where the book itself or its author is taken to be the "deliverer" or 'saviour' of the title" (see chapter five of this study, section 5.5 for more

details). The second feature is his tendency to insert English transliterations of Arabic words and phrases within the text itself, probably to give more clarification or to create a foreign flavour in translation. The third feature is his translation of the key Arabic term **الله** as *Allah*, something that many Muslims in the West and in the Muslim world would approve of from a religious point of view. The translator also tends to separate the verses and traditions of the Prophet cited by al-Ghazālī from other paragraphs in the translated text, probably for religious reasons, to show respect for these sacred texts. Finally, the translator leaves two large paragraphs of the source text without translation, which is a serious ‘defect’ in a short text such as *Munqidh* (see *Munqidh*, Holland: 30).

Holland’s translation only comes with two pages of introduction and without notes on the translated text. The visibility of the translator in this translation cannot be compared to that of McCarthy’s and Abūlaylah’s translation, which throws serious doubt on the applicability of the Retranslation Hypothesis in this regard.

6.6.4 How Al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh* are Presented

The publisher of Holland’s translation adopts commonly held images and interpretations of al-Ghazālī and his *Munqidh* in English. He points out that the text is best read as a treatise in which al-Ghazālī reviews and criticizes dominant contemporary ideology, and as a personal testimony of his conversion and the light of certain knowledge that he lived by (*ibid*: v).

6.6.5 Conclusion of Chapter Six

So far, this chapter has shown that the translation and retranslation of *Munqidh* is better seen in its broader socio-cultural, historical, and political context. A major motivating factor that seems to have influenced the decision of choosing this text to be translated and retranslated into English as well as the methods used in translating it, is the academic institution in which the text was housed, particularly Western scholarship on Arabic and Islamic studies in general and al-Ghazālī’s philosophy and work in particular. Another major motivating factor is the religious background of the translators of *Munqidh* which must have played a role in choosing the text to be translated and retranslated into English, as well as how the text and its author are presented in the target language. The five English translations of the text represent in some ways a dominant

interpretation in the West according to which Sufi texts, figures and literature are appraised as being “the better side of Islam which should be fostered in order to modernise the common religion of Islam” (Klinkhammer, *ibid*: 209).

It could also be said in conclusion that the translators’ personal appreciation of the source text is probably the most important motivation behind selecting the text to be translated and retranslated into English. However, other factors such as the success the text achieved in English as well as economic profit seem to play a role in this regard.

It is also shown that the paratextual materials published with the translations of Watt, McCarthy, Abūlaylah, and Holland, particularly the prefaces of translators, editors, and publishers, shape the translated text as they all require the translator to produce a translation that is at the same time accurate and readable, something that accords with the translations themselves. This explains the literal translation method and the emphasis on accuracy that the translators concerned themselves with. The higher status of al-Ghazālī’s autobiography in the United States and the United Kingdom may also have played a role in adopting this method of translation. The goal of the retranslations of *Munqidh* was to produce an accurate translation, through adherence to norms of semantic fidelity and of natural expression. The retranslators’ personal affinity with the source culture and source text writer and their linguistic and scholarly competence are strong contributory factors to the accuracy and idiomatic style of their retranslations of *Munqidh*.

Examining the translational notes that the translators Watt, McCarthy and Abūlaylah added to their translations of *Munqidh* shows that they focus almost completely on issues of accuracy, that is, on the rendition of the conceptual content of the source text as close as possible. This is no surprising fact given the informative nature of the source text.

The chapter also shows that the translation and retranslation of *Munqidh* was dictated by interests that are distant from the content of the original text in its historical, social, and literary and linguistic framework. Thus, the author’s intended meaning of *Munqidh* is augmented by an extra value that is added by the agency of translation in English (translators, editors, publishers), which lends it an orientation that is not necessarily related to the original text intention. For example, it is shown that the text was used in English to construct a local discourse about al-

Ghazālī and his philosophy in the English-speaking world, and to promote ‘spirituality’ and a tolerant image of Islam in the face of contemporary concerns in the West. The way the text is presented in the paratextual materials also reflects the development of Islamic Studies in the West in the 20th century. Thus, the text is carefully studied and placed within the history of ideas in general and the cultural history of Islam in particular.

The selection of *Munqidh* to be translated and retranslated five times into the same language, with the images of al-Ghazali as a seeker for truth who found his way in Sufism or mysticism that the translators constructed about it, must have played a role in emphasizing these images in the West. For, as argued previously in this study, the texts chosen from the dominant culture to be translated in the dominating culture are those which help to create a desired image that accords with dominant images in the translating culture (see section 2.5 of chapter two of this study).

The chapter also shows that the Retranslation Hypothesis is not confirmed by the data of *Munqidh* in light of the visibility of the translator. The visibility of the translator, which reaches its peak in McCarthy’s and Abūlaylah’s translations, significantly falls with the publication of Holland’s translation which comes with only two pages of introduction by the publisher and with no notes on the translated text.

CHAPTER SEVEN: RETRANSLATION HYPOTHESIS, CLOSENESS AND LITERALISM

In chapter six of this study, the Retranslation Hypothesis was tested with reference to the visibility of the translator. In this chapter the same hypothesis will be tested with reference to literalism and/or closeness in translation. In other words, this chapter aims to show to what extent each new translation of *Munqidh* became more literal and closer to the source text than previous translation(s) of the same text.

The chapter examines the translation of ten texts that are randomly chosen from different points of the source text. The sequence of this chapter is the same as that of chapter seven, where the work of each translator is compared with that of his immediate predecessor.

This chapter is divided into three sections. Section one is a general account of the whole chapter. Section two contains the data analysis of the chapter. Section three interprets and discusses results taken from section two. It compares all five translators together, in terms of the way they all translated the 10 texts that are taken from *Munqidh*.

7.1 Overview

In chapter seven of this study, the Retranslation Hypothesis was shown not to be confirmed by the paratextual materials of the English translations of *Munqidh*. In this chapter the same hypothesis will be examined with reference to the translated texts themselves. The chapter aims to show to what extent each new translation of *Munqidh* became more literal and closer to the source text than the previous translation of the same text. In other words, it aims to show whether there is a linear development toward literalism and accuracy in these retranslations as the Retranslation Hypothesis posits (see section (4.2.1) of chapter three of this study for more details).

To examine whether the English translations of *Munqidh* tend toward source-oriented translation and/or literalism in translation, and whether they adhere to or deviate from the Retranslation Hypothesis, this chapter compares the work of the translators of *Munqidh* in dealing with 10 short texts which are randomly taken from different points of the source text and reflect different facets of it. Each new translation will be compared with the previous translation with reference to

those chosen texts. The structure of this chapter would be useful because it will enable the reader to see how the work of each translator differed from that of his immediate predecessor, and how this, in turn, bears on the Retranslation Hypothesis.

The ten texts chosen from *Munqidh* are given in this section with a literal translation of each text, which was developed on the basis of the source text and the existing translations of the text in English. The literal translation of these texts, given in section (7.2.1), will be a starting point for the analysis of how these same texts were translated by Field, Watt, McCarthy, Abūlaylah and Holland respectively, i.e. to what extent each new translation became less/more literal and closer to the source text than the previous translation.

7.2 Data of This Chapter

7.2.1 Example (1)

فقد سألتني أيها الأخ في الدين، أن أبثّ إليك غاية العلوم وأسرارها، وغائلة المذاهب وأغوارها، وأحكي لك ما قاسيته في استخلاص الحق من بين اضطراب الفرق، مع تباين المسالك والطرق، وما استجرات عليه من الارتفاع عن حضيض التقليد، إلى يفاع الاستبصار. وما استفدته أولاً من علم الكلام، وما اجتَوَيْتَه ثانياً من طرق أهل التعليم القاصرين أدرك الحق على تقليد الإمام، وما ازدريته ثالثاً من طرق التفلسف، وما ارتضيته آخراً من طريقة التصوف، وما انجلى لي في تضاعيف تفتيشي عن أقاويل الخلق، من لباب الحق، وما صرفني عن نشر العلم ببغداد، مع كثرة الطلبة، وما دعاني إلى معاودته بنيسابور بعد طول المدة (المنقذ: 61).

You have asked me, my brother in religion, to convey to you the aim of the sciences and their secrets, and the evil and depths of creeds, and to relate to you what I have endured in extracting truth from the chaos of sects, with [their] differing routes and paths, and how I have dared to rise from the lowest levels of conformity to the summit of insight, [you have asked me to relate to you] what I gleaned, first, from theology, what I disliked, second, about the methods of the people of education, who confine the apprehension of truth to imitating the imam; what I rejected, third, of the methods of philosophizing; and what pleased me, finally, of the way of Sufism. [You have asked me] about what became clear to me in the course of my investigation into the doctrines of human beings, what diverted me from the spread of knowledge in Baghdad despite the large number of students, and what motivated me to resume teaching in Nisāpūr after a long period.

7.2.2 Example (2)

فابتدرت لإجابتك إلى مطلبك، بعد الوقوف على صدق رغبتك، وقلت مستعيناً بالله ومتوكلاً عليه، ومستوثقاً منه، وملتجئاً إليه:
اعلموا -أحسن الله (تعالى) إرشادكم، وألأنَّ للحق قيادكم- أن اختلاف الخلق في الأديان والملل، ثم اختلاف الأئمة في المذاهب،
على كثرة الفرق وتباين الطرق، بحر عميق غرق فيه الأكثرون، وما نجا منه إلا الأقلون، وكل فريق يزعم أنه الناجي، و((كلُّ
حزبٍ بما لديهم فرحون)) (الروم: 32) هو الذي وعدنا به سيد المرسلين، صلوات الله عليه، وهو الصادق الصدوق. (المنقذ:
61)

I will hasten to answer your request, after confirming the sincerity of your desire. I say, while seeking help from God, and placing my trust in Him, and imploring His favour, and having recourse to Him: know then, may God Almighty guide you and gently lead you towards the truth, that the diversity among people in religions and sects, with the multiplicity of sects and ways, is a deep sea in which many have drowned and from which only a few have been saved. Each faction alleges that it is saved, and “each rejoicing in what it had” [Qur’an, 23: 53, Khan’s translation, 1925: 259]. This was predicted by the chief of the Messengers (the blessings of God be upon him) who is truthful and trustworthy [...].

7.2.3 Example (3)

وقد كان التعطش إلى درك حقائق الأمور دأبي وديني من أول أمري وربيعان عمري، غريزة وفطرة من الله وضعتا في جيلتي،
لا باختيارٍ وحيلتي، حتى انحلت عني رابطة التقليد وانكسرت علي العقائد الموروثة على قرب عهد سن الصبا. (المنقذ: 63).

The thirst for apprehending the reality of things has been my preoccupation and habit from my early years and in the prime of my life. It is an instinct and disposition from God, placed within my being, not of my choice and invention. Hence, the bonds of conformity fell away from me and my inherited beliefs were shattered on me, when I was just a boy.

7.2.4 Example (4)

فعلمت أن رد المذهب قبل فهمه والإطلاع على كنهه رمى في عماية، فشمردت عن ساق الجد، في تحصيل ذلك العلم من الكتب،
بمجرد المطالعة من غير استعانة بأستاذ، وأقبلت على ذلك في أوقات فراغي من التصنيف والتدريس في العلوم الشرعية، وأنا
ممنو بالتدريس والإفادة لثلاثمائة نفر من الطلبة ببغداد. (المنقذ: 74).

I knew that refuting a creed before understanding it and knowing its underlying nature was like shooting in darkness. Therefore, I buckled myself¹ to acquire that science from books, simply by reading without the help of an instructor. I did so during my free time, [when I was not] engaged in writing and teaching the religious sciences, and [when] I was burdened with teaching and advising three hundred students in Baghdad.

7.2.5 Example (5)

فهذه آفة عظيمة لأجلها يجب زجر كل من يخوض في تلك العلوم، فإنها وإن لم تتعلق بأمر الدين، ولكن لما كانت من مبادئ علومهم، سرى إليه شرهم وشؤمهم، فقل من يخوض فيها إلا وينخلع من الدين وينحل عن رأسه لجام التقوى. (المنقذ: 80).

This is a great evil. Because of it, everyone ought to be restrained from delving into these sciences. Even though these [sciences] are not concerned with the domain of religion, they are among the primary elements of their sciences [philosophers' sciences], [and anyone who delves into them] will be affected by the evil and mischief of them [the philosophers]. It is rare that one delves into them without being stripped off his religion and without the bridle of fearing God falling away from his head.

7.2.6 Example (6)

ولقد كان في عصرهم، بل في كل عصر، جماعة من المتأهلين، لا يُخلى الله [سبحانه] العالم عنهم، فإنهم أوتاد الأرض، ببركاتهم تنزل الرحمة على أهل الأرض كما ورد في الخبر حيث قال صلى الله عليه وسلم: ((بهم تمطرون وبهم ترزقون ومنهم كان أصحاب الكهف)). (المنقذ: 86).

There was in the age of them [the philosophers], as in every age, a group of godly men. Since God does not allow the world to be empty of them, for they are the pillars of the earth. By their blessings, mercy descends upon the people of the earth, as has been reported in the hadith. [The Prophet] (blessings be upon him): [says] “by them you are watered and by them you are blessed, and among them were the companions of the Cave.”

¹ The source text has the stock metaphor *شمرت عن ساق الجد*. The literal translation of it is “I uncovered the leg of diligence”, which makes no sense in English. This stock metaphor is used in Arabic to mean “I prepared myself to do something”. A stock metaphor such as ‘I buckled down to’ would be a faithful translation of the original, though not as literal as the original.

7.2.7 Example (7)

ولقد اعترض على بعض الكلمات الميثوثة في تصانيفنا في أسرار علوم الدين، طائفة من الذين لم تستحكم في العلوم سرائرهم، ولم تنفتح إلى أقصى غايات المذاهب بصائرهم، وزعمت أن تلك الكلمات من كلام الأوائل، مع أن بعضها من مولدات الخواطر - ولا يبعد أن يقع الحافر على الحافر - وبعضها يوجد في الكتب الشرعية، وأكثرها موجود معناه في كتب الصوفية. (المنقذ: 88).

Some have objected against some of the words set down in our works on the secrets of religious sciences. [These objections came from] a group of people whose hearts have not been grounded in the sciences and whose insight was not open to the ultimate aims of creeds. They have claimed that these words are taken from the discourse of the ancient [philosophers], even though some of them are the innovations of reflections, and it is not unlikely that ideas should coincide, just as a [horse's] hoof may match [another] hoof, while others are to be found in religious books, and the majority of these [thoughts] coincide in meaning with what is [found] in the works of the Sufis.

7.2.8 Example (8)

ثم إنني، لما فرغت من هذه العلوم، أقبلت بهمتي على طريق الصوفية وعلمت أن طريقهم إنما تتم بعلم وعمل؛ وكان حاصل علومهم قطع عقبات النفس. والتنزه عن أخلاقها المذمومة وصفاتها الخبيثة، حتى يتوصل (بها) إلى تخلية القلب عن غير الله وتحليته بذكر الله. (المنقذ: 100).

When I was done with these sciences, I turned eagerly to the way of Sufism and came to know that their way is realized by knowledge and work. The objective of their sciences is to cut off the obstacles found in the soul. They free the soul of blameworthy characteristics and malicious attributes in order to cleanse the heart of everything but God and adorn it with the remembrance of God.

7.2.9 Example (9)

وفي هذا الشهر جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار، إذ أقفل الله على لساني حتى اعتقل عن التدريس، فكنت أجاهد نفسي أن أدرس يوماً واحداً تطيبياً لقلوب المختلفة [إلي]، فكان لا ينطق لساني بكلمة [واحدة] ولا أستطيعها البتة. (المنقذ: 104).

In this month, the matter passed the domain of choice to compulsion. For, God locked up my tongue and I became incapable of teaching. I would struggle with myself to lecture for even one

day to satisfy the hearts of those around me, but my tongue would not utter a single word, and I would be completely incapable of doing so.

7.2.10 Example (10)

فأول ما يخلق في الإنسان حاسة اللمس، فيدرك بها أجناساً من الموجودات: كالحرارة، والبرودة، والرطوبة واليبوسة، واللين والخشونة، وغيرها. واللمس قاصر عن الألوان والأصوات قطعاً، بل هي كالمعدوم في حق اللمس. ثم تخلق له [حاسة] البصر، فيدرك بها الألوان والأشكال، وهو أوسع عوالم المحسوسات. (المنقذ: 110).

The first sense to be created in the human being is the sense of touch, by means of which he apprehends species of existents such as heat, coldness, wetness, dryness, softness, hardness, and so on. Touch is absolutely incapable of apprehending colours and sounds, which are as though nonexistent in relation to touch. Next, the sense of vision is created in the human being, which enables him to apprehend colours and shapes; and this is the most extensive of the worlds of the sensibles.

7.3 Compared Analysis: Field and Watt

In this section, the ten texts from *Munqidh* are analyzed with reference to the first and second translation of this text in English, that is, Field's and Watt's translation.

7.3.1 Example (1)

فقد سألتني أيها الأخ في الدين، أن أبثّ إليك غاية العلوم وأسرارها، وغائلة المذاهب وأغوارها، وأحكي لك ما قاسيته في استخلاص الحق من بين اضطراب الفرق، مع تباين المسالك والطرق، وما استجرات عليه من الارتفاع عن حضيض التقليد، إلى يفاح الاستبصار، وما استفدته أولاً من علم الكلام، وما اجتويته ثانياً من طرق أهل التعليم القاصرين لدرك الحق على تقليد الإمام، وما ازدريته ثالثاً من طرق التفلسف، وما ارتضيته آخراً من طريقة التصوف، وما انجلى لي في تضاعيف تفتيشي عن أقاويل الخلق، من لباب الحق، وما صرفني عن نشر العلم ببغداد، مع كثرة الطلبة، وما دعاني إلى معاودته بنيسابور بعد طول المدة (المنقذ: 61).

You have asked me, O brother in the faith, to expound the aim and the mysteries of religious sciences, the boundaries and depths of theological doctrines. You wish to know my experiences while disentangling truth lost in the medley of sects and divergencies of thought, and how I have dared to climb from the low levels of traditional belief to the topmost summit of assurance. You

desire to learn what I have borrowed, first of all from scholastic theology; and secondly from the method of the Ta'limites, who, in seeking truth, rest upon the authority of a leader; and why, thirdly, I have been led to reject philosophic systems; and finally, what I have accepted of the doctrine of the Sufis, and the sum total of truth which I have gathered in studying every variety of opinion. You ask me why, after resigning at Bagdad a teaching post which attracted a number of hearers, I have, long afterwards, accepted a similar one at Nishapur. (*Munqidh*, Field: 11).

You have asked me, my brother in religion, to show you the aims and inmost nature of the sciences and the perplexing depths of the religious systems. You have begged me to relate to you the difficulties I encountered in my attempt to extricate the truth from the confusion of contending sects and to distinguish the different ways and methods, and the venture I made in climbing from the plain of naive and second-hand belief (*taqlid*) to the peak of direct vision. You want me to describe, firstly what profit I derived from the science of theology (*kalam*), secondly, what I disapprove of in the methods of the party of *ta'lim* (authoritative instruction), who restrict the apprehension of truth to the blind following (*taqlid*) of the Imam, thirdly, what I rejected of the methods of philosophy, and lastly, what I approved in the Sufi way of life. You would know, too, what essential truths became clear to me in my manifold investigation into the doctrines held by men, why I gave up teaching in Baghdad although I had many students, and why I returned to it at Naysabur (Nishapur) after a long interval. I am proceeding to answer your request, for I recognise that your desire is genuine (*Munqidh*, Watt: 17-18).

7.3.1.1 Discussion of Example (1)

Field's translation of the word الأخ (literally, brother) as 'brother' is more literal than Watt's translation of the same word as 'my brother'. Watt's translation of الدين as 'religion' is more literal than Field's translation of the same word as 'faith' (faith is the literal translation of the Arabic word إيمان rather than دين which is more general in meaning than the English word 'faith'). The word إليك (literally, for you) in line one is omitted in Field's translation but maintained in Watt's. Field's translation of غاية العلوم وأسرارها as 'the aim and mysteries of sciences' is more literal than Watt's translation of the same phrase as 'the aims and inmost nature of the sciences'. First, the word غاية which is singular in Arabic is rendered by a singular word in English. Second, the word أسرار (literally, secrets) is rendered by Field into English by its direct

or dictionary meaning, ‘secrets’. In contrast, Watt renders the same word by using the expression ‘inmost nature’ which is not the literal meaning of the Arabic word.

Watt’s translates the phrase *غانلة المذاهب وأغوارها* (literally, the evil and depths of creeds) as ‘perplexing depths’, whereas Field’s translates the same phrase as ‘boundaries and depths of doctrines’. Watt’s translation of this phrase is more accurate because the negative connotations of the word *غانلة* (literally, evil) is lost in Field’s translation but preserved in Watt’s translation through the use of the adjective ‘perplexing’. In addition, Watt’s translation of the word *مذاهب* as ‘religious systems’ is more accurate than Field’s translation of the same term as ‘theological doctrines’, because the Arabic word refers to religious schools or systems in general rather than to theological schools or systems in particular. Similarly, Watt’s translation of the sentence *ما قاسيته* (literally, what I have endured) as ‘the difficulties I encountered’ is more literal and accurate translation than Field’s translation of the same sentence as “my experiences”. Moreover, the term *التقليد* is a key term in *Munqidh*. The literal meaning of this term is imitation. Technically speaking, it refers to holding a belief on the basis of imitation, that is, on the basis of what others believe and say. The term has negative connotation in *Munqidh* because believing on the basis of what others say or believe does not constitute true or certain knowledge and/or faith. Watt’s translation of this term as ‘naïve and second-hand belief’ communicates the negative connotation associated with the Arabic term, whereas Field’s translation of the same term as ‘traditional belief’ does not. The Arabic word *إمام* is accurately and literally rendered by Watt as ‘imam’, and less so by Field who translates it using the general word ‘leader’. The phrase *طرق التفلسف* (literally, ways of philosophizing) is translated by Watt as ‘the methods of philosophy’, and by Field as ‘philosophic systems’. The former translation is more literal than the latter.

To conclude, Watt’s translation of this text seems to be more literal and accurate than Field’s.

7.3.2 Example (2)

فابتدرت لإجابتك إلى مطلبك، بعد الوقوف على صدق رغبتك، وقلت مستعيناً بالله ومتوكلاً عليه، ومستوثقاً منه، وملتجئاً إليه: اعلموا- أحسن الله (تعالى) إرشادكم، وألآنَ للحق قيادكم- أن اختلاف الخلق في الأديان والملل، ثم اختلاف الأئمة في المذاهب، على كثرة الفرق وتباين الطرق، بحر عميق غرق فيه الأكثرون، وما نجا منه إلا الأقلون، وكل فريق يزعم أنه الناجي، و ((كلُّ حزبٍ بما لديهم فرحون)) (الروم: 32) (المنقذ: 61).

Know then, my brothers (may God direct you in the right way), that the diversity in beliefs and religions, and the variety of doctrines and sects which divide men, are like a deep ocean strewn with shipwrecks, from which very few escape safe and sound. Each sect, it is true, believes itself in possession of the truth and of salvation, "each party," as the Koran saith, "rejoices in its own creed "; but as the chief of the apostles, whose word is always truthful [...] (*Munqidh*, Field: 12).

I am proceeding to answer your request, for I recognise that your desire is genuine. In this I seek the help of God and trust in Him; I ask His succour and take refuge with Him. You must know- and may God most high perfect you in the right way and soften your hearts to receive the truth- that the different religious observances and religious communities of the human race and likewise the different theological systems of the religious leaders, with all the multiplicity of sects and variety of practices, constitute ocean depths in which the majority drown and only a minority reach safety. Each separate group thinks that it alone is saved, and 'each party is rejoicing in what they have' (Q. 23, 55; 30, 31). This is what was foretold by the prince of the Messengers (God bless him), who is true and trustworthy (*Munqidh*, Watt: 18).

7.3.2.1 Discussion of Example (2)

The sentence *والآن للحق قيادكم* (literally, and gently lead you towards the truth) is omitted from Field's translation, but maintained in Watt's translation. The word *الخلق* is omitted from Field's translation, but maintained in Watt's. The word *الأئمة* is translated by Watt as 'religious leaders' and by Field as 'men'. It is Watt's translation that is more literal and accurate in this context, because in the source text this word refers to 'religious leaders' in particular rather than to 'men' in general. The phrase *على كثرة الفرق وتباين الطرق* (literally, with the multiplicity of sects and ways) is omitted from Field's translation, but translated in Watt's. The metaphor *غرق فيه الأكثرون* (literally, many have drowned) is literally translated by Watt as 'in which the majority drown'. Field translated the same metaphor as 'strewn with shipwrecks', which is less literal than Watt's translation. The word *الناجي* (literally, saved) is literally translated by Watt as 'saved' and less so by Field who translates it as 'in possession of truth and salvation'. The phrase *صلوات الله عليه* is omitted from Field's translation, but maintained in Watt's.

Therefore, the analysis of example (2) shows clearly that Watt's translation is more literal and more accurate than that of Field.

7.3.3 Example (3)

وقد كان التعتش إلى درك حقائق الأمور دأبي وديني من أول أمري وريعان عمري، غريزة وفطرة من الله وضعتا في جيلتي، لا باختيارى وحيلى، حتى انحلت عني رابطة التقليد وانكسرت علي العقائد الموروثة على قرب عهد سن الصبا (المنقذ: 63).

The thirst for knowledge was innate in me from an early age; it was like a second nature implanted by God, without any will on my part. No sooner had I emerged from boyhood than I had already broken the fetters of tradition and freed myself from hereditary beliefs (*Munqidh*, Field: 13).

To thirst after comprehension of things as they really are was my habit and custom from a very early age. It was instinctive with me, a part of my God-given nature, a matter of temperament and not of my choice or contriving. Consequently as I drew near the age of adolescence the bonds of mere authority (*taqlid*) ceased to hold me and inherited beliefs lost their grip upon me (Watt, *Munqidh*: 19).

7.3.3.1 Discussion of Example (3)

The source text has three instances of semantic repetition. The first is دأبي وديني (literally, my preoccupation and habit), the second is غريزة وفطرة (literally, instinct and disposition) and حيلتي واختيارى (my choice or invention). These three instances are rendered by Field using only one word or phrase in English, whereas Watt rendered them using two different words and phrases in English. For example, for دأبي وديني Watt has 'my habit and custom', whereas Field has 'innate'.

In addition, Field changed the sentence order of حتى انحلت عني رابطة التقليد وانكسرت علي العقائد الموروثة whereas Watt maintained it as in the original.

There is no doubt that Watt's translation of this text seems to be more literal than Field's translation.

7.3.4 Example (4)

فعلمت أن رد المذهب قبل فهمه والإطلاع على كنهه رمى في عماية، فشمرت عن ساق الجد، في تحصيل ذلك العلم من الكتب، بمجرد المطالعة من غير استعانة بأستاذ، وأقبلت على ذلك في أوقات فراغي من التصنيف والتدريس في العلوم الشرعية، وأنا ممنو بالتدريس والإفادة لثلاثمائة نفر من الطلبة ببغداد. (المنقذ: 74).

Convinced that to dream of refuting a doctrine before having thoroughly comprehended it was like shooting at an object in the dark, I devoted myself zealously to the study of philosophy; but in books only and without the aid of a teacher. I gave up to this work all the leisure remaining from teaching and from composing works on law. There were then attending my lectures three hundred of the students of Bagdad (*Munqidh*, Field: 23-4).

I realized that to refute a system before understanding it and becoming acquainted with its depths is to act blindly. I therefore set out in all earnestness to acquire a knowledge of philosophy from books, by private study without the help of an instructor. I made progress towards this aim during my hours of free time after teaching in the religious sciences and writing, for at this period I was burdened with the teaching and instruction of three hundred students in Baghdad (*Munqidh*, Watt: 29).

7.3.4.1 Discussion of Example (4)

Watt's translation of the sentence علمت (literally, I knew) as "I realized" is more literal in translation than Field's translation of the same sentence as "convinced that". Field added the phrase "to dream of" to the first line of the target text which is not in the original. The text قبل فهمه والإطلاع على كنهه (literally, before understanding it and knowing its underlying nature) is translated by Watt as "understanding it and becoming acquainted with its depths", which is more literal than Field's translation of the same text as "before having thoroughly comprehended it". Finally, the sentence وأنا ممنو بالتدريس (literally, I was burdened with the teaching) is literally and accurately translated by Watt as 'I was burdened with the teaching', whereas Field translates it freely as 'There were then attending my class'. It is important to maintain the nuanced meaning of the word ممنو (literally, burdened) in this sentence, because it highlights how al-Ghazālī managed to study philosophy without an instructor and when he was burdened by teaching more than 300 students.

In conclusion, Watt's translation of this text seems to be more literal and more accurate than Field's.

7.3.5 Example (5)

فهذه آفة عظيمة لأجلها يجب زجر كل من يخوض في تلك العلوم، فإنها وإن لم تتعلق بأمر الدين، ولكن لما كانت من مبادئ علومهم، سرى إليه شرهم وشؤمهم، فقل من يخوض فيها إلا وينخلع من الدين وينحل عن رأسه لجام التقوى. (المنقذ: 80).

This is a serious evil, and for this reason those who study mathematics should be checked from going too far in their researches. For though far removed as it may be from the things of religion, this study, serving as it does as an introduction to the philosophic systems, casts over religion its malign influence. It is rarely that a man devotes himself to it without robbing himself of his faith and casting off the restraints of religion. (*Munqidh*, Field: 29)

This is a great drawback, and because of it those who devote themselves eagerly to the mathematical sciences ought to be restrained. Even if their subject-matter is not relevant to religion, yet, since they belong to the foundations of the philosophical sciences, the student is infected with the evil and corruption of the philosophers. Few there are who devote themselves to this study without being stripped of religion and having the bridle of godly fear removed from their heads. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 34).

7.3.5.1 Discussion of Example (5)

Watt's translation of علومهم (their [philosophical] sciences) as "philosophical sciences" is more literal than Field's translation of the same phrase as 'philosophic system'. Also, Watt literally translates the word مبادئ (literally, principles) as 'principles', whereas Field freely translates the same word as 'introduction'. Field mistranslated the prepositional phrase إليه, translating it as if it was a reference to 'religion', whereas in the original it refers to anyone who delves into studying mathematics' as Watt's translation rightly indicates. The metaphor وينحل عن رأسه لجام التقوى (literally, the bridle of fearing God falling away from his head) is translated by Field as 'casting off the restraints of religion' and Watt as 'having the bridle of godly fear removed from their heads'. Again, Watt's translation of this metaphor seems to be more literal and closer to the source text than Field's.

This example shows that Watt's translation is more literal and accurate translation than Field's.

7.3.6 Example (6)

ولقد كان في عصرهم، بل في كل عصر، جماعة من المتأهلين، لا يُخلِي الله [سبحانه] العالم عنهم، فإنهم أوتاد الأرض، ببركاتهم تنزل الرحمة على أهل الأرض كما ورد في الخبر حيث قال صلى الله عليه وسلم: ((بهم تمطرون وبهم ترزقون ومنهم كان أصحاب الكهف)) . (المنقذ: 86).

In the times of the philosophers, as at every other period, there existed some of these fervent mystics. God does not deprive this world of them, for they are its sustainers, and they draw down to it the blessings of heaven according to the tradition: "It is by them that you obtain rain, it is by them that you receive your subsistence." Such were "the Companions of the Cave," [...] (*Munqidh*, Field: 35).

Assuredly there was in the age of the philosophers, as indeed there is in every age, a group of those godly men, of whom God never denudes the world. They are the pillars of the earth, and by their blessings mercy comes down on the people of the earth, as we read in the Tradition where Muhammad (peace be upon him) says: `Through them you receive rain, through them you receive sustenance; of their number were the men of the Cave'. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 39).

7.3.6.1 Discussion of Example (6)

The preposition لقد at the beginning of this text is used to convey certainty. This is accurately conveyed by Watt who translates it as 'assuredly'. In contrast, this same preposition is not translated by Field. The word المتأهلين (literally, godly men) is accurately rendered by Watt as 'godly'. Field's translation of this word as 'mystic' is more specific in meaning than the original and could be confusing because the word متأهلين does not refer in the source text to Sufis or mystics in particular but rather to all those who devoted themselves wholly to God. The sentence فإنهم أوتاد الأرض (literally, they are the pillars of earth) is literally rendered by Watt as 'they are the pillars of earth'. Field translates it as 'they are its [the world] sustainers', which is an accurate translation, but not as literal as Watt's. Field omitted the phrase حيث قال صلى الله عليه وسلم in translation, whereas Watt maintained it. The tradition cited by al-Ghazali in the end of this text is divided into two separate parts in Field's translation, whereas Watt preserved its original format as in the source text.

In conclusion, Watt's translation of this text seems to be more literal and more accurate than Field's translation.

7.3.7 Example (7)

ولقد اعترض على بعض الكلمات الموثقة في تصانيفنا في أسرار علوم الدين، طائفة من الذين لم تستحكم في العلوم سرائرهم، ولم تنفتح إلى أقصى غايات المذاهب بصائرهم، وزعمت أن تلك الكلمات من كلام الأوائل، مع أن بعضها من مولدات الخواطر -ولا يبعد أن يقع الحافر على الحافر- وبعضها يوجد في الكتب الشرعية، وأكثرها موجود معناه في كتب الصوفية. (المنقذ: 88).

Some of the maxims found in my works regarding the mysteries of religion have met with objectors of an inferior rank in science, whose intellectual penetration is insufficient to fathom such depths. They assert that these maxims are borrowed from the ancient philosophers, whereas the truth is that they are the fruit of my own meditations, but as the proverb says, "Sandal follows the impress of sandal." Some of them are found in our books of religious law, but the greater part are derived from the writings of the Sufis. (*Munqidh*, Field: 37)

To some of the statements made in our published works on the principles of the religious sciences an objection has been raised by a group of men whose understanding has not fully grasped the sciences and whose insight has not penetrated to the fundamentals of the systems. They think that these statements are taken from the works of the ancient philosophers, whereas the fact is that some of them are the product of reflections which occurred to me independently-it is not improbable that one shoe should fall on another shoe-mark- while others come from the revealed Scriptures, and in the case of the majority the sense though perhaps not the actual words is found in the works of the mystics. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 41-42).

This example shows Watt's translation to be more literal and accurate translation than Field's.

7.3.7.1 Discussion of Example (7)

Field's translation of the word أسرار (literally, mysteries) as 'mysteries' is more literal in meaning than Watt's translation of the same term as 'principles'. The word طائفة (literally, group) is rendered by Watt as 'group' but omitted in Field's translation. Field translates مع أن بعضها من مولدات الخواطر (literally, some of them are innovations of reflections) as 'the truth is that

they are the fruit of my own meditations'. By the omission of the word بعض (some) in translation, Field misinterpreted al-Ghazālī's claim in this text. The latter claims that *some* of the statements that are found in his works are the innovations of different minds rather than *all* of them. Field replaced 'some' with 'all' in translation, and this resulted in changing the meaning of the source text. Watt's translation of this same text as 'some of them are the product of reflections' is accurate and more literal than Field's.

Comparing Field's and Watt's translation of this text, it could be argued that the latter is more literal and accurate than the former.

7.3.8 Example (8)

ثم إنني، لما فرغت من هذه العلوم، أقبلت بهمتي على طريق الصوفية وعلمت أن طريقهم إنما تتم بعلم وعمل؛ وكان حاصل علومهم قطع عقبات النفس. والتنزه عن أخلاقها المذمومة وصفاتها الخبيثة، حتى يتوصل (بها) إلى تخلية القلب عن غير الله (تعالى) وتخليته بذكر الله. (المنقذ: 100).

When I had finished my examination of these doctrines I applied myself to the study of Sufism I saw that in order to understand it thoroughly one must combine theory with practice. The aim which the Sufis set before them is as follows: To free the soul from the tyrannical yoke of the passions, to deliver it from its wrong inclinations and evil instincts, in order that in the purified heart there should only remain room for God and for the invocation of His holy name. (*Munqidh*, Field: 41)

When I had finished with these sciences, I next turned with set purpose to the method of mysticism (or Sufism). I knew that the complete mystic 'way' includes both intellectual belief and practical activity; the latter consists in getting rid of the obstacles in the self and in stripping off its base characteristics and vicious morals, so that the heart may attain to freedom from what is not God and to constant recollection of Him (*Munqidh*, Watt: 56).

7.3.8.1 Discussion of Example (8)

Watt translates the word العلوم as 'sciences', which is more literal translation than Field's translation of the same word as 'doctrines'. In fact, the word doctrine is not a precise translation of this word in this text because the context in which the word occurs leaves no doubt that it is

used to refer to philosophical sciences, as al-Ghazālī calls them in *Munqidh*, rather than to ‘doctrines’ in general as Field’s translation indicates. The reference to the ‘way’ of the Sufis or Sufism as a particular way is omitted in Field’s translation, but maintained in Watt’s. Watt translates the sentence قطع عقبات النفس as ‘getting rid of the obstacles in the self’. This translation is obviously more literal than Field’s translation of the same sentence as ‘free the soul from the tyrannical yoke of the passions’. The word ذكر (literally, remembrance) is translated by Watt as ‘recollection’ and by Field as ‘invocation’. It is the former that is a more literal translation.

In conclusion, this example shows that Watt’s translation is more literal and more accurate translation than Field’s.

7.3.9 Example (9)

وفي هذا الشهر جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار، إذ أقفل الله على لساني حتى اعتقل عن التدريس، فكنت أجاهد نفسي أن أدرس يوماً واحداً تطيبياً لقلوب المختلفة [إلي] ، فكان لا ينطق لساني بكلمة [واحدة] ولا أستطيعها البتة. (المنقذ: 104).

At the close of them my will yielded and I gave myself up to destiny. God caused an impediment to chain my tongue and prevented me from lecturing. Vainly I desired, in the interest of my pupils, to go on with my teaching, but my mouth became dumb. (*Munqidh*, Field: 45).

In that month the matter ceased to be one of choice and became one of compulsion. God caused my tongue to dry up so that I was prevented from lecturing. One particular day I would make an effort to lecture in order to gratify the hearts of my following, but my tongue would not utter a single word nor could I accomplish anything at all. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 60).

7.3.9.1 Discussion of Example (9)

The phrase وفي هذا الشهر (literally, in this month) is translated by Watt as ‘in that month’ and by Field as ‘at the close of them’. It is the former that is a more literal translation. The same applies to the translation of the sentence جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار (the matter passed the domain of choice to compulsion) which Watt literally translates as ‘the matter ceased to be one of choice and became one of compulsion’, and Field loosely translates as ‘my will yielded and I gave myself up to destiny’. Al-Ghazālī says in this text that when he was unable to lecture because of his sickness, he tried to do this even for a single day, but to no avail. The reference to ‘one day’

in this text is omitted in Field's translation, but maintained in Watt's. It could, thus, be argued that Watt's translation of this text is more literal and closer to the source text than that of Field.

7.3.10 Example (10)

فأول ما يخلق في الإنسان حاسة اللمس، فيدرك بها أجناساً من الموجودات: كالحرارة، والبرودة، والرطوبة واليبوسة، واللين والخشونة، وغيرها. واللمس قاصر عن الألوان والأصوات قطعاً، بل هي كالمعدوم في حق اللمس. ثم تخلق له [حاسة] البصر، فيدرك بها الألوان والأشكال، وهو أوسع عوالم المحسوسات. (المنقذ: 110).

The first sense revealed to man is touch, by means of which he perceives a certain group of qualities—heat, cold, moist, dry. The sense of touch does not perceive colours and forms, which are for it as though they did not exist. Next comes the sense of sight, which makes him acquainted with colours and forms; that is to say, with that which occupies the highest rank in the world of sensation. (*Munqidh*, Field: 50-51).

The first thing created in man was the sense of *touch*, and by it he perceives certain classes of existents, such as heat and cold, moisture and dryness, smoothness and roughness. Touch is completely unable to apprehend colours and noises. These might be non-existent so far as concerns touch. Next there is created in him the sense of *sight*, and by it he apprehends colours and shapes. This is the most extensive of the worlds of sensible. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 67).

7.3.10.1 Discussion of Example (10)

The sentence *يخلق في الإنسان* (literally, created in a human being) is literally translated by Watt as 'created in man', and less so by Field who translates it as 'revealed to man'. The same applies to *حاسة اللمس* (literally, sense of touch), which Watt translates as 'sense of touch', and Field translates as 'touch'. The phrase *أصنافاً من الموجودات* (literally, species of existents) is rendered more literally in Watt's translation as 'certain classes of existents', and less so by Field who translates it as 'certain group of qualities'. The phrase *ثم تخلق له* (literally, then created for him) is rendered by Watt as 'is created in him', which is more literal than Field's translation of the same phrase as 'next comes'. Moreover, the word *عوالم* (literally, worlds), is literally translated by Watt as 'worlds' and less so by Field who translates it as 'world'. Finally, the adjective *أوسع* (literally,

the extensive) is literally rendered by Watt as ‘the most extensive’, and less so by Field who translated it as ‘the highest rank’.

7.4 Compared Analysis: Watt and McCarthy

In this section, the ten texts from *Munqidh* are analyzed with reference to the second and third translation of this text in English, that is, Watt’s and McCarthy’s translation.

7.4.1 Example (1)

فقد سألتني أيها الأخ في الدين، أن أبتّ إليك غاية العلوم وأسرارها، وغائلة المذاهب وأغوارها، وأحكي لك ما قاسيته في استخلاص الحق من بين اضطراب الفرق، مع تباين المسالك والطرق، وما استجرات عليه من الارتفاع عن حضيض التقليد، إلى يفاع الاستبصار. وما استفدته أولاً من علم الكلام، وما اجتؤيته ثانياً من طرق أهل التعليم القاصرين أدرك الحق على تقليد الإمام، وما ازدريته ثالثاً من طرق التفلسف، وما ارتضيته آخراً من طريقة التصوف، وما انجلى لي في تضاعيف تفتيشي عن أقاويل الخلق، من لباب الحق، وما صرفني عن نشر العلم ببغداد، مع كثرة الطلبة، وما دعاني إلى معاودته بنيسابور بعد طول المدة (المنقذ: 61).

You have asked me, my brother in religion, to show you the aims and inmost nature of the sciences and the perplexing depths of the religious systems. You have begged me to relate to you the difficulties I encountered in my attempt to extricate the truth from the confusion of contending sects and to distinguish the different ways and methods, and the venture I made in climbing from the plain of naive and second-hand belief (*taqlid*) to the peak of direct vision. You want me to describe, firstly what profit I derived from the science of theology (*kalam*), secondly, what I disapprove of in the methods of the party of *ta`lim* (authoritative instruction), who restrict the apprehension of truth to the blind following (*taqlid*) of the Imam, thirdly, what I rejected of the methods of philosophy, and lastly, what I approved in the Sufi way of life. You would know, too, what essential truths became clear to me in my manifold investigation into the doctrines held by men, why I gave up teaching in Baghdad although I had many students, and why I returned to it at Naysabur after a long interval. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 17-18).

You have asked me, my brother in religion, to communicate to you the aim and secrets of the sciences and the dangerous and intricate depths of the different doctrines and views. You want me to give you an account of my travail in disengaging the truth from amid the welter of the

sects, despite the polarity of their means and methods. You also want to hear about my daring in mounting from the lowland of servile conformism to the highland of independent investigation: and first of all what profit I derived from the science of *ka'līm*; secondly what I found loathsome among the methods of the devotees of *ka'līm*, who restrict the attainment of truth to uncritical acceptance of the Imam's pronouncements; thirdly, the methods of philosophizing which I scouted; and finally, what pleased me in the way pursued by the practice of Sufism. You also wish to know the quintessential truth disclosed to me in the tortuous course of my inquiry into the views expressed by various men: and what led me to quit teaching in Baghdad, though I had many students there: and what induced me to resume teaching in Nishapur much later. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 61).

7.4.1.1 Discussion of Example (1)

McCarthy renders أبت (literally, to communicate) as 'communicate' which is more literal in meaning than Watt's translation of the same word as 'show'. The phrase غاية العلوم وأسرارها (literally, the aim of the sciences and their secrets) is rendered by Watt as 'the aims and inmost nature of the sciences' and by McCarthy as 'the aim and secrets of the sciences'. In this example McCarthy closely follows the form of the source text. Firstly, the word غاية which is singular in Arabic is rendered as singular in English. Secondly, the word أسرار (literally, secrets) is rendered by McCarthy into English by its direct or dictionary meaning, 'secrets'. Watt, in contrast, renders the word غاية which is singular in Arabic as 'aims' which is plural in English, and renders the word أسرار by using the phrase 'inmost nature' which is not the literal meaning of the Arabic word. Similarly, the phrase ما قاسيته (literally, what I have endured) is rendered by Watt as 'the difficulties I encountered' and by McCarthy as 'my travail'. It is the latter translation that is closer to the source text, because the Arabic text is stronger in connotation than Watt's translation indicates. The word تباين which Watt renders as 'different' is accurate, but McCarthy's use of the word 'polarity' is better because the Arabic word means 'significant difference' rather than merely 'difference' as Watt's translation indicates. The word تفلسف (literally, philosophizing) is literally translated by McCarthy as 'philosophizing' and less so by Watt who translates it as 'philosophy'. Watt maintained the word order of وما ازدريته من طرق التفلسف, translating it as 'what I rejected of the methods of philosophy', whereas McCarthy changed it in

translation, rendering it as ‘the methods of philosophizing which I scouted’. The verb ارتضى in ارتضيته (literally, pleasingly accepted) has positive connotation because it suggests that something has been pleasingly or satisfactorily accepted by someone after a deep research. It is McCarthy who communicates this positive connotation in translation as he translates it as ‘what pleased me’, whereas Watt’s translation of the same verb as ‘approved’ does not communicate fully that positive connotation associated with the original. The sentence ما دعاني (literally, what motivated me) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘what induced me’, and less so by Watt who translates it as ‘why I’.

7.4.2 Example (2)

فابتدرت لإجابتك إلى مطلبك، بعد الوقوف على صدق رغبتك، وقلت مستعيناً بالله ومتوكلاً عليه، ومستوثقاً منه، وملتجئاً إليه. اعلموا -أحسن الله تعالى) إرشادكم، والآن للحق قيادكم- أن اختلاف الخلق في الأديان والملل، ثم اختلاف الأئمة في المذاهب، على كثرة الفرق وتباين الطرق، بحر عميق غرق فيه الأكثرون، وما نجا منه إلا الأقلون، وكل فريق يزعم أنه الناجي، و ((كلُّ حزبٍ بما لديهم فرحون)) (الروم: 32) هو الذي وعدنا به سيد المرسلين، صلوات الله عليه، وهو الصادق الصدوق. (المنقذ: 61).

I am proceeding to answer your request, for I recognise that your desire is genuine. In this I seek the help of God and trust in Him; I ask His succour and take refuge with Him. You must know- and may God most high perfect you in the right way and soften your hearts to receive the truth- that the different religious observances and religious communities of the human race and likewise the different theological systems of the religious leaders, with all the multiplicity of sects and variety of practices, constitute ocean depths in which the majority drown and only a minority reach safety. Each separate group thinks that it alone is saved, and ‘each party is rejoicing in what they have’ (Q. 23, 55; 30, 31). This is what was foretold by the prince of the Messengers (God bless him), who is true and trustworthy, when he said, ‘My community will be split up into seventy-three sects, and but one of them is saved’; and what he foretold has indeed almost come about. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 17-18).

Convinced of the sincerity of your desire, I am losing no time in answering your request.

Invoking God’s help, and placing my trust in Him, and imploring His favor, and having recourse to Him, I say:

You should first of all know -God give you good guidance and gently lead you to the truth!- that the diversity of men in religions and creeds, plus the disagreement of the Community of Islam about doctrines, given the multiplicity of sects and the divergency of methods, is a deep sea in which most men founder and from which few only are saved. Each group alleges that it is the one saved, and “each faction is happy about its own beliefs.” This is the state of affairs which the truthful and most trustworthy Chief of God’s envoys -God bless him! -ominously promised us when he said: “My Community will split into seventy-odd [...] (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 61).

7.4.2.1 Discussion of Example (2)

The sentence وألان للحق قيادكم (literally, and gently lead you towards the truth) is translated more literally by McCarthy as ‘gently lead you to the truth’, and less so by Watt who translates it as ‘soften your hearts to receive the truth’. The phrase ‘your heart’ is not in the original. McCarthy’s translation of الأديان (literally, religions) as ‘religions’ is a more literal translation than Watt’s translation of the same word as ‘religious observances’. The phrase بحر عميق (literally, deep sea) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘deep sea’, and less so by Watt who translates it as ‘ocean depths’. Also the verb نجا (literally, saved) is translated by McCarthy as ‘saved’, and by Watt as ‘reach safety’. McCarthy’s translation of this word is also more literal than Watt’s. The word فريق (literally, group) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘group’, and less so by Watt who translated it as ‘separate group’. McCarthy’s translation of the Arabic verb يزعم (literally, allege) as ‘alleges’ is more literal than Watt’s translation of the same verb as ‘thinks’.

In conclusion, the discussion of this example shows McCarthy’s translation is more accurate and literal than Watt’s.

7.4.3 Example (3)

وقد كان التعتش إلى درك حقائق الأمور دأبي وديدني من أول أمري وريعان عمري، غريزة وفطرة من الله وضعتا في جِبَلَّتِي، لا باختيارٍ وحيلتي، حتى انحلت عني رابطة التقليد وانكسرت علي العقائد الموروثة على قرب عهد سن الصبا (المنقذ: 63).

To thirst after comprehension of things as they really are was my habit and custom from a very early age. It was instinctive with me, a part of my God-given nature, a matter of temperament

and not of my choice or contriving. Consequently as I drew near the age of adolescence the bonds of mere authority (*taqlid*) ceased to hold me and inherited beliefs lost their grip upon me (*Munqidh*, Watt: 19).

The thirst for grasping the real meaning of things was indeed my habit and wont from my early years and in the prime of my life. It was an instinctive, natural disposition placed in my makeup by God Most High, not something due to my own choosing and contriving. As a result, the fetters of servile conformism fell away from me, and inherited beliefs lost their hold on me, when I was still quite young. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 63).

7.4.3.1 Discussion of Example (3)

As this example shows, Watt omits *وريعان عمري* (literally, and in the prime of my life), whereas McCarthy retains it. The phrase *على قرب عهد الصبا* is rendered accurately in both translations, but Watt places it at the beginning of the sentence whereas McCarthy places it at the end of the text as in the source text. The Arabic word *التعطش* (literally, thirst) is rendered by Watt using a verb 'to thirst', whereas McCarthy renders it as a noun 'the thirst' as in the original. The phrase *دأبي وديني* (my preoccupation and habit) is accurately rendered by McCarthy as 'my habit and wont', and less so by Watt who translated it as 'my habit and custom'. Unlike the word 'wont' which refers to the way *one* does something, which is what the original Arabic word refers to, the word 'custom' refers to socially structured practices or habits. The sentence *انحلت عني* (literally, falling away from me) is rendered by McCarthy as 'fell away from me', which is more literal in translation than Watt's translation of the same sentence as 'ceased to hold me'.

In conclusion, the discussion of this example shows that McCarthy's translation is more accurate and literal translation than Watt's.

7.4.4 Example (4)

فعلمت أن رد المذهب قبل فهمه والإطلاع على كنهه رمى في عماية، فشمزت عن ساق الجد، في تحصيل ذلك العلم من الكتب، بمجرد المطالعة من غير استعانة بأستاذ، وأقبلت على ذلك في أوقات فراغي من التصنيف والتدريس في العلوم الشرعية، وأنا ممنو بالتدريس والإفادة لثلاثمائة نفر من الطلبة ببغداد. (المنقذ: 74).

I realized that to refute a system before understanding it and becoming acquainted with its depths

is to act blindly. I therefore set out in all earnestness to acquire a knowledge of philosophy from books, by private study without the help of an instructor. I made progress towards this aim during my hours of free time after teaching in the religious sciences and writing, for at this period I was burdened with the teaching and instruction of three hundred students in Baghdad. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 29).

I knew, of course, that undertaking to refute their doctrine before comprehending it and knowing it in depth would be a shot in the dark. So I girded myself for the task of learning that science by the mere perusal of their writings without seeking the help of a master and teacher. I devoted myself to that in the moments I had free from writing and lecturing on the legal sciences — and I was then burdened with the teaching and instruction of three hundred students in Baghdad. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 70).

7.4.4.1 Discussion of Example (4)

The Arabic sentence علمت (literally, I knew) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘I knew’, and less so by Watt who translates it as ‘I realized’. The phrase ذلك العلم is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘that science’, whereas Watt translates it freely as ‘a knowledge of philosophy’. The word أستاذ is literally translated by Watt as ‘an instructor’, whereas McCarthy uses two words in English (a master and teacher) to translate one word in the original text. The phrase التصنيف والتدريس (literally, writing and teaching) is literally translated by Watt and McCarthy, but the former changed the order of the Arabic words and the latter maintained it. The idiom رمي في عمية (shooting in darkness) is translated by McCarthy as ‘shot in the dark’, which is more literal than Watt’s translation of the same idiom as ‘to act blindly’. Also, the stock metaphor شمرت عن ساق الجد is used in Arabic to mean ‘I prepared myself to exert every effort (to do something)’. McCarthy translates this sock metaphor using a stock metaphor in English, that is, the phrase ‘I girded myself to’, whereas Watt translates it freely as ‘I set out in all earnestness’. In translating this stock metaphor, McCarthy’s translation is more literal translation than Watt’s.

In conclusion, the discussion of this example also shows that McCarthy’s translation is more accurate and literal translation than Watt’s.

7.4.5 Example (5)

فهذه آفة عظيمة لأجلها يجب زجر كل من يخوض في تلك العلوم، فأنها وإن لم تتعلق بأمر الدين، ولكن لما كانت من مبادئ علومهم، سرى إليه شرهم وشؤمهم، فقل من يخوض فيها إلا وينخلع من الدين وينحل عن رأسه لجام التقوى. (المتقذ: 80).

This is a great drawback, and because of it those who devote themselves eagerly to the mathematical sciences ought to be restrained. Even if their subject-matter is not relevant to religion, yet, since they belong to the foundations of the philosophical sciences, the student is infected with the evil and corruption of the philosophers. Few there are who devote themselves to this study without being stripped of religion and having the bridle of godly fear removed from their heads (*Munqidh*, Watt: 34).

This, then, is a very serious evil, and because of it one should warn off anyone who would embark upon the study of those mathematical sciences. For even though they do not pertain to the domain of religion, yet, since they are among the primary elements of the philosophers' sciences, the student of mathematics will be insidiously affected by the sinister mischief of the philosophers. Rare, therefore, are those who study mathematics without losing their religion and throwing off the restraint of piety. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 74).

7.4.5.1 Discussion of Example (5)

The Arabic sentence *يجب زجر كل من يخوض في تلك العلوم* (literally, everyone ought to be restrained from delving into these sciences) has singular references (*كل من*, literally, everyone/whoever) and *يخوض* (one who delves) which is maintained in McCarthy's translation, whereas Watt's translation turned these references into plural (those who, themselves). The metaphor *وينخلع من الدين* (stripped off from religion) is literally translated by Watt as "being stripped of religion", whereas McCarthy approaches the same metaphor using a less literal approach, translating it as 'losing their religion'. Watt's translation of this metaphor is more accurate because the original metaphor is stronger in connotation than the metaphor used by McCarthy. The original metaphor indicates that if one studied mathematics he would be stripped off (deprived by force) from his religion, which is a great consequence or risk. The phrase used by McCarthy, 'losing their religion', is not as strong as the original. The metaphor *وينحل عن رأسه لجام التقوى* (literally, and without the bridle of fearing God falling away from his head) is translated more literally by Watt

as ‘the bridle of godly fear removed from their heads’, and less so by McCarthy who translates it as ‘throwing off the restraint of piety’.

Unlike previous examples, the discussion of this example shows Watt’s translation to be more accurate and literal translation than McCarthy’s.

7.4.6 Example (6)

ولقد كان في عصرهم، بل في كل عصر، جماعة من المتأهلين، لا يُخلى الله [سبحانه] العالم عنهم، فأنهم أوتاد الأرض، ببركاتهم تنزل الرحمة على أهل الأرض كما ورد في الخبر حيث قال صلى الله عليه وسلم: ((بهم تمطرون وبهم ترزقون ومنهم كان أصحاب الكهف)). (المنقذ: 86).

Assuredly there was in the age of the philosophers, as indeed there is in every age, a group of those godly men, of whom God never denudes the world. They are the pillars of the earth, and by their blessings mercy comes down on the people of the earth, as we read in the Tradition where Muhammad (peace be upon him) says: ‘Through them you receive rain, through them you receive sustenance; of their number were the men of the Cave’. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 39).

There was indeed in their age, nay but there is in every age, a group of godly men of whom God Most High never leaves the world destitute. For they are the pillars of the earth, and by their blessings the divine mercy descends upon earth dwellers as is declared in the tradition from Muhammad — God’s blessing and peace be upon him! — in which he says: “Because of them you receive rain, and thanks to them you receive sustenance, and among them were the Companions of the Cave.” (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 77).

7.4.6.1 Discussion of Example (6)

The phrase كما ورد (literally, as was mentioned) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘as declared in’, and less so by Watt who translates it as ‘as we read in’. The prepositional phrase بهم (literally, because of them) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘because of them’, and less so by Watt who translates it as ‘through them’. McCarthy added the adjective ‘divine’ before ‘mercy’ which is not in the original. Finally, the word أصحاب (companions) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘Companions’ and less so by Watt who translates it as ‘men of’. Thus, the discussion of this example shows that McCarthy tends to follow a more literal method of translation than Watt.

7.4.7 Example (7)

ولقد اعترض على بعض الكلمات الموثقة في تصانيفنا في أسرار علوم الدين ، طائفة من الذين لم تستحكم في العلوم سرائرهم، ولم تنفتح إلى أقصى غايات المذاهب بصائرهم، وزعمت أن تلك الكلمات من كلام الأوائل، مع أن بعضها من مولدات الخواطر - ولا يبعد أن يقع الحافر على الحافر - وبعضها يوجد في الكتب الشرعية ، وأكثرها موجود معناه في كتب الصوفية. (المنقذ: 88).

To some of the statements made in our published works on the principles of the religious sciences an objection has been raised by a group of men whose understanding has not fully grasped the sciences and whose insight has not penetrated to the fundamentals of the systems. They think that these statements are taken from the works of the ancient philosophers, whereas the fact is that some of them are the product, of reflections which occurred to me independently- it is not improbable that one shoe should fall on another shoe-mark-while others come from the revealed Scriptures, and in the case of the majority the sense though perhaps not the actual words is found in the works of the mystics. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 41-42).

Some of the remarks found here and there in our works on the mysteries of the religious sciences were objected to by a group of men whose minds were not thoroughly grounded in those sciences and whose mental vision was not open to the ultimate aims of our teachings. They alleged that those remarks were taken from things said by the early philosophers. As a matter of fact, some of them were my own original ideas — and it is not farfetched that ideas should coincide, just as a horse's hoof may fall on the print left by another; and some are found in the scriptures; and the sense of most is found in the writings of the Sufis. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 79).

7.4.7.1 Discussion of Example (7)

McCarthy omitted الهدى والضلالة (literally, guidance and astray) in translation, whereas Watt maintained it. The phrase الكلمات الموثقة (literally, words scattered) is literally translated by McCarthy as “remarks found here and there”. In contrast, Watt translates the same phrase freely as ‘statements’, ignoring the translation of the word الموثقة (scattered). Similarly, the word أسرار (literally, secrets) is translated by McCarthy as ‘mysteries’, which is a literal translation of the Arabic word. In contrast, Watt freely translated the same word as ‘principles’. The same applies to the translation of the word تستحكم (be grounded in), which McCarthy translates as ‘grounded

in' and Watt translates as 'penetrated to'. Therefore, McCarthy's translation of this text is also more literal than Watt's.

7.4.8 Example (8)

ثم إنني، لما فرغت من هذه العلوم، أقبلت بهمتي على طريق الصوفية وعلمت أن طريقهم إنما تتم بعلم وعمل؛ وكان حاصل علومهم قطع عقبات النفس. والتنزه عن أخلاقها المذمومة وصفاتها الخبيثة، حتى يتوصل (بها) إلى تخلية القلب عن غير الله (تعالى) وتحليته بذكر الله. (المنقذ: 100).

When I had finished with these sciences, I next turned with set purpose to the method of mysticism (or Sufism). I knew that the complete mystic 'way' includes both intellectual belief and practical activity; the latter consists in getting rid of the obstacles in the self and in stripping off its base characteristics and vicious morals, so that the heart may attain to freedom from what is not God and to constant recollection of Him (*Munqidh*, Watt: 56).

When I had finished with all those kinds of lore, I brought my mind to bear on the way of the Sufis. I knew that their particular Way is consummated [realized] only by knowledge and by activity [by the union of theory and practice]. The aim of their knowledge is to lop off the obstacles present in the soul and to rid oneself of its reprehensible habits and vicious qualities in order to attain thereby a heart empty of all save God and adorned with the constant remembrance of God. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 80).

7.4.8.1 Discussion of Example (8)

The Arabic word العلوم is literally translated by Watt as 'sciences', and less so by McCarthy who translates it as 'kinds of lore'. McCarthy translates the phrase/term طريق الصوفية (literally, the way of the Sufis/Sufism) as 'the way of the Sufis', whereas Watt translates it as 'the methods of mysticism (Sufism)'. The English word 'way' is the most literal and accurate translation of the Arabic word طريق in this context, because the word 'way' indicates that the Sufis, in their search for a direct knowledge of God, travel into a particular way, a way with stages, which the Arabic word indicates. Thus, it is McCarthy's translation that is preferable here. Similarly, the literal meaning of تتم is 'achieved' or 'realized', which McCarthy adopts, whereas Watt translates the same word using 'includes', which is less literal in translation. Also, the phrase أخلاقها المذمومة

(blameworthy characteristics) is rendered more accurately by McCarthy and less so by Watt. The former translates it as ‘reprehensible habits’, whereas the latter translates it as ‘base characteristics’. Finally, the phrase تحليته (adorning it) is translated by McCarthy as ‘adorned’, but omitted from Watt’s translation.

To conclude, the discussion of this example shows that McCarthy tends to be more literal and closer to the source text than Watt.

7.4.9 Example (9)

وفي هذا الشهر جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار، إذ أقفل الله على لساني حتى اعتقل عن التدريس، فكنت أجاهد نفسي أن أدرس يوماً واحداً تطيباً لقلوب المختلفة [إلي] ، فكان لا ينطق لساني بكلمة [واحدة] ولا أستطيعها البتة. (المنقذ: 104).

In that month the matter ceased to be one of choice and became one of compulsion. God caused my tongue to dry up so that I was prevented from lecturing. One particular day I would make an effort to lecture in order to gratify the hearts of my following, but my tongue would not utter a single word nor could I accomplish anything at all. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 60).

In this month the matter passed from choice to compulsion. For God put a lock upon my tongue so that I was impeded from public teaching. I struggled with myself to teach for a single day, to gratify the hearts of the students who were frequenting my lectures, but my tongue would not utter a single word: I was completely unable to say anything. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 92).

7.4.9.1 Discussion of Example (9)

The phrase وفي هذا الشهر (literally, in this month) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘in this month’ and less so by Watt who translates it as ‘in that month’. The sentence جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار (the matter passed the domain of free choice to compulsion) is literally translated by Watt and McCarthy. The former translates it as ‘the matter ceased to be one of choice and became one of compulsion’, whereas the latter translates it as ‘the matter passed from choice to compulsion’. However, McCarthy used fewer words than Watt, bringing his translation closer in form to the source text. The word إذ (literally, for) is translated in McCarthy’s translation as ‘for’, but ignored in Watt’s. The metaphor إذ أقفل الله على لساني (God locked up my tongue) is translated by McCarthy as ‘God put a lock upon my tongue’, and by Watt as ‘God caused my tongue to dry

up'. It is not difficult to see why McCarthy's translation of this metaphor is more literal than that of Watt's. The metaphor كنت أجاهد نفسي (literally, struggle with myself) is literally translated by McCarthy as 'I struggled with myself', and less so by Watt who translates it as 'I would make an effort'.

In conclusion, this example shows that Watt tends to follow the original text more closely than Watt.

7.4.10 Example (10)

فأول ما يخلق في الإنسان حاسة اللمس، فيدرك بها أجناساً من الموجودات: كالحرارة، والبرودة، والرطوبة واليبوسة، واللين والخشونة، وغيرها. واللمس قاصر عن الألوان والأصوات قطعاً، بل هي كالمعدوم في حق اللمس. ثم تخلق له [حاسة] البصر، فيدرك بها الألوان والأشكال، وهو أوسع عوالم المحسوسات. (المنقذ: 110).

The first thing created in man was the sense of *touch*, and by it he perceives certain classes of existents, such as heat and cold, moisture and dryness, smoothness and roughness. Touch is completely unable to apprehend colours and noises. These might be non-existent so far as concerns touch. Next there is created in him the sense of *sight*, and by it he apprehends colours and shapes. This is the most extensive of the worlds of sensible. (*Munqidh*, Watt: 67).

The first thing created in man is the sense of touch: by this he perceives certain classes of existents such as heat and cold, wetness and dryness, smoothness and roughness, etc. But touch is definitely unable to perceive colors and sounds: indeed, these are, as it were, nonexistent with respect to touch.

Next the sense of sight is created for man, by which he perceives colors and shapes: this is the most extensive of the "worlds" of the sensibles (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 96).

7.4.10.1 Discussion of Example (10)

The word قطعاً (absolutely) is more literally translated by McCarthy as 'definitely' than by Watt who translates it as 'completely'. The literal translation of the Arabic word أصوات is 'sounds'. McCarthy adheres to this literal meaning. In contrast, Watt translates the same word as 'noises'. The English word is less specific in meaning than the meaning of the original word, hence the

preference for McCarthy's translation to Watt's translation. Finally, the word يدرك (literally, perceives) is replicated twice in this text. McCarthy uses one word in English to translate the Arabic word, whereas Watt uses two different words (perceive and apprehends) to translate the same word. This means that McCarthy followed the original more closely than Watt. Finally, the phrase عوالم المحسوسات (literally, the worlds of the sensibles) is literally translated by McCarthy as 'the "worlds" of the sensibles', whereas Watt translates it less literally as 'the worlds of sensible'.

Thus, it could be said that McCarthy's translation of this text is more literal and closer to the source text than that of Watt.

7.5 Compared Analysis: McCarthy and Abūlaylah

In this section, the ten texts from *Munqidh* are analyzed with reference to the third and fourth translation of this text in English, that is, McCarthy's and Abūlaylah's translation.

7.5.1 Example (1)

فقد سألتني أيها الأخ في الدين، أن أبثّ إليك غاية العلوم وأسرارها، وغائلة المذاهب وأغوارها، وأحكي لك ما قاسيته في استخلاص الحق من بين اضطراب الفرق، مع تباين المسالك والطرق، وما استجرات عليه من الارتفاع عن حضيض التقليد، إلى يفاع الاستبصار. وما استفدته أولاً من علم الكلام، وما اجتؤيته ثانياً من طرق أهل التعليم القاصرين أدرك الحق على تقليد الإمام، وما ازدريته ثالثاً من طرق التفلسف، وما ارتضيته آخراً من طريقة التصوف، وما انجلى لي في تضاعيف تفتيشي عن أقاويل الخلق، من لباب الحق، وما صرفني عن نشر العلم ببغداد، مع كثرة الطلبة، وما دعاني إلى معاودته بنيسابور بعد طول المدة (المنقذ: 61).

You have asked me, my brother in religion, to communicate to you the aim and secrets of the sciences and the dangerous and intricate depths of the different doctrines and views. You want me to give you an account of my travail in disengaging the truth from amid the welter of the sects, despite the polarity of their means and methods. You also want to hear about my daring in mounting from the lowland of servile conformism to the highland of independent investigation: and first of all what profit I derived from the science of *kalām*; secondly what I found loathsome among the methods of the devotees of *ta'lim*, who restrict the attainment of truth to uncritical acceptance of the Imam's pronouncements; thirdly, the methods of philosophizing which I

scouted; and finally, what pleased me in the way pursued by the practice of Sufism. You also wish to know the quintessential truth disclosed to me in the tortuous course of my inquiry into the views expressed by various men: and what led me to quit teaching in Baghdad, though I had many students there: and what induced me to resume teaching in Nishapur much later. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 61).

My brother in faith, you have asked me to reveal to you the purpose and secrets of the sciences, and the dangerous and complex depths of the schools of thought. You would like me to tell you what I have undergone in order to distinguish the truth from error in the different sects, despite the differences in their paths and methods.

You wish to know the daring it took to rise above the plain of conformism (*Taqlid*) to the heights of observation and independent investigation. First, what profit I drew at the beginning from *Kalam* (or theology). Secondly, how I then turned away from those who defended *Ta'lim* (teaching) because they were impeded in reaching the truth by their subjection to an Imam. Thirdly, how much I mistrusted the methods of philosophers, and finally how I came to appreciate the way of Sufism.

You would like to see the "pulp of the truth" as it appeared to me after I came to doubt my efforts to analyze what different people said, and you would like to know what caused me to abandon my teaching in Baghdad despite the great number of my pupils there, and what made me take it up again, a long time later, in Nishapūr. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 61-62).

7.5.1.1 Discussion of Example (1)

As can be seen from this text, McCarthy's translation follows the meaning and form of the source text more closely and literally than Abūlaylah's. The source text, for example, has the phrase *أيها الأخ في الدين* after the sentence *فقد سألتني* which is maintained in McCarthy's translation but changed in Abūlaylah's translation. The word *استخلاص* (literally, extract) is rendered literally by McCarthy as 'disengaging'. In contrast, Abūlaylah translates the same word using the English word 'distinguish' which is not the literal meaning of the original. The word *اضطراب* (literally, chaos) is maintained in McCarthy's translation which he translates as 'welter' but omitted in Abūlaylah's translation. The verbal sentence *وما اجتويته* (what I detested) is translated by

McCarthy as ‘what I found loathsome’, which is more literal in translation than Abūlaylah’s translation of the same sentence as ‘how I then turned away from’. The word القاصرين (literally, who confine) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘who restrict’, and less literally by Abūlaylah who translates it as ‘who were impeded’. The phrase لباب الحق (literally, pulps of truth) is literally translated by Abūlaylah as ‘pulp of truth’, and less so by McCarthy who translates it as ‘quintessential truth’. The phrase في تضاعيف تفتيشي (in the course of my investigation) is rendered by McCarthy as ‘in the tortuous course of my inquiry’, which is a literal translation of the original text. In rendering the same phrase, Abūlaylah uses different wording, translating it as ‘after I came to doubt my efforts’.

To conclude, this example shows McCarthy is more literal than Abūlaylah.

7.5.2 Example (2)

فابتدرت لإجابتك إلى مطلبك، بعد الوقوف على صدق رغبتك، وقلت مستعيناً بالله ومتوكلاً عليه، ومستوثقاً منه، وملتجئاً إليه. اعلموا -أحسن الله (تعالى) إرشادكم، وألآنَ للحق قيادكم- أن اختلاف الخلق في الأديان والملل، ثم اختلاف الأئمة في المذاهب، على كثرة الفرق وتباين الطرق، بحر عميق غرق فيه الأكثرون، وما نجا منه إلا الأقلون، وكل فريق يزعم أنه الناجي، و ((كلُّ حزبٍ بما لديهم فرحون)) (الروم: 32) هو الذي وعدنا به سيد المرسلين، صلوات الله عليه، وهو الصادق الصدوق. (المنقذ: 61)

Convinced of the sincerity of your desire, I am losing no time in answering your request. Invoking God’s help, and placing my trust in Him, and imploring His favor, and having recourse to Him, I say:

You should first of all know — God give you good guidance and gently lead you to the truth! — that the diversity of men in religions and creeds, plus the disagreement of the Community of Islam about doctrines, given the multiplicity of sects and the divergency of methods, is a deep sea in which most men founder and from which few only are saved. Each group alleges that it is the one saved, and “each faction is happy about its own beliefs.” This is the state of affairs which the truthful and most trustworthy Chief of God’s envoys — God bless him! — ominously promised us when he said: “My Community will split into seventy-odd [...] ((*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 61).

I promptly fulfilled your wishes, which I recognize as sincere, and, counting on God to grant aid, confidence, success and protection I now plunge into my subject.

You should know -- may God set you on the right path, and lead you gently towards the truth -- that people have different religions and beliefs, that there are different theological systems among religious leaders, and that the community of Islam has different sects and paths. All of this constitutes a deep sea in which most have foundered and only a few have survived. Yet each group believes it has found salvation, "each party rejoices at what it possesses." This was accomplished by what the Master of prophets -- peace be upon him -- foretold sincerely and truthfully when he said: "My nation will divide into seventy-three sects, and only one of them will be saved." What he foretold has indeed almost come true. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 62).

7.5.2.1 Discussion of Example (2)

The phrase لإجابة مطلبك (literally, answering your request) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘answering your request’. Abūlaylah translates the same phrase as ‘fulfilled your wishes’, which is less literal than McCarthy’s. The phrase أن اختلاف الخلق في الأديان والملل (literally, that the diversity among people in religions and sects) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘that the diversity of men in religions and creeds’. Abūlaylah’s translation of the same phrase as ‘that people have different religions and beliefs’ is less literal than McCarthy’s. The phrase على كثرة الملل وتباين الطرق (literally, with the multiplicity of sects and ways) is translated more literally in McCarthy’s translation than in Abūlaylah’s translation. The former translates it as ‘given the multiplicity of sects and the divergency of methods’, whereas the latter translates it as ‘that the community of Islam has different sects and paths’ (Abūlaylah added ‘the community of Islam’ within translation which is not in the original and ignored the preposition على (literally, with) in translation). The verb نجا (saved) has a religious connotation as it signifies ‘religious connotation’ rather than ‘survival’ in general. McCarthy accurately translates this verb as ‘saved’, whereas Abūlaylah’s translation of this same verb as ‘survived’ does not have the religious connotation that the original term has. Also, the literal meaning of the Arabic verb يزعم is ‘allege’. McCarthy literally translates it as ‘alleges’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it less literally as ‘believes’. The phrase أنه الناجي (literally, each group alleges it is the one saved) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘it is the one saved’, whereas Abūlaylah uses different wording, translating it as

‘each group believes it has found salvation’. The two adjectives الصادق الصدوق (literally, truthful and trustworthy) are rendered in McCarthy’s translation by two adjectives (truthful and trustworthy) as in the original. In contrast, these two adjectives are rendered by Abūlaylah by two adverbs (sincerely and truthfully).

In conclusion, the discussion of this example shows that McCarthy’s translation is not only more literal than Abūlaylah’s, but also more accurate.

7.5.3 Example (3)

وقد كان التعتش إلى درك حقائق الأمور دأبي وديدي من أول عمري وريعان شبابي، غريزة وفطرة من الله وضعتا في جيلتي، لا باختيار وحيلتي، حتى انحلت عني رابطة التقليد وانكسرت علي العقائد الموروثة على قرب عهد سن الصبا (المنقذ: 63).

The thirst for grasping the real meaning of things was indeed my habit and wont from my early years and in the prime of my life. It was an instinctive, natural disposition placed in my makeup by God Most High, not something due to my own choosing and contriving. As a result, the fetters of servile conformism fell away from me, and inherited beliefs lost their hold on me, when I was still quite young. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 63).

From my youngest years in the prime of life, my thirst to seize the profound reality of things was a natural instinct or tendency which God placed in me not by my choice or conscious decision. As I approached adolescence, while still young, the traditional bonds had already loosened and my inherited tendencies had broken down. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 62).

7.5.3.1 Discussion of Example (3)

As can be seen from this text, Abūlaylah changes the first sentence order of وقد كان التعتش إلى درك حقائق الأمور دأبي وديدي من أول عمري وريعان شبابي by placing the phrase من أول عمري وريعان شبابي at the beginning of the target text. In contrast, McCarthy maintained the original order of this sentence in translation. There are four instances of semantic repetitions in the original text. These are دأبي (my habit and preoccupation), غريزة وفطرة (literally, instinct and disposition), حيلتي واختياري (literally, choice and invention) and أول عمري وريعان شبابي (literally, in my early years and in the prime of my life). In translating these instances of semantic repetition, McCarthy followed the ‘form’ of the source text more closely than Abūlaylah. Thus, he translates دأبي وديدي as ‘my habit

and wont', حيلتي as 'from my early years and in the prime of my life' and حيلتي واختياري as 'my own choosing and contriving'. In contrast, Abūlaylah changes the form of these examples in a significant way. Thus, he replaced the article و (literally, and), which separates each pair of these semantic repetitions, into 'or' in translation (e.g. حيلتي واختياري is translated as 'my choice or conscious decision'), or into 'in' (e.g. من أول عمري وربيعان شبابي is translated as 'my youngest years in the prime of life').

This example shows clearly that McCarthy followed the form of the source text more than Abūlaylah; hence his translation is more literal than that of Abūlaylah.

7.5.4 Example (4)

فعلت أن رد المذهب قبل فهمه والإطلاع على كنهه رمى في عماية، فشمرت عن ساق الجد، في تحصيل ذلك العلم من الكتب، بمجرد المطالعة من غير استعانة بأستاذ، وأقبلت على ذلك في أوقات فراغي من التصنيف والتدريس في العلوم الشرعية، وأنا ممنو بالتدريس والإفادة لثلاثمائة نفر من الطلبة ببغداد. (المنقذ: 74).

I knew, of course, that undertaking to refute their doctrine before comprehending it and knowing it in depth would be a shot in the dark. So I girded myself for the task of learning that science by the mere perusal of their writings without seeking the help of a master and teacher. I devoted myself to that in the moments I had free from writing and lecturing on the legal sciences — and I was then burdened with the teaching and instruction of three hundred students in Baghdad. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 70).

I have learned that to attempt to refute a system without understanding it or knowing it through and through is to do so blindfold. Therefore I set myself to a serious study of this science (of philosophy) through its written works, reading them without the help of a teacher. I did this during leisure moments while working on the composition and teaching of religious law-- at this time in Baghdad I had 300 pupils to teach and instruct. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 73).

7.5.4.1 Discussion of Example (4)

The phrase فعلت (literally, I knew) is literally translated by McCarthy as 'I knew' and less so by Abūlaylah who translates it as 'I have learned'. The idiom رمى في عماية (literally, shooting in darkness) is literally translated by McCarthy as 'shot in darkness' and less so by Abūlaylah who

translates it as ‘do so blindfold’. The word *ممنو* (literally, burdened) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘burdened’, whereas Abūlaylah translated it as ‘had’, which is less literal than the word McCarthy uses. Also, the stock metaphor *شمرت عن ساق الجد* is used to mean ‘I decided to exert every effort (to do something)’. In translating this stock metaphor, McCarthy uses a sock metaphor in English (‘I girded myself to’), whereas Abūlaylah translates it freely as ‘I set myself to’.

In conclusion, the discussion of this example shows that McCarthy’s translation is not only more literal than that of Abūlaylah, but also more accurate.

7.5.5 Example (5)

فهذه آفة عظيمة لأجلها يجب زجر كل من يخوض في تلك العلوم، فإنها وإن لم تتعلق بأمر الدين، ولكن لما كانت من مبادئ علومهم، سرى إليه شرهم وشؤمهم، فقل من يخوض فيها إلا وينخلع من الدين وينحل عن رأسه لجام التقوى. (المنقذ: 80).

This, then, is a very serious evil, and because of it one should warn off anyone who would embark upon the study of those mathematical sciences. For even though they do not pertain to the domain of religion, yet, since they are among the primary elements of the philosophers’ sciences, the student of mathematics will be insidiously affected by the sinister mischief of the philosophers. Rare, therefore, are those who study mathematics without losing their religion and throwing off the restraint of piety. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 74).

As the risk is considerable, it is fitting to warn regarding mathematics. Although it has no connection with religion, it provides the basis for the other sciences; anyone who studies it risks infection by their vices. Few who study it escape the danger of loss of faith. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 76).

7.5.5.1 Discussion of Example (5)

The word *آفة* (literally, evil) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘evil’. Abūlaylah’s translation of this same word as ‘risk’ does not communicate fully the negative connotation of the original word which is associated in the source text with ‘astray’ and ‘disease’. The sentence *وبسببها يجب* (literally, because of it, everyone ought to be restrained from delving into these sciences) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘and because of it one should warn off

anyone who would embark upon the study of those mathematical sciences'. In contrast, Abūlaylah translates the same text freely as 'it is fitting to warn regarding mathematics'. The sentence وينحل عن رأسه لجام التقوى (literally, and the bridle of fear of God falling away from his head) is omitted from Abūlaylah's translation and maintained in McCarthy's. McCarthy translates it as 'and throwing off the restraint of piety'.

Thus, this example shows that McCarthy adhered to the content and form of the original text more closely and literally than Abūlaylah.

7.5.6 Example (6)

ولقد كان في عصرهم، بل في كل عصر، جماعة من المتأهلين، لا يُخلي الله [سبحانه] العالم عنهم، فإنهم أوتاد الأرض، ببركاتهم تنزل الرحمة على أهل الأرض كما ورد في الخبر حيث قال صلى الله عليه وسلم: ((بهم تمطرون وبهم ترزقون ومنهم كان أصحاب الكهف)). (المنقذ: 86).

There was indeed in their age, nay but there is in every age, a group of godly men of whom God Most High never leaves the world destitute. For they are the pillars of the earth, and by their blessings the divine mercy descends upon earth dwellers as is declared in the tradition from Muhammad -God's blessing and peace be upon him!- in which he says: "Because of them you receive rain, and thanks to them you receive sustenance, and among them were the Companions of the Cave." (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 77).

In their time, as always, there was one of those groups which God never leaves the world without, for they are the pillars which support the earth. God's mercy descends upon it because of their spirit, in accord with Muhammad's saying -- peace be upon him -- "It is by them that the rain and your subsistence comes to you." The sleepers in the cave were of such persons (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 79).

7.5.6.1 Discussion of Example (6)

The phrase بل في كل عصر (literally, as indeed in all ages) is literally translated by McCarthy as 'nay but there is in every age'. In contrast, the same phrase is translated freely by Abūlaylah as 'always'. In addition, Abūlaylah separates the phrase ومنهم أصحاب الكهف from the first part of the tradition (hadith) which al-Ghazālī cited in this text, whereas McCarthy maintains the original

hadith as it is in the source text. The word المتألهين (godly men) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘godly men’, whereas Abūlaylah omitted it in translation. The metaphor أوتاد الأرض (literally, pillars of the earth) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘pillars of the earth’. Abūlaylah’s translation of the same metaphor as ‘the pillars which support the earth’ is similar to that of McCarthy, but should be considered as less literal because of the addition of ‘which support’ within the target text, which is not in the original.

Thus, the discussion of this example shows that McCarthy’s translation is more literal and accurate than that of Abūlaylah.

7.5.7 Example (7)

ولقد اعترض على بعض الكلمات الميثوثة في تصانيفنا في أسرار علوم الدين، طائفة من الذين لم تستحكم في العلوم سرائرهم، ولم تنفتح إلى أقصى غايات المذاهب بصائرهم، وزعمت أن تلك الكلمات من كلام الأوائل، مع أن بعضها من مولدات الخواطر - ولا يبعد أن يقع الحافر على الحافر- وبعضها يوجد في الكتب الشرعية، وأكثرها موجود معناه في كتب الصوفية. (المنقذ: 88).

Some of the remarks found here and there in our works on the mysteries of the religious sciences were objected to by a group of men whose minds were not thoroughly grounded in those sciences and whose mental vision was not open to the ultimate aims of our teachings. They alleged that those remarks were taken from things said by the early philosophers. As a matter of fact, some of them were my own original ideas — and it is not farfetched that ideas should coincide, just as a horse’s hoof may fall on the print left by another; and some are found in the scriptures; and the sense of most is found in the writings of the Sufis. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 79).

On the other hand, some of my readers have criticized some passages of my books dealing with the mysteries of religion. They have not studied the sciences sufficiently deeply, and their minds have not been able to embrace the full implications of our teachings. They believed that those passages were borrowed from the ancient philosophers. In fact, some of my expressions were the fruit of my own thinking (and why should the tracks of one horse not cover those of another); some of them can be found in the sacred texts; many others are to be found, in substance, in the works of the mystics. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 81).

7.5.7.1 Discussion of Example (7)

The word اعترض (literally, objected) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘objected’, and less so by Abūlaylah who translates it as ‘have criticized’. The sentence من الذين لم تستحكم في العلوم سرائرهم (literally, whose hearts have not been grounded in the sciences) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘whose minds were not thoroughly grounded in those sciences’. Translating the same phrase, Abūlaylah adopts a less literal approach, rendering it as ‘They have not studied the sciences sufficiently deeply’. The same applies to the sentence ولم تتفتح إلى أقصى غايات المذاهب بصائرهم (literally, and whose insight was not open to the ultimate aims of creeds), which McCarthy literally translates as ‘and whose mental vision was not open to the ultimate aims of our teachings’ and Abūlaylah translates as ‘and their minds have not been able to embrace the full implications of our teachings’. The verb زعم (literally, alleged) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘alleged’ and less so by Abūlaylah who translates it as ‘believed’. The phrase ومعناها (literally, its sense) is translated by McCarthy as ‘the sense of’, which is more literal than Abūlaylah’s translation of the same phrase as ‘in substance’.

To conclude, this example shows that McCarthy’s translation is more literal than Abūlaylah’s translation.

7.5.8 Example (8)

ثم إنني، لما فرغت من هذه العلوم، أقبلت بهمتي على طريق الصوفية وعلمت أن طريقهم إنما تتم بعلم وعمل؛ وكان حاصل علومهم قطع عقبات النفس. والتنزه عن أخلاقها المذمومة وصفاتها الخبيثة، حتى يتوصل (بها) إلى تخلية القلب عن غير الله (تعالى) وتحليته بذكر الله. (المنقذ: 100).

When I had finished with all those kinds of lore, I brought my mind to bear on the way of the Sufis. I knew that their particular Way is consummated [realized] only by knowledge and by activity [by the union of theory and practice]. The aim of their knowledge is to lop off the obstacles present in the soul and to rid oneself of its reprehensible habits and vicious qualities in order to attain thereby a heart empty of all save God and adorned with the constant remembrance of God. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 80).

After I had finished with those branches of knowledge, I directed my mind entirely to the Way of the mystics. I came to know that their Way consists of both knowledge and deeds as equally necessary. The object of their works is to eliminate the obstacles created by one's own self, and to eradicate the defects and vices in one's own character. In this way, in the end the heart will be rid of all that is not God the Almighty, and will adorn itself solely with praise of God. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 91).

7.5.8.1 Discussion of Example (8)

The phrase طريق الصوفية (literally, the way of the Sufis) is translated by McCarthy as ‘the Way of the Sufis’ and by Abūlaylah as ‘the Way of the mystics’. Although the terms ‘Sufis’ and ‘mystics’ are sometimes used interchangeably, the word ‘mystic’ has a more general sense (e.g. some philosophers are also mystics). By using a transliteration of the Arabic word, Sufis, McCarthy adhered more closely to the original than Abūlaylah. The phrase or metaphor قطع عقبات النفس (cut off the obstacles of the self) is translated literally by McCarthy as ‘lop off the obstacles present in the soul’. In contrast, Abūlaylah translates the same text as ‘eradicate the obstacles created by one’s own self’ which is less literal than McCarthy’s translation. The term ذكر الله (remembrance of God) is translated by McCarthy as ‘constant remembrance of God’ which is more literal and accurate translation than Abūlaylah’s translation of the same term as ‘praise of God’. In fact, the term ذكر الله has a specific denotation that is better distinguished from the general meaning of the word ‘praise’. (see section (8.2.16) of chapter eight of this study for more details).

In conclusion, the discussion of this example also shows that McCarthy’s translation is more literal and accurate translation than that of Abūlaylah.

7.5.9 Example (9)

وفي هذا الشهر جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار، إذ أقفل الله على لساني حتى اعتقل عن التدريس، فكنت أجاهد نفسي أن أدرس يوماً واحداً تطيباً لقلوب المختلفة [إلي] ، فكان لا ينطق لساني بكلمة [واحدة] ولا أستطيعها البتة. (المنقذ: 104).

In this month the matter passed from choice to compulsion. For God put a lock upon my tongue so that I was impeded from public teaching. I struggled with myself to teach for a single day, to

gratify the hearts of the students who were frequenting my lectures, but my tongue would not utter a single word: I was completely unable to say anything. (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 92).

[the month]... during which I lost my free will and was under compulsion. [...]. The fact is that God tied my tongue and stopped me teaching. I struggled to no avail to speak at least once to my pupils, to please the hearts of those who were attending my lectures, but my tongue refused to serve me at all. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 93).

7.5.9.1 Discussion of Example (9)

The sentence جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار (literally, the matter passed the domain of choice to compulsion) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘the matter passed from choice to compulsion’. Translating the same sentence, Abūlaylah uses different wording, rendering it as ‘I lost my free will and was under compulsion’. McCarthy translates أقفل الله على لساني (literally, God locked up my tongue) as ‘God put a lock on my tongue’ which is more literal than Abūlaylah’s translation of the same text as ‘God tied my tongue’. The metaphor وكنت أجاهد نفسي (I struggled with myself) is translated by McCarthy as ‘I struggled with myself’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it less literally as ‘I struggled’. The phrase يوماً واحداً is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘one single day’, whereas Abūlaylah translates the same phrase freely as ‘once’. The text فكان لا ينطق لساني بكلمة واحدة، ولا أستطيعها البتة (literally, but my tongue would not utter a single word, and I would be completely incapable of doing so) is translated by McCarthy as ‘but my tongue would not utter a single word: I was completely unable to say anything’. In contrast, Abūlaylah translates the same text freely as ‘my tongue refused to serve me at all’.

In conclusion, the analysis of this example also shows that McCarthy’s translation is more literal and accurate translation than Abūlaylah’s.

7.5.10 Example (10)

فأول ما يخلق في الإنسان حاسة اللمس، فيدرك بها أجناساً من الموجودات: كالحرارة، والبرودة، والرطوبة واليبوسة، واللين والخشونة، وغيرها. واللمس قاصر عن الألوان والأصوات قطعاً، بل هي كالمعدوم في حق اللمس. ثم تخلق له [حاسة] البصر، فيدرك بها الألوان والأشكال، وهو أوسع عوالم المحسوسات. (المنقذ: 110).

The first thing created in man is the sense of touch: by this he perceives certain classes of existents such as heat and cold, wetness and dryness, smoothness and roughness, etc. But touch is definitely unable to perceive colors and sounds: indeed, these are, as it were, nonexistent with respect to touch.

Next the sense of sight is created for man, by which he perceives colors and shapes: this is the most extensive of the “worlds” of the sensibles (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 96).

The first sense is that of touch, by which one can feel, for example, hot and cold, wet and dry, smooth and rough, etc. But with this sense alone one could not experience colors or sounds, which do not exist so far as touch is concerned. Next is the sense of sight, which allows one to perceive colors and shapes. It is the most extensive of the sensible worlds. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 97).

7.5.10.1 Discussion of Example (10)

Abūlaylah translates *فأول ما يخلق في الإنسان حاسة اللمس* (literally, the first thing to be created in the human being is the sense of touch) as ‘The first sense is that of touch’. This translation is less literal than McCarthy’s translation of the same text as ‘The first faculty to be created in the human being is the sense of touch’. The verb *فيدرك* (literally, perceive) is literally translated by McCarthy as ‘perceive’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it as ‘feel’, which is not the literal meaning of the original. The phrase *أجناسا من الموجودات* (literally, species of existents) is omitted from Abūlaylah’s translation, but maintained in McCarthy’s translation. The words *الحرارة والبرودة واللين والخشونة والرطوبة واليبوسة* (literally, heat, coldness, wetness, dryness, softness, hardness) are nouns in Arabic. Abūlaylah changed these nouns in translation into adjectives, whereas McCarthy translated them using nouns like in the original. Also, the sentence *ثم تخلق له حاسة البصر* is translated by Abūlaylah as ‘next is the sense of sight’ and by McCarthy as ‘The next to be created for him is the faculty of sight’. The latter translation is obviously more literal than the former. Finally, the phrase *عوالم المحسوسات* (literally, worlds of sensibles) is literally translated by McCarthy as “‘worlds’ of the sensibles’, and less so by Abūlaylah who translates it as ‘the sensible worlds’.

In conclusion, it could be argued that McCarthy reproduced the original more literally than

Abūlaylah.

7.6 Compared Analysis: Abūlaylah and Holland

In this section, the ten texts from *Munqidh* are analyzed with reference to the fourth and fifth translation of this text in English, that is, Abūlaylah's and Holland's translation.

7.6.1 Example (1)

فقد سألتني أيها الأخ في الدين، أن أبثّ إليك غاية العلوم وأسرارها، وغائلة المذاهب وأغوارها، وأحكي لك ما قاسيته في استخلاص الحق من بين اضطراب الفرق، مع تباين المسالك والطرق، وما استجرات عليه من الارتفاع عن حضيض التقليد، إلى يفاع الاستبصار. وما استفدته أولاً من علم الكلام، وما اجتَوَيْتَه ثانياً من طرق أهل التعليم القاصرين لدرك الحق على تقليد الإمام، وما ازدريته ثالثاً من طرق التفلسف، وما ارتضيته آخراً من طريقة التصوف، وما انجلى لي في تضاعيف تفتيشي عن أقاويل الخلق، من لباب الحق، وما صرفني عن نشر العلم ببغداد، مع كثرة الطلبة، وما دعاني إلى معاودته بنيسابور بعد طول المدة، فابتدرت لإجابتك إلى مطلبك، بعد الوقوف على صدق رغبتك، وقلت مستعيناً بالله ومتوكلاً عليه، ومستوثقاً منه، وملتجئاً إليه. (المنقذ: 61).

My brother in faith, you have asked me to reveal to you the purpose and secrets of the sciences, and the dangerous and complex depths of the schools of thought. You would like me to tell you what I have undergone in order to distinguish the truth from error in the different sects, despite the differences in their paths and methods.

You wish to know the daring it took to rise above the plain of conformism (*Taqlid*)⁵ to the heights of observation and independent investigation.⁶ First, what profit I drew at the beginning from *Kalam* (or theology). Secondly, how I then turned away from those who defended *Ta'lim*⁸ (teaching) because they were impeded in reaching the truth by their subjection to an Imam. Thirdly, how much I mistrusted the methods of philosophers, and finally how I came to appreciate the way of Sufism.

You would like to see the "pulp of the truth" as it appeared to me after I came to doubt my efforts to analyze what different people said, and you would like to know what caused me to abandon my teaching in Baghdad despite the great number of my pupils there, and what made me take it up again, a long time later, in Nīshapār. I promptly fulfilled your wishes, which I recognize as

sincere, and, counting on God to grant aid, confidence, success and protection I now plunge into my subject (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 61-62).

You have asked me, O brother in the religion, to propound to you the aim of the sciences and their secrets, and the peril of the schools of thought and their pitfalls. You have asked me to tell you what I endured in the process of extracting the Truth from the confusion of the sects, as well as the disparity of the methods and procedures. You have asked me to relate how I ventured to ascend from the depth of conventionality to the height of active inquiry. To have asked me to explain the followings: Firstly, what benefit I obtained from the science of theology. Secondly, what I disliked about the methods of the scholarly teachers, whose pursuit of the Truth is confined to conventional adherence to the leader. Thirdly, what I found lacking in the methods of philosophy. Finally, what I found satisfactory in the Spiritual Path of Sufism; how I discovered the kernel of the Truth in the multiple facets of my investigation of people pronouncements; what turned me away from the dissemination of knowledge in Baghdad, in spite of the number of students there, and what prompted me to return to Nīsāpūr after a long period of time. (*Munqidh*: Holland, 1)

7.6.1.1 Discussion of Example (1)

Abūlaylah changed the sentence order in the first line of this text فقد سألتني أيها الأخ في الدين translating it as ‘My brother in religion, you have asked me’, whereas Holland maintained the original order. Also, Abūlaylah translates the word الدين (literary, religion) as ‘faith’ which is not the literal meaning of the Arabic word (see section (7.3.11) of this chapter). Holland translates the phrase غاية العلوم وأسرارها (literally, the aims of the sciences and their secrets) as ‘the aims of the sciences and their secrets’ which is more literal translation than Abūlaylah’s translation of the same phrase as ‘the purposes and secrets of sciences’. The phrase ما قاسيته (literally, what I have endured) is translated by Abūlaylah as ‘what I have undergone’ and by Holland as ‘what I endured’. The Arabic text suggests that al-Ghazālī encountered great difficulties in extracting truth from the confusion of the sects, which is communicated more accurately by the word ‘endured’ than by the word ‘undergone’. Also the word تباين (literally, disparity) is literally translated by Holland as ‘disparity’. Abūlaylah translates it as ‘differences’ which is less accurate translation than Holland’s. Abūlaylah translation of the word المسالك (literally, paths) is more

literal and accurate than Holland's translation of the same word as 'methods'. The Arabic word *المسالك* suggest something that is physical (something that one goes through in life, in his search for truth), whereas the word 'methods' suggest something 'theoretical' or 'procedural'. Abūlaylah translated *وما استفدته من علم الكلام* as 'First, what profit I drew at the beginning from *Kalam* (or theology)', adding the phrase 'at the beginning', which is not only redundant but also not in the original. The same text is literally and accurately translated by Holland as 'Firstly, what benefit I obtained from the science of theology'. Abūlaylah translates the sentence *الفاصرين* (literally, who confine the apprehension of truth to imitating the imam) as 'were impeded in reaching the truth by their subjection to an Imam'. But his use of the words 'impeded' and 'subjection' suggests a stronger meaning than the original text. In contrast, Holland's translation of this same text as 'whose pursuit of the Truth is confined to conventional adherence to the leader' is more literal and accurate. Also, in translating this text, Abūlaylah adds 'which I came to doubt' which is not in the original. The phrase *نشر العلم* (literally, dissemination of science) is more literally translated by Holland as 'dissemination of knowledge' than by Abūlaylah who freely translates it as 'teaching'.

The discussion of this example shows that Holland's translation is not only more literal than Abūlaylah's translation, but also more accurate.

7.6.2 Example (2)

فابتدرت لإجابتك إلى مطلبك، بعد الوقوف على صدق رغبتك، وقلت مستعيناً بالله ومتوكلاً عليه، ومستوثقاً منه، وملتجئاً إليه. اعلموا -أحسن الله تعالى) إرشادكم والآن للحق قيادكم- أن اختلاف الخلق في الأديان والملل، ثم اختلاف الأئمة في المذاهب، على كثرة الفرق وتباين الطرق، بحر عميق غرق فيه الأكثرون، وما نجا منه إلا الأقلون، وكل فريق يزعم أنه الناجي، و ((كل حزب بما لديهم فرحون)) (الروم: 32) هو الذي وعدنا به سيد المرسلين، صلوات الله عليه، وهو الصادق الصدوق. (المنقذ: 61).

I promptly fulfilled your wishes, which I recognize as sincere, and, counting on God to grant aid, confidence, success and protection I now plunge into my subject.

You should know -- may God set you on the right path, and lead you gently towards the truth -- that people have different religions and beliefs, that there are different theological systems

among religious leaders, and that the community of Islam has different sects and paths. All of this constitutes a deep sea in which most have foundered and only a few have survived. Yet each group believes it has found salvation, "each party rejoices at what it possesses." This was accomplished by what the Master of prophets -- peace be upon him -- foretold sincerely and truthfully when he said: "My nation will divide into seventy-three sects, and only one of them will be saved." What he foretold has indeed almost come true. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 62).

I have therefore made haste to respond to your request, after confirming the genuine nature of your interest. I have spoken as one who seeks help from Allāh, who puts all his trust in Him, who relies upon him, and who takes refuge with Him.

Allāh (Exalted is He) has granted you the most excellent direction, and your guidance now belongs to the Lord of Truth. You must be aware of the diversity of people in the religions and creeds, as well as the diversity of leaders in the schools of thought, the multiplicities of sects and differences of methods. You must know that this is a very deep ocean, in which most people are drowned, and from which only a few people are saved, although every faction claims to be the one that is rescued [...] (*Munqidh*, Holland: 1-2)

7.6.2.1 Discussion of Example (2)

The phrase *إجابة مطلبك* (literally, to answer your request) is literally translated by Holland as 'respond to your request', and less so by Abūlaylah who translates it as 'fulfilled your wishes'. The phrase *بعد الوقوف على صدق رغبتك* (literally, after confirming the sincerity of your desire) is literally translated by Holland as 'after confirming the genuine nature of your interest'. In translating the same phrase, Abūlaylah uses different wording, rendering it as 'which I recognize as sincere'. The text *مستعينا بالله، ومتوكلا عليه، ومستوثقا منه، وملتجنا إليه* is composed of four adverbial phrases that have the same structure in the source text. Holland reproduced the form of the original, translating it as: 'who seeks help from Allāh, who puts all his trust in Him, who relies upon him, and who takes refuge with Him'. In contrast, Abūlaylah changed the 'form' of the original, rendering it as: 'counting on God to grant aid, confidence, success and protection'. Abūlaylah translates *أحسن الله إرشادكم وألآن للحق قيادكم* (literally, may God Almighty guide you and gently lead you towards the truth) as 'may God set you on the right path, and lead you gently

towards the truth’, whereas Holland translates it as ‘Allāh (Exalted is He) has granted you the most excellent direction, and your guidance now belongs to the Lord of Truth’. Abūlaylah’s translation of this text is more literal than Holland’s. The phrase *أن اختلاف الناس في الأديان والملل* (literally, that the diversity among people in religions and sects) is literally translated by Holland as ‘the diversity of people in the religions and creeds’. In contrast, Abūlaylah translates the same text as ‘that people have different religions and beliefs’ which is less literal than Holland’s. The word *المذاهب* (creeds) is general in meaning as it could refer to creeds of all kinds (theological or legal). This word is accurately and precisely translated by Holland as ‘schools of thought’, whereas Abūlaylah’s translation of the same word as ‘theological systems’ is more specific in meaning than the original word. Abūlaylah translates *بحر عميق* (literally, deep sea) as ‘deep sea’, which is more literal than Holland’s translation of the same phrase as ‘deep ocean’. The word *نجا* (literally, saved) is more literally and accurately rendered by Holland as ‘saved’ than by Abūlaylah who translated it as ‘survived’. As mentioned in section (7.4.2.1) of this chapter, the word *نجا*, as used in the source text, has a particular meaning, referring to ‘religious or divine salvation’ rather than to ‘survival’ in general as Abūlaylah’s translation indicates.

7.6.3 Example (3)

وقد كان التعتش إلى درك حقائق الأمور دأبي وديني من أول أمري وريعان عمري، غريزة وفطرة من الله وضعتا في جبّاتي، لا باختيارٍ وحيّاتي، حتى انحلت عني رابطة التقليد وانكسرت علي العقائد الموروثة على قرب عهد سن الصبا (المنقذ: 63).

From my youngest years in the prime of life, my thirst to seize the profound reality of things was a natural instinct or tendency which God placed in me not by my choice or conscious decision. As I approached adolescence, while still young, the traditional bonds had already loosened and my inherited tendencies had broken down (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 62).

The thirst for attaining the true facts has always been my custom and practice, from the start of my career and the prime of my life. It is an instinct and a disposition installed in my nature by Allāh, not by my own choice and design. As a result, the bond of conventionality was detached from me, and the ties of hereditary dogmas were broken off me, around the time of vigor of youth. (*Munqidh*, Holland: 3).

7.6.3.1 Discussion of Example (3)

As can be seen from this text, Abūlaylah changes the first sentence order of *وقد كان التعطش إلى درك* and *من أول عمري وريعان شبابي* by placing the phrase *من أول عمري وريعان شبابي* at the beginning of the target text. In contrast, Holland maintains the original order of this sentence in translation. There are four instances of semantic repetitions in the original text. These are *دأبي* (literally, my habit and wont), *غريزة وفطرة* (literally, instinct and disposition), *حيلتي واختياري* (literally, my choice and invention) and *أول عمري وريعان شبابي* (literally, in my early years and in the prime of my life). In translating these instances of semantic repetition, Holland followed the ‘form’ of the source text more closely than Abūlaylah. So, he translated *دأبي وديني* as ‘my custom and practice’, *من أول عمري وريعان شبابي* as ‘from the start of my career and the prime of my life’ and *حيلتي واختياري* as ‘my own choice and design’. In contrast, Abūlaylah changed the form of these examples in a significant way. Thus, he replaced the article *و* (literally, and), which separates each pair of these semantic repetitions, with ‘or’ in translation (e.g. *حيلتي واختياري* is translated by him as ‘my choice or conscious decision’), or with ‘in’ (e.g. *من أول عمري وريعان* is translated by him as ‘my youngest years in the prime of life’). The phrase *العقائد الموروثة* (literally, the inherited beliefs) is translated literally by Holland as ‘hereditary dogmas’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it less literally as ‘inherited tendencies’.

As this example shows, Holland’s translation tends to be more literal than Abūlaylah’s translation.

7.6.4 Example (4)

فهذه آفة عظيمة لأجلها يجب زجر كل من يخوض في تلك العلوم، فأنها وإن لم تتعلق بأمر الدين، ولكن لما كانت من مبادئ علومهم، سرى إليه شرهم وشؤمهم، فقل من يخوض فيها إلا وينخلع من الدين وينحل عن رأسه لجام التقوى. (المنقذ: 80).

As the risk is considerable, it is fitting to warn regarding mathematics. Although it has no connection with religion, it provides the basis for the other sciences; anyone who studies it risks infection by their vices. Few who study it escape the danger of loss of faith. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 76).

This is a very grave consequence, because of which it is necessary to admonish anyone who delves into those science. Even though they are not related to the matter of religion, their evil and their misfortune are infectious, because of the principles of their sciences. If someone plunges into a harmful influence, he seldom escapes being stripped of the religion and having bridle of pious devotion removed from his head (*Munqidh*, Holland: 16).

7.6.4.1 Discussion of Example (4)

The Arabic word يجب is more accurately translated by Holland as ‘it is necessary’ than by Abūlaylah who translates it using a softer phrase, ‘it is fitting’. The verb يخوض (literally, delve) is translated by Abūlaylah as ‘study’, but translated more accurately and literally by Holland as ‘delve’. Al-Ghazālī seems to be warning against studying mathematics in depth rather than merely ‘studying’ as Abūlaylah’s translation indicates. The phrase شرهم وشؤمهم (literally, their evil and misfortune) is literally translated by Holland as ‘evil and their misfortune’, and less so by Abūlaylah who translates it as ‘evil’, merging these two Arabic adjectives into one in English.

In conclusion, Holland tends to adhere more closely and literally to the source text than Abūlaylah.

7.6.5 Example (5)

فعلت أن رد المذهب قبل فهمه والإطلاع على كنهه رمى في عماية، فشمريت عن ساق الجد، في تحصيل ذلك العلم من الكتب، بمجرد المطالعة من غير استعانة بأستاذ، وأقبلت على ذلك في أوقات فراغي من التصنيف والتدريس في العلوم الشرعية، وأنا ممنو بالتدريس والإفادة لثلاثمائة نفر من الطلبة ببغداد. (المنقذ: 74).

I have learned that to attempt to refute a system without understanding it or knowing it through and through is to do so blindfold. Therefore I set myself to a serious study of this science (of philosophy) through its written works, reading them without the help of a teacher. I did this during leisure moments while working on the composition and teaching of religious law-- at this time in Baghdad I had 300 pupils to teach and instruct. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 73).

I realized that it is shooting in the blind ignorance, to refute a school of thought before understanding it and studying its essence, so I buckled down to the task of acquiring that knowledge directly, by pursuing the books [of the philosophers] without seeking the assistance of a teacher. I tackled that in the moments I had to spare from my compiling and teaching about

the Islāmic legal sciences, for I was heavily occupied in the teaching and instruction of three hundred students in Baghdād (*Munqidh*, Holland: 12).

7.6.5.1 Discussion of Example (5)

The idiom رمي في عمية (literally, shooting in darkness) is literally translated by Holland as ‘shooting in the blind’. Abūlaylah translates the same idiom as ‘do so blindfold’ which is less literal than Holland’s translation. Also, the stock metaphor شمردت عن ساق الجد is used in the source text to mean ‘I decided to exert every effort (to do something)’. This stock metaphor is translated by Holland by a stock metaphor in English, that is, the phrase ‘I buckled down to’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it freely as ‘I set myself to’. Also, the phrase وأنا ممنو (literally, while I was burdened) literally and accurately translated by Holland as ‘heavily occupied’. Translating the same phrase, Abūlaylah renders it freely and less accurately as ‘I had’.

It is obvious that Holland followed the original text more closely and literally than Abūlaylah.

7.6.6 Example (6)

ولقد كان في عصرهم، بل في كل عصر، جماعة من المتأهلين، لا يُخلي الله [سبحانه] العالم عنهم، فأنهم أوتاد الأرض، ببركاتهم تنزل الرحمة على أهل الأرض كما ورد في الخبر حيث قال صلى الله عليه وسلم: ((بهم تمطرون وبهم ترزقون ومنهم كان أصحاب الكهف)). (المنقذ: 86).

In their time, as always, there was one of those groups which God never leaves the world without, for they are the pillars which support the earth. God's mercy descends upon it because of their spirit, in accord with Muhammad's saying -- peace be upon him -- "It is by them that the rain and your subsistence comes to you." The sleepers in the cave were of such persons. According to the *Qur'an* there were such persons in ancient times. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 79).

In their day and age there was a community of worshipful devotees, and indeed there is such a community in every day and age. Allāh (Glory be to Him) does not leave the world devoid of them, for they are the props of the earth. Their blessings send down mercy to the people of the earth, as related in the traditional report of the Prophet’s saying: (peace be upon him):

“By them you are watered and by them you are sustained, and among them were the Companions of the Cave.” (*Munqidh*, Holland: 20-21).

7.6.6.1 Discussion of Example (6)

The word المتألهين (godly men) is literally translated by Holland as ‘worshipful’, whereas Abūlaylah omitted it in translation. The phrase or metaphor أوتاد الأرض (literally, pillars of the earth) is translated by Holland as ‘pillars of the earth’ and by Abūlaylah as ‘the pillars which support the earth’. It is the former that is more literal because of the addition of the phrase ‘which support’ within the latter’s translation, which is not in the original. Also, Holland’s translation of بركاتهم تنزل الرحمة على أهل الأرض (literally, by their blessings mercy descends upon the people of earth) as ‘Their blessings send down mercy to the people of the earth’ is more literal translation than Abūlaylah’s translation of the same text as ‘God’s mercy descends upon it because of their spirit’. In addition, Abūlaylah changed the original hadith (sayings of the Prophet) بهم تمطرون وبهم تترزقون ومنهم أصحاب الكهف by separating this hadith into two parts. He put the first part of this hadith into quotation marks, indicating that only this part is an authentic hadith, whereas Holland preserved the original hadith as it is in the source text.

Therefore, it could be argued that, in translating this text, Holland tends to reproduce the original more closely and literally than Abūlaylah.

7.6.7 Example (7)

ولقد اعترض على بعض الكلمات الموثقة في تصانيفنا في أسرار علوم الدين ، طائفة من الذين لم تستحكم في العلوم سرائرهم ، ولم تنفتح إلى أقصى غايات المذاهب بصائرهم ، وزعمت أن تلك الكلمات من كلام الأوائل ، مع أن بعضها من مولدات الخواطر - ولا يبعد أن يقع الحافر على الحافر - وبعضها يوجد في الكتب الشرعية ، وأكثرها موجود معناه في كتب الصوفية . (المنقذ: 88).

On the other hand, some of my readers have criticized some passages of my books dealing with the mysteries of religion. They have not studied the sciences sufficiently deeply, and their minds have not been able to embrace the full implications of our teachings. They believed that those passages were borrowed from the ancient philosophers. In fact, some of my expressions were the fruit of my own thinking (and why should the tracks of one horse not cover those of another); some of them can be found in the sacred texts; many others are to be found, in substance, in the works of the mystics. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 81).

Against some of the statements cited in our literary works, concerning the secrets of the sciences of the religion, objections have been raised by a group of those whose feelings have not become rooted in the sciences, and whose perceptions have not been opened to the ultimate aims of the schools of thought. They have claimed that those statements come from the teaching of the ancients, although some of them are actually the product of random notions, so coincidental similarity is not unlikely, while some of them are found in the books of Islamic law. And the meaning of most of them is found in the books of the *Ṣūfīs*. (*Munqidh*, Holland: 22).

7.6.7.1 Discussion of Example (7)

Abūlaylah added the phrase ‘on the other hand’ at the beginning of this text, which is not in the original. Holland literally translates the phrase طائفة (literally, group) as ‘group’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it less literally as ‘some of my readers’. The sentence لم تستحكم في العلوم سرائرهم (literally, whose hearts have not been grounded in the sciences) is literally translated by Holland as ‘their feelings have not become rooted in sciences’, whereas Abūlaylah adopts a less literal method in translating the same text, rendering it as ‘They have not studied the sciences sufficiently deeply’. The same applies to the sentence ولم تتفتح إلى أقصى غايات المذاهب بصائرهم (literally, and whose insight was not open to the ultimate aims of creeds) which Holland literally translates as ‘and whose perceptions have not been opened to the ultimate aims of the schools of thought’, and Abūlaylah translates as ‘and their minds have not been able to embrace the full implications of our teachings’. The word أوائل (literally, ancients) is literally translated by Holland as ‘ancients’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it as ‘ancient philosophers’, imposing on the original text an interpretation that is not necessarily implied in the source text. The phrase مع أن (literally, even though) is literally translated by Holland as ‘although’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it as ‘in fact’. The proverb ولا يبعد أن يقع الحافر على الحافر (literally, just as a [horse’s] hoof may match [another] hoof), is translated by Abūlaylah as ‘and why should the tracks of one horse not cover those of another’ and by Holland as ‘so coincidental similarity is not unlikely’. It is clear that the former translation is a more literal translation than the latter. Holland’s translation of الصوفية as *Ṣūfīs* is a more literal and accurate translation than Abūlaylah’s translation of the same word as ‘mystics’, for reasons that have been discussed earlier in this chapter (see section (7.5.8.1)).

7.6.8 Example (8)

ثم إنني، لما فرغت من هذه العلوم، أقبلت بهمتي على طريق الصوفية وعلمت أن طريقتهم إنما تتم بعلم وعمل؛ وكان حاصل علومهم قطع عقبات النفس. والتنزه عن أخلاقها المذمومة وصفاتها الخبيثة، حتى يتوصل (بها) إلى تخلية القلب عن غير الله (تعالى) وتحليته بذكر الله. (المنقذ: 100).

After I had finished with those branches of knowledge, I directed my mind entirely to the Way of the mystics. I came to know that their Way consists of both knowledge and deeds as equally necessary. The object of their works is to eliminate the obstacles created by one's own self, and to eradicate the defects and vices in one's own character. In this way, in the end the heart will be rid of all that is not God the Almighty, and will adorn itself solely with praise of God. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 91).

Next, when I have finished with these sciences, I turned my attention to the methods of the Ṣūfīs. I learned that the spiritual Path is completed only through knowledge and work. Their work is directed toward surmounting the hurdles of the lower self, and obtaining deliverance from its blameworthy characteristics and its evil attributes, for the ultimate purpose of cleansing the heart of everything other than Allāh (Exhaled is He) and adorning it with the remembrance of Allāh. (*Munqidh*, Holland: 32).

7.6.8.1 Discussion of Example (8)

The phrase فلما فرغت من هذه العلوم (literally, when I have finished with these sciences) is literally translated by Holland as ‘Next, when I have finished with these sciences’. In contrast, Abūlaylah’s translates the same text as ‘After I had finished with those branches of knowledge’, which is not as literal as Holland’s translation. Abūlaylah’s translation of the term طريق الصوفية as ‘the Way of the Sufis’ is more literal and accurate translation than Holland’s translation of the same term as ‘the methods of the Ṣūfīs’’. For as argued in section (7.4.8.1), the English word ‘way’ is the most literal and accurate translation of the Arabic word طريق when the reference is made to the ‘way of the Sufis’, because the word ‘way’ indicates that the Sufis, in their search for a direct knowledge of God, travel into a particular way, a way or journey with stages, which the Arabic word indicates. The English word ‘method’ does not suggest this meaning.

The word عمل (literally, work), which is singular in Arabic, is translated by Holland as singular in English (work), whereas Abūlaylah translates it using a plural word (deeds). The term ذكر الله (literally, remembrance of God) is translated by Holland as ‘the remembrance of Allāh’, which is more literal and accurate translation than Abūlaylah’s translation of the same term as ‘praise of God’. In fact, the term ذكر الله has a specific denotation (see section (8.2.16) of chapter eight of this study for more details) that is better distinguished from the general meaning of the word ‘praise’.

The discussion of this example shows that Holland’s translation is, for the most part, more literal than Abūlaylah’s.

7.6.9 Example (9)

وفي هذا الشهر جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار، إذ أقفل الله على لساني حتى اعتقل عن التدريس، فكنت أجاهد نفسي أن أدرس يوماً واحداً تطيباً لقلوب المختلفة [إلي] ، فكان لا ينطق لساني بكلمة [واحدة] ولا أستطيعها البتة. (المنقذ: 104).

The fact is that God tied my tongue and stopped me teaching. I struggled to no avail to speak at least once to my pupils, to please the hearts of those who were attending my lectures, but my tongue refused to serve me at all. And having my tongue tied made my heart grow heavy. I could not swallow anything; I had no appetite for food or drink; I could neither swallow easily nor digest any solid food. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 93).

In that month the matter passed from one of free choice to one of compelling necessity. Since Allāh bolted my tongue, rendering it incapable for academic teaching. I would struggle to make myself teach for one single day, but my tongue would not utter a single word, and I simply could not force it to do so (*Munqidh*, Holland: 35)

7.6.9.1 Discussion of Example (9)

The phrase جاوز الأمر حد الاختيار إلى الاضطرار (literally, the matter passed the domain of choice to compulsion) is literally translated by Holland as ‘the matter passed from one of free choice to one of compelling necessity’, whereas Abūlaylah translates it using different wording, ‘I lost my free will and was under compulsion’. Abūlaylah translates أقفل الله على لساني (God locked up my tongue) as ‘God tied my tongue’, whereas Holland translates it more literally as ‘Allah bolted my

tongue'. The phrase يوما واحدا is literally translated by Holland as 'one single day', and less so by Abūlaylah who translates it as 'once'. The text فكان لا ينطق لساني بكلمة واحدة، ولا أستطيعها البتة (literally, my tongue would not utter a single word, and I would be completely incapable of doing so) is translated literally by Holland as 'but my tongue would not utter a single word: I was completely unable to say anything'. Abūlaylah freely translated the same text as 'my tongue refused to serve me at all'.

To conclude, the discussion of this example shows that Holland's translation is, for the most part, more literal than Abūlaylah's.

7.6.10 Example (10)

فأول ما يخلق في الإنسان حاسة اللمس، فيدرك بها أجناساً من الموجودات: كالحرارة، والبرودة، والرطوبة واليبوسة، واللين والخشونة، وغيرها. واللمس قاصر عن الألوان والأصوات قطعاً، بل هي كالمعدوم في حق اللمس. ثم تخلق له [حاسة] البصر، فيدرك بها الألوان والأشكال، وهو أوسع عوالم المحسوسات. (المنقذ: 110).

The first sense is that of touch, by which one can feel, for example, hot and cold, wet and dry, smooth and rough, etc. But with this sense alone one could not experience colors or sounds, which do not exist so far as touch is concerned. Next is the sense of sight, which allows one to perceive colors and shapes. It is the most extensive of the sensible worlds. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 91).

The first faculty to be created in the human being is the sense of touch, by which he perceives certain categories of the existing entities, like heat and cold, moisture and dryness, smoothness and roughness, and so on. Touch is absolutely incapable of recognizing colors and sounds, which are simply non-existent as far as touch is concerned.

The next to be created for him is the faculty of sight, by which he perceives the world of colors and shapes, and that the most extensive of all the world of sensory perceptions (*Munqidh*, Holland: 41).

7.6.10.1 Discussion of Example (10)

Abūlaylah translates *فأول ما يخلق في الإنسان حاسة اللمس* (literally, the first thing to be created in the human being is the sense of touch) as ‘The first sense is that of touch’. This is less literal translation than Holland’s translation of the same text as ‘The first faculty to be created in the human being is the sense of touch’. The verb *فيدرك* (literally, perceive) is literally translated by Holland as ‘perceive’ and less so by Abūlaylah who translates it as ‘feel’. The phrase *أجناسا من الموجودات* (literally, species of existents) is omitted from Abūlaylah’s translation, but maintained in Holland’s. The words *الحرارة والبرودة والرطوبة واليبوسة واللين والخشونة* (literally, heat and cold, moisture and dryness, smoothness and roughness) are nouns in Arabic. Abūlaylah changes these nouns in translation into adjectives, whereas Holland translates them all using nouns like in the original. The sentence *واللمس قاصر عن الألوان والأصوات قطعا* is translated in Holland’s translation literally as ‘Touch is absolutely incapable of recognizing colors and sounds’, whereas Abūlaylah translates the same text less literally as ‘But with this sense alone one could not experience colors or sounds’. Also, the phrase *ثم تخلق له حاسة البصر* is translated by Abūlaylah as ‘next is the sense of sight’, which is less literal than Holland’s translation of the same phrase as ‘The next to be created for him is the faculty of sight’.

Therefore, it could be argued that, in translating this text, Holland tends to reproduce the original more closely and literally than Abūlaylah.

7.7 Concluding Remarks

This section contains concluding remarks that aim to interpret results found in sections (7.3 to 7.6). It aims to examine how these results bear on the Retranslation Hypothesis, that is to say, to what extent each new translation became more literal and closer to the source text than first translation. Literalism was measured by whether the translator adhered to literal meaning, translated each word and phrase in the original, showed more respect for the form or mode of expression of the original text, and followed the word order of the original text, among other things. Closeness or source-oriented translation was measured mainly by the number of instances that can be considered as inaccuracies or losses of semantic and pragmatic meaning.

To start with the work of Watt compared to the work of Field, his immediate predecessor, the empirical evidence of this chapter as derived from the compared analysis of 10 texts clearly shows that Watt's translation tends to be not only more literal translation than that of Field, but also more accurate. The analysis of all texts completely confirms this result. Similarly, comparing the work of McCarthy with the work of Watt, his immediate predecessor, the empirical evidence of this chapter shows that the work of the former is, for the most part, not only more literal, but also more accurate. The analysis of 9 texts out of 10 texts confirms this result. Up to this point, the Retranslation Hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the data of this study. However, when the fourth translation of *Munqidh*, Abūlaylah's translation, was compared with the third one, that is with McCarthy's translation, his immediate predecessor, the empirical evidence of this chapter shows clearly that the work of McCarthy clearly tends to be not only more literal translation than Abūlaylah's, but also more accurate. Abūlaylah's translation is, generally speaking, less literal and less accurate than McCarthy's translation. He shows less respect for the form of the source text than McCarthy, and less respect for the nuanced meanings included in the source text. McCarthy's translation follows the meaning and form of the source text more closely and literally than Abūlaylah's. Moreover, comparing the fourth retranslation of *Munqidh* by Holland with the third retranslation of the same text by Abūlaylah, the empirical evidence of this chapter clearly shows that the work of the former is not only more literal, but also more accurate. The analysis of all texts completely confirms this result.

Consequently, this shows that the Retranslation Hypothesis is not confirmed by the data of *Munqidh* and its English translations with reference to both literalism and accuracy of translation. This means that Berman's model, according to which retranslations tend to show an increasing tendency toward literalism and closeness in translation (see section (4.2.2 of chapter four) cannot explain satisfactorily the work of the translators who were involved in translating this text.

To conclude, this chapter shows that the Retranslation Hypothesis is not confirmed by the data of *Munqidh* when literalism and closeness in translation are concerned. For, although Watt's translation seems to be more literal and closer translation than Field's translation, and McCarthy's translation seems to be a more literal and closer translation than that of Watt,

Abūlaylah's translation seems to be less literal in translation than McCarthy's translation, and Holland's translation seems to be more literal and closer translation than that of Abūlaylah. Consequently, the retranslations of *Munqidh* do not follow a linear progression from target-oriented translation to source-oriented translation.

CHAPTER EIGHT: CULTURAL REFERENCES IN *MUNQIDH* AND THE RETRANSLATION HYPOTHESIS

In chapter three of this study, it was argued that CSIs are used as typical examples to examine the ways translators deal with ‘foreign’ elements in other cultures, especially when the involved cultures are considered significantly distant and unequal. As a text that belongs to a different culture and time, *Munqidh*, as shown in chapter five of this study, is full of religious terms that can be considered to be specific to Islam, and thus challenging when translated into a different language and culture. This chapter aims to 1) identify the procedures of translation that the translators of *Munqidh* use in translating CSIs contained in the text; 2) categorize them into source-oriented or target-oriented procedures of translation, and 3) to examine to what extent they can be used to confirm the Retranslation Hypothesis. These procedures will mainly be described in light of Aixelá’s typology (1996) as outlined and discussed in chapter three of this study section (3.3.2). Through showing how English translators of *Munqidh* deal with cultural elements in this text, it is hoped that there will be a greater understanding about the translations of this text into English. It is also hoped that testing the Retranslation Hypothesis with reference to the translation of CSIs will consolidate the conclusions drawn in chapter six of this study, where this hypothesis is tested with reference to linguistic closeness (literalism) and the paratextual visibility of the translator (see section 6.6.5).

This chapter is divided into three sections. Section one is a general account of the whole chapter. Section two contains the data analysis of the chapter. It contains a discussion of the translation of 40 cultural references contained in *Munqidh* and the procedures used in translating them. The section will be divided into sub-sections each of which lays bare the procedures of translation used by the translators of *Munqidh* in rendering each cultural reference or term. Section three interprets and discusses results taken from section two.

8.1 Overview

As argued in chapter five of this study, *Munqidh* is a religio-philosophical autobiography that is characterized, among other things, by being conceptual in nature. It is full of religious terms that stand for specific concepts in Islam and classical Islamic thought. A considerable number of

these terms are culturally specific as they are used in Arabic to express concepts in Islamic thought that can only be understood with reference to a culture that Arabs and Muslims share. Those terms are unknown to or are understood in significantly different ways in the West, and thus have no direct equivalent in a language such as English. As these terms contain elements that are bound to Islam and Islamic thought, they constitute a sensitive part of the text that translators must pay attention to during the translation process. The analysis of the procedures used in translating these terms can be considered a typical example of the way the English translators of *Munqidh* dealt with these elements in translation, i.e. to what extent they attempt to preserve and highlight these cultural terms in translation or, instead, erase and downplay them.

In order to describe the methods these translators use in the rendition of these terms, the typology of procedures developed by Aixelá (1996) (see chapter three section (3.2.3) of this study for more details) will be used in this chapter with the addition of the procedure ‘literal translation’. Aixelá suggests specific procedures that he believes translators (can) use in translating CSIs. These procedures have been reviewed in chapter three of this study and there is no need here to repeat them in full, but a summary could be useful for the reader in order to help him or her follow the arguments of this chapter:

- Transliteration: borrowing the source term and writing it in accordance to the alphabet of the target language.
- Intratextual gloss: the source term, or its constituents, is preserved in translation through transliteration or literal translation, but the translator includes additional words within the text to make the source term clearer in the target language.
- Extratextual gloss. The translator adds an explanatory note on the source term outside the text in a form of endnote or footnote. This procedure is only used with other procedures.
- Limited universalization: replacing the source term for another in the source culture that is still considered less specific and closer to the target reader’s understanding.
- Absolute universalization: replacing the source term for a neutral term in the target language, deleting any cultural connotation of it in translation.
- Naturalization: aims to replace the source item specific to the source culture with an item specific to the target culture.

- Deletion: deleting the cultural references in translation.

In addition to these procedures, the procedure that is commonly known as ‘literal translation’ will also be used in the description of the translation of CSIs of *Munqidh*. By literal translation it is meant that a CSI is rendered into the target language by using words and phrases that match its denotative or dictionary meaning. In other words, literal translation involves rendering a CSI using its linguistic (dictionary) equivalent in the target language without any additional words.

Each of the aforementioned procedures of translation can be used in translating a given CSI, but two or more procedures can also be used in translating one and the same term. These procedures, as argued in chapter three of this study, form a continuum. At one end of the spectrum there is ‘preservation’: source-oriented or foreignizing procedures, which include the procedures transliteration, linguistic (non-cultural) translation, intratextual gloss, extratextual gloss, and literal translation. At the other end of the spectrum of this typology there is ‘substitution’: target-oriented or domesticating procedures, which include limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization and deletion.

This continuum will be used in the concluding remarks of this chapter in order to determine to what extent one can talk about a linear development in the translation of CSIs that are contained in *Munqidh*, i.e. to what extent the subsequent translators of this text lean toward source-oriented translation in the rendition of these elements.

The chapter analyses the translation of 40 cultural terms taken from *Munqidh*. The vast majority of these terms, about 36, are religious terms specific to Islam, and Islamic culture and thought. Some of these terms relate to worship in Islam such as the terms ركوع and سجود. Others are theological terms understood only with reference to Islamic theology such as the terms المعتزلة and إخوان الصفا. Still others refer to places related to Islamic culture such as قبة جبل حراء and الصخرة. In addition to these terms, there is one term referring to a special Iraqi dish, one term referring to an Abbasid coin, one term referring to a measure of weight, and one term referring to a job known only in the Arab and Islamic World (and perhaps in other non-Western culture such as Chinese).

Some of these CSIs are well-known for ordinary Muslims such as قبة الصخرة and غار حراء, whereas other terms such as the terms سؤال الإضلال are unknown even to well-educated Muslims. However, the majority of these items belong to the first category as the ensuing section will show.

The examined terms constitute the main data that can be considered as culturally specific in *Munqidh*. The remaining words or terms that could be categorized as CSIs in some sense (one proverb, two idioms, a few proper names, and a few metaphors) constitute less than 5% of the total number of the cultural terms of the text, and will not affect the results of this chapter in any significant way.

8.2 Data Analysis

This section contains the analysis of 40 CSIs taken from *Munqidh* in light of the procedures suggested mainly by Aixelá. A table of the translations of the term with the procedures of translation that these translators use will be compiled in each section. The section contains a brief analysis of the translated term and the procedures used in translating it into English by Field, Watt, McCarthy, Abūlaylah and Holland. Because Field's translation of *Munqidh* is not complete, the terms that he did not originally translate will be marked in each table with the sign (-). To avoid confusion, extratextual glosses will only be mentioned in the analysis of CSIs.

8.2.1 Example (1): المعتزلة (*mu'tazilah*)

The term المعتزلة (*mu'tazilah*) refers to a group of theologians who introduced speculative theology to Islam (Wehr, 1961: 611). Although the term has been in circulation in English since the 19th century with the rise of British Orientalism, the term is only understood by those who are well-versed in Islamic studies.

7.2.1.1 Translation of *mu'tazilah*

Table (1)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Mutazilites	Mu'tazillah	Mu'tazilites	Mu'tazila	Mūtazila
Procedure	Transliteration	Transliteration	Transliteration	Transliteration	Transliteration

As table (1) shows, all translators of *Munqidh* translate the term *mu'tazilah* using transliteration, but each employ slightly different methods. Watt, Abūlaylah and Holland drop the definite article from the source term in translation, whereas Field and McCarthy drop this article and adapt the term according to English grammar (for example, the addition of “s” as a plural marker). McCarthy¹ and Abūlaylah² include more information about this term in an endnote gloss in their translation of *Munqidh*. The translation of this term is a typical case of source-oriented translation that is adopted by all translators of *Munqidh*.

8.2.2 Example (2): الطريقة (*ṭarīqah*)

The word *ṭarīqah* is derived from the word *ṭarīq*, literally meaning ‘path’ or ‘to take as a way’. In its technical sense, the word is used to refer to the distinctive Sufi journey, i.e. the mystical path through which the Sufi travels to achieve direct knowledge of God. For al-Ghazālī, *tariqa* is “the upward ascent and esoteric path to a union with Ultimate Reality” (Greenland, *ibid*: 54). This involves specific steps along the way such as purifying the soul, self-discipline, and practicing *dhikr* (on *dhikr* see section (7.2.17) of this chapter).

7.2.2.1 Translation of *ṭarīqah*

Table (2)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	path	A mystic ‘way’ (<i>ṭarīqah</i>)	the Way	the Way	Spiritual Path
Procedure	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss	Literal translation	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss

Although a mystical tradition has been developed in Islam and Christianity, the term *ṭarīqah* has no direct equivalent in the West. As table (2) shows, the translators of *Munqidh* adopt different procedures in translating the term *ṭarīqah*. Field translates it literally as *path*, and McCarthy and Abūlaylah adopt the same procedure, translating the same term as *the Way*. McCarthy³ and Abūlaylah⁴ add an extratextual gloss about this term in the endnotes of their translation of *Munqidh*. Both McCarthy and Abūlaylah capitalize the word “way”, probably to indicate that the word is used as a specific reference in the source text, i.e. as a reference to a particular ‘way’. In contrast, Watt translates the same term as *the mystic way (tariqah)*. The term *the mystic way* is an example of intratextual translation (the word *ṭarīqah* is translated literally as ‘way’ and the word ‘mystic’ is added in the target text for more clarification) and translation by transliteration. Watt puts the word ‘way’ between speech marks to indicate that the word is used in a specific sense in the source text. Holland’s translation of the same term as “*Spiritual Path*” is also an example of intratextual gloss, where the word *tariqah* is translated literally as ‘path’ and the word “spiritual’ is added into the translation to bring the source term closer to the reader’s understanding. Holland also capitalized the target term to indicate that the term is a technical term. The translation of this term is an example of a source-oriented translation which involves the use of preservation through literal translation (Field, McCarthy and Abūlaylā), intratextual gloss (Holland), and intratextual gloss plus transliteration (Watt).

8.2.3 Example (6) باطني (*bāṭinī*)

The term باطني (*bāṭinī*) (plu. *Bāṭiniyyah* or *bāṭiniyyūn*) is a key term in *Munqidh* that is used to refer to a follower of the Ismā’lī sect (on the Ismā’lī sect, see chapter five of this study section (5.4.7)). The word *bāṭinī* is derived from *bāṭin*, meaning literally “inward”, “inner”, and “interior”. It is the opposite of *ẓahirī* (lit. outward, exterior). In Islamic theology the term *baṭini* is often used to denote a doctrine that states that truth (the true meaning of the Qura’n, mainly) can only be disclosed to divinely gifted people, mainly the Imams of Shiite Muslims or the Imams of the Ismā’lī sect. The term denotes any group who adheres to such a doctrine. From this viewpoint, the *bāṭinī* follows an esoteric or secret doctrine (Classé, 1989: 79). The true interpretation of the scripture was considered by the *bāṭinī* Ismā’lī to be like revelation itself: beyond the boundaries of human reasoning. It is only given to infallible imams (the descendants

of the family of the Prophet) who are divinely gifted with authoritative knowledge (Leaman and Groff, 2007: 19-20). The definition al-Ghazālī gave for this term in *Munqidh* leaves no doubt that the term is used to refer to the Ismā’īlī sect.

7.2.3.1 Translation of *bāṭinī*

Table (3)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	One who maintained the hidden meaning of the Qur’an	one of the <i>Bāṭinīyah</i>	Interiorist	an “interiorist” (<i>Bāṭini</i>)	esotericist
Procedure	Intratextual gloss	Transliteration	Literal translation	Literal translation plus transliteration	Literal translation

As table (3) shows, Field translates the term *bāṭinī* as “one who maintained the interior meaning of the Qur’an”. This is a typical example of translation by intratextual gloss, where the original term is preserved through literal translation (hidden) but more words are added within the target text to bring the source term closer to the target audience. The same term is translated by Watt as “one of the *Bāṭinīyah*”, which uses the process of transliteration in a specific manner. Instead of transliterating the original term *bāṭinī* directly, Watt transliterates the plural form of the term then modifies it with the phrase “one of” to indicate that the original term is singular. McCarthy also preserves the original term by translating it literally as “interiorist”. McCarthy explains⁵ the term further in the endnotes of his translation of *Munqidh*, thus his translation can be considered as translation by literal translation and extratextual gloss. Abūlaylah follows both McCarthy and Watt, translating the same term by literal translation and transliteration as “interiorist” (*Bāṭini*). Abūlaylah also adds an extratextual gloss⁶ about this term in the endnotes of his translation of *Munqidh*. Holland’s translation is similar to that of McCarthy in that he translates the term *bāṭinī* by the English word “esotericist”. This is also a literal rendition because the noun “esotericist” is derived from ‘esoteric’ which is defined by *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary* as that

knowledge which is intended for or understood only by a small number of people with a specialized knowledge or interest (2010: 597).

8.2.4 Example (4): ظاهري *zāhirī*

The term ظاهري (*zāhirī*) is derived from the word ظاهر *zāhir* (literally, apparent or external) but specifically referring to those who recognize the literal sense of the Qur'an and the traditions of the Prophet instead of using interpretation and rational reasoning. The followers of this doctrine generally reject the use of reason and interpretation in favour of the literal truth of the Qur'an and the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad and his Companions (Leaman and Goff, *ibid*: 215-6). In some ways, this term is opposite to that of *bāṭini* discussed in section (7.2.3) of this chapter. But unlike the term *bāṭini*, the term *zāhirī* is not defined, either directly or indirectly by al-Ghazālī in *Munqidh* and therefore a good background understanding of Islamic studies is essential for comprehension.

7.2.4.1 Translation of (*zāhirī*)

Table (4)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	a partisan of the Qur'an exterior sense	One of the <i>Zāhirīyah</i>	Literalist	"literalist" (<i>Zahiri</i>)	Exotericist
Procedure	Intratextual gloss	Transliteration	Literal translation	Literal translation plus transliteration	Literal translation

The translators of *Munqidh*, as seen in table (4), use different procedures in the rendition of this term into English. Field translates it as “*a partisan of its [the Qur'an] exterior sense*” which is a clear example of translation using intratextual gloss (the word *zāhirī* is rendered literally as ‘*exterior*’ but other words are added within the text for more clarification). Although the definition Field gives to *zāhirī* captures the semantic core of the original term, it seems to restrict the range of meanings this term has (for example, the fact that those who hold this doctrine reject

reason in religious matters). Watt’s translation retains the source term by translating it as “*one of the Zāhirīyah*”. Here, his translation is unique because he transliterates the plural form of the term *zāhiri* then adds the phrase “one of” to indicate that the source term is singular, something that he also does in his translation of the term *bāṭinī*. But given the fact that the term *zāhiri* is not defined in the original text, providing a transliteration of the original term without more clarification means that it would only will be understood by those who are experts or at least very knowledgeable in Arabic and Islamic studies. A literal translation of the same term is given by McCarthy who translates it simply as “*literalist*”. The reader should find this translation adequate because, generally speaking, in a religious context the word ‘literalist’ is understood in the West the same way that the term *zāhiri* is understood in the source text. McCarthy uses an explanatory note⁷ at the end of his translation of *Munqidh* to point out that the term *zāhiri* describes anyone who “holds to the literal and immediate sense of the revealed text” (McCarthy, 1982: 84), thus justifying his translation of this term as ‘literalist’. McCarthy’s translation comes into line with Field’s translation of the same term as “*one who maintained the exterior sense of the Qur’an*”, although the procedure of translation he uses is different from that used by Field. Abūlaylah adopts McCarthy’s translation but adds transliteration of the original term, translating the source term as “*literalist*” (*Zahiri*). Finally, Holland’s translation of the term *zāhiri* as “*exteriorist*” is similar to McCarthy, and can simply be considered a literal translation of the original term. This is also an example of translating a CSI by using source-oriented procedures of translation.

8.2.5 Example (5) إخوان الصفا (*Ikhwān al-ṣafā*)

The term إخوان الصفا (*Ikhwān al-ṣafā*) refers to a group of people or more precisely thinkers to whom is attributed a well-known book known in Arabic as رسائل إخوان الصفا (literally, the treatises of the brethren of purity or sincerity). The group is generally considered as one of the main sources of the Ismā’īlī thought. According to Glassé (*ibid*), the writings of those thinkers “reveal a surprising open-minded intellectual curiosity about such civilizations as those of the ancient Greeks, the Persians, and the Indians; in fact, their universalism went so far as to accept that there is truth in religions other than Islam” (78). The term إخوان الصفا is composed of the word إخوان (literally, brethren) and الصفا (literally, purity or sincerity). Al-Ghazālī refers to *Ikhwān al-*

ṣafā several times in *Munqidh*, often in the context of criticism, for they, like philosophers, hold views contrary to Islam

7.2.5.1 Translation of *Ikhwān al-ṣafā*

Table (5)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Brothers of Purity	‘Brethren of Purity’	“The Brethren of Purity”	‘Brethren of Purity’	<i>Ikhwān aṣṣafā</i> [Brethren of Purity]
Procedure	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation	Transliteration plus Literal translation

As shown in table (5), the term إخوان الصفا (*Ikhwān al-ṣafā*) is rendered into English by all translators of *Munqidh* except Holland as “*Brethren of Purity*”, which is a clear example of literal translation. Holland renders the same term by two procedures of translation, transliteration and literal translation. The translation of this term is thus a typical example of source-oriented translation that is adopted by all translators of *Munqidh*. Both McCarthy and Abūlaylah add a note on this term at the end of their translation of *Munqidh*, combining their literal translation of the term with extratextual gloss.

8.2.6 Example (6) سؤال الإضلال (*su’āl al-iḍlāl*)

The term سؤال الإضلال (*su’āl al-iḍlāl*, literally, the question or topic of “misleading” or “misguidance”) is a term that al-Ghazālī used to refer to a theological debate in Islamic theology about whether God misleads human beings, that is, whether He intentionally brings a human to life and then misleads him or only misleads those who have already become disobedient as the Quran itself indicates (Quran, 2:27). The debate is part of a broader debate over the relationship between God’s will and actions, on one hand, and a human’s freedom, on the other hand. (see details in Sweetman, 1967: 169-73). This is a well-known debate in Christian theology as well, but the term سؤال الإضلال as a reference to a specific question or topic (whether God misleads His creatures) has no direct equivalent in the West.

7.2.6.1 Translation of *su'āl al-iḍlāl*

Table (6)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	The topic of God's leading men astray	The problem of "leading astray"	[the question] whether God ever misleads His servants	Omitted
Procedure	-	intratextual gloss	Literal translation	intratextual gloss	Translation by deletion

The term سؤال الإضلال is mentioned only once in *Munqidh* and the context in which it occurs does not give enough information or indication about or of its precise meaning. Watt translates the term as “*The topic of God's leading men astray*”, which is an example of translation by intratextual gloss. The words سؤال (*su'āl*, question or topic) and الإضلال (*iḍlāl*, misleading) are translated literally by Watt, but the translator adds the words ‘God’ and ‘men’ in translation to give further information that he deems necessary so that this term is more easily understood by the target reader. Although, to some extent, the added words clarify the meaning of the original term, it will probably remain vague for non-specialists in Islamic studies. In translating the same term, McCarthy adopted a literal translation, rendering it simply as “*the question of leading astray*”. He also added a note ⁸about this term in the endnotes of his translation. Abūlaylah translates the same term as “*whether God ever misleads His servants*” which is also an example of intratextual gloss similar to that of Watt, but Abūlaylah comments on this term in the endnotes of his translation⁹, pointing out that this question emerges from reading specific verses in the Qur'an in a way that may lead to a strong belief in pre-destination. The translation and the extratextual gloss he gives make this term easier to understand for general readers. The term *su'āl al-iḍlāl* is not translated by Holland, which can be considered as translation by deletion.

8.2.7 Example (7) الكتاب (*al-kitāb*)

The term الكتاب (*al-kitāb*) means literally, the book. It is one of the Islamic different names given to the Qur'an (Glassé, *ibid*: 228). There are verses in the Qur'an and traditions attributed to the Prophet that refer to the Qur'an as "the book".

7.2.7.1 Translation of *al-kitāb*

Table (7)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Koran	The Book	The Book	The Qur'an	The Book
Procedure	Limited universalization	Literal translation	Literal translation	Limited universalization	Literal translation

As shown in table (7), Watt, McCarthy, and Holland translate the term *al-kitāb* literally as "the Book" with the use of the capital "B" to indicate that in this context the word refers to a specific book, the Qur'an. But the same term is translated by both Field and Abūlaylah as "Koran" or the "Qur'an", which is now an established term in English. Field's and Abūlaylā's translations can be considered as examples of translation by limited universalization in some sense because although both words "Qura'n" and "*al-kitāb*" belong to the source culture and refer to the same thing, the word 'Qura'n in English is closer to the reader's understanding than the word "the Book".

8.2.8 Example (8) السنة (*sunnah*)

The term السنة (*sunnah*) is a key term in *Munqidh*. The most common literal meanings of the word *sunnah* is without doubt *ṭariq* (literally, way or path) and biography or way of life (Fitzpatrick and Walker, 2014: 611). Technically speaking, the word *sunnah* is typically used in Islamic contexts to refer to the established practice of the Prophet, i.e. the way and example he established (for Muslims). The word is also used to refer to the transmitted reports (*hadith*) which are written records of what the Prophet said, did, and approved of (Glassé, *ibid*: 381). These two meanings of the word are not always clearly distinguished.

7.2.8.1 Translation of (*al-sunna*)

Table (8)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Traditions	Sunnah (the example of Muḥammed)	Sunna	the traditions (sunna)	Sunna
Procedure	Literal translation	intratextual gloss	Transliteration	Literal translation plus Transliteration	Transliteration

As can be seen from table (8), Field translates the term *sunnah* as “*the traditions*”, which is now an established term in English. Watt translates the same term as “*Sunnah (the example of Muḥammed)*”, preserving the original term in translation through transliteration and adding more words “the example of Muḥammed” for further clarification. McCarthy¹⁰ uses transliteration, rendering the term as “*Sunna*”, adding an extratextual gloss about it in the endnotes of his translation of *Munqidh*. Abūlaylā’s translation of the term as “*the traditions (sunna)*” is a combination of literal translation and transliteration. Abūlaylah adds an extratextual gloss about the term in the endnotes of his translation of *Munqidh*¹¹. Holland translates the same term as “*the Sunna*” which is an example of translation by transliteration. Watt, McCarthy, and Holland use the word ‘*sunna*’ with a capital letter in the translation to indicate that the word is used in the source text as a technical term. The term *sunna* is translated by all translators of *Munqidh* by source-oriented procedures (literal translation, transliteration, intratextual gloss, extratextual gloss).

8.2.9 Example (9): الصحاح (*ṣiḥāḥ*)

The word الصحاح *ṣiḥāḥ* (literally, sound or authenticated) is an Islamic term that is often used to refer to the collections of sound or authentic reports attributed to the Prophet known as كتب الصحاح (*kutub al- ṣiḥāḥ*). (see Saleh, 2011: 203). The term could also be interpreted as being a reference to sound traditions of the Prophet rather than to the collections of these traditions themselves. The context in which this term occurs justifies both of these senses of the word:

أما قوله (عليه السلام): ((لكن الله إذا تجلى لشيء خضع له)) فليس توجد هذه الزيادة في الصحاح أصلاً
(المنقذ: 81).

Here, al-Ghazālī is commenting on a part of a tradition attributed to the Prophet, pointing out that this part is not found in *ṣiḥāḥ*. Is he referring to the authenticated collections of hadith or to authenticated hadith in general here? It is difficult to tell, and it is the translator who must make the final decision.

7.2.9.1 Translation of *ṣiḥāḥ*

Table (9)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	trustworthy collection of the tradition	the collections of sound Traditions	sound tradition	the authenticated collections of <i>Hadiths</i>	The authentic records
Procedure	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss

As shown in table (11), the translators of *Munqidh* translate the term *ṣiḥāḥ* by intratextual gloss. The word *ṣiḥāḥ* is translated literally as “trustworthy” or “sound” “authenticated” or “authentic”, but the translators deem it necessary to add more information within the target text to facilitate the reader’s comprehension of the original term. All translators take this term to be a reference to the collections of sound traditions attributed to the Prophet except for McCarthy whose translation seems to indicate that the original term refers to sound traditions rather than to the collections of these sound traditions themselves. As table (9) shows, all of the translators render the term using intratextual gloss, where the original term is preserved through literal translation and further words are added in the target text to bring the term closer to the target reader’s understanding.

8.2.10 Example (10) الفطرة الأصلية (*fiṭrah aṣliyyah*)

The term الفطرة الأصلية (*fiṭrah aṣliyyah*) literally means “original disposition”, “original nature”, “original constitution”, but in an Islamic context it refers to “the initial disposition” that every human has and which would lead him or her to become a monotheist (Griffel, 2012: 2-4). In other words, it denotes the innate knowledge (mainly of God) which is placed in human beings by God before birth. The *fiṭrah* or the tendency toward believing in one God is equated by most Muslim scholars with Islam (see Rubin, 2003: 74). Islam is often described as being “the religion of *fiṭra*”, that is, the religion of true nature of human beings. According to al-Ghazālī and other Muslim scholars, this original nature or *fiṭra* is then affected by a variety of false teachings of different kinds including those falsehoods found in other religions such as Christianity (see Griffle, *ibid*). The term *fiṭrah aṣliyyah* is important for al-Ghazālī in *Munqidh* because his search for a certain belief in God is nothing less than the search for the true meaning of *fiṭrah aṣliyyah*.

7.2.10.1 Translation of *fiṭrah aṣliyyah*

Table (10)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	innate disposition	original nature	<i>original fiṭra</i>	original human nature	Original nature
Procedure	Literal translation	Literal translation	Transliteration	intratextual gloss	Literal translation

As shown in table (12), Field and Watt translate the term *fiṭrah aṣliyyah* literally as “*innate disposition*” and “*original nature*” respectively. McCarthy prefers to retain the key original term *fiṭrah* through transliteration. In the endnote of his translation of *Munqidh*, McCarthy points out that this Arabic term is complex, and this is why he decided to retain the Arabic term in his translation¹². The same term is translated as “original human nature” by Abūlaylā, which is an example of translation by intratextual gloss (the word ‘human’ is added in the target text for further clarification). Abūlaylah also adds an extratextual gloss on this term in the endnote of his translation of *Munqidh*, pointing out that the word *fiṭrah* means the condition of a human being at birth which is nothing but Islam or submission to God (Abūlaylā, 2001: 114n). Holland

translates the same term by literal translation and transliteration as “*true nature*” (*fiṭrah*). Therefore, the procedures used in translating the term *fiṭrah aṣliyyah* in *Munqidh* are literal translation (Field and Watt), transliteration with extratextual gloss (McCarthy), intratextual gloss with extratextual gloss (Abūlaylah), and literal translation with transliteration (Holland). These procedures of translation can all be considered as source-oriented.

8.2.11 Example (11): الشرح (*sharḥ*)

One of the major themes of *Munqidh* is that knowledge or true and certain knowledge of God is a gift from God for those who follow the way of true believers (Prophets and Sufis, for example). This gift is a light that God sometimes casts into the hearts of his servants. This theme is also referred to in *Munqidh* as الشرح (*sharḥ*). The word literally means “expansion”, but technically refers to the fact that God may expand (open up) the hearts of those who seek Him to receive true knowledge and certitude. This technical sense is derived originally from the verb شرح (*sharaḥa*) as used by the Qura’n in the following verse:

"فمن يرد الله أن يهديه يشرح صدره للإسلام" (الأنعام: 125).

“When God wishes to guide someone, He opens their breast to *Islam*” (Q, 6:125).

7.2.11.1 Translation of *sharḥ*

Table (11)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Omitted	Enlarging (<i>sharḥ</i>)	“the dilation”	Spiritual expansion	‘expansion’
Procedure of translation	Translation by deletion	Literal translation plus transliteration	Literal translation	intratextual gloss	Literal translation

As shown in table (11), Field translates the term *sharḥ* by omission, but this does not affect the meaning of the original text because the context in which this term occurs communicates its meaning adequately as can be seen from the text in which the term occurs in *Munqidh* and its translation into English by Field:

فمن ظن أن الكشف موقوف على الأدلة المحررة فقد ضيق رحمة الله [تعالى] الواسعة؛ ولما سئل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن (الشرح) ومعناه في قوله تعالى:

"فمن يرد الله أن يهديه يشرح صدره للإسلام" (الأنعام: 125)

قال: ((هو نور يقذفه الله تعالى في القلب)) (المنقذ: 68).

To suppose that certitude can be only based upon formal arguments is to limit the boundless mercy of God. Some one [sic] asked the Prophet the explanation of this passage in the Divine Book": God opens to Islam the heart of him whom He chooses to direct." "That is spoken," replied the Prophet, "of the light which God sheds in the heart"(The Confessions, 1909: 19).

The content of the term *sharḥ*, which Field omitted in translation, is fully understood because its meaning is clear from the explanation given by the Prophet of a verse which contains the verb from which the term is derived.

Watt translates the term *sharḥ* as "Enlarging (*sharḥ*)", thus applying a literal translation and transliteration. McCarthy only uses a literal translation, and translated the term as "the dilation", allowing the context to make the content of this term clearer. Holland follows suit and translates the same term as "expanding". The translation Abūlaylah gives to this term is "spiritual expansion", which is a clear example of translation by intratextual gloss where the word "spiritual" is added to the target text to specify what kind of "expansion" the source term is about. The translations of this term provided by these translators are marked by speech marks to indicate that the literal translation of this Arabic term should be understood figuratively and with reference to the context in which the source term is used.

8.2.12 Example (12) نفحات (*nafaḥāt*)

The word نفحات (*nafaḥāt*, plural of *nafaḥah*) is an Arabic word that is almost always used in religious or Islamic contexts. Wehr, in the *Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, gives the following meanings of the word *nafaḥah*, the singular form of *nafaḥāt*: "breeze, gust; breath, diffusing odor; fragrance, scent; gift, present" (*ibid*: 982). In *Munqidh*, the word appears in a hadith attributed to the Prophet in the context of explaining the importance of receiving God's

grace as a gift that He sometimes bestows upon those who seek His way and guidance. The hadith says that God has gentle breezes that Muslims are recommended to expose themselves to:

"إن لربكم نفحات، ألا فتعرضوا لها" (المنقذ: 68).

7.2.12.1 Translation of *nafahāt*

Table (12)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Breathings of his [God] grace	Gusts of favour	gusts of grace	messages of grace	Sweet breezes
Procedure	intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss	limited universalization plus intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss

As shown in table (12), the term *nafahāt* is translated literally by Field as “*breathings of his [God] grace*”, which can be categorized as intratextual gloss translation where the word *nafahāt* is first translated into English literally as ‘breathings’ and then the phrase ‘of his grace’ is added for more clarification. The same term is translated by Watt as ‘Gusts of favour’, which can also be categorized as intratextual gloss translation where the word *nafahāt* is first translated literally into English as ‘gusts’ and then the phrase ‘of grace’ is added for more clarification. McCarthy’s translation is similar to that of Watt’s. The same term is translated by Holland as ‘Sweet breezes’, which can also be considered as intratextual gloss translation where the word *nafahāt* is first translated literally into English as ‘breezes’ and then the word ‘sweet’ is added for more clarification. Abūlaylā’s translation combines two procedures in translation. First of all, the word *nafahāt* is translated as ‘messages’ which is not a literal (dictionary) meaning of the Arabic word. In fact, it is more general in sense, although it still retains something of the source term. Thus, it is translation by limited universalization. To this the translator adds the phrase ‘of his grace’ for extra clarification. The effect that this translation generates is something between domestication and foreignization.

8.2.13 Example (13) إجماع الأمة (*Ijmā' al-ummah*)

The term إجماع الأمة (*Ijmā' al-ummah*), literally the consensus of the community, is a key term in Islamic jurisprudence or law (see Glassé, *ibid*: 182). Islamic law is derived from four sources, and these are the Qura'n, the tradition of the Prophet, analogy and *Ijmā' al-ummah*. However, the precise meaning of *ijmā' al-ummah* has been a subject of debate past and present, because the concept designated by this term can be interpreted to refer to the consensus of the Community of the Prophet (his Companions) or to the consensus of the Muslim community in general (see details in Sodiq, 2010: 170). In *Munqidh*, the term is not defined and seems to be vaguely used to refer to the consensus of the Muslim community in general.

7.2.13.1 Translation of *Ijmā' al-ummah*

Table (13)

Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Universal consent	The consensus of the community	Community's consensus	the consensus of the Muslim nation	the consensus of the Community
limited universalization	Literal translation	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss	Literal translation

As seen in table (13), Field translates the term *ijmā' al-ummah* as “universal consent”. The Arabic term does not refer to ‘universal consent’ but to the consent or consensus of the Muslim community. For this reason, it could be said that Field’s translation is an example of translation by limited universalization. Watt’s, McCarthy’s and Holland’s translations of the same term are typical examples of literal translation, because the original term is translated literally without any additions. Abūlaylā’s translation of *ijmā' al-ummah* as “the consensus of the Muslim nation” is an example of translation by intratextual gloss (the original term is translated literally, but with the addition of the word ‘Muslim’ for more clarification). The translators of *Munqidh* do not give more information about this term in the form of a footnote or endnote, probably because the term, although important in jurisprudence, is not a key term in *Munqidh*.

8.2.14 Example (14) القبلة (*qiblah*)

The word قبلة (*qiblah*, literally, direction) is an Islamic term that is used to refer to the direction to which Muslims turn in praying (toward the Kaaba)” (Wehr, *ibid*: 740). The concept has no equivalence in Christianity.

7.2.14.1 The Translation of *qiblah*

Table (14)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	<i>qiblah</i>	<i>qibla</i>	the direction of the Kibla	<i>Qibla</i>
procedure	-	Transliteration	Transliteration	Intratextual gloss	transliteration

As shown in table (14), the term *qiblah* is translated by Watt, McCarthy and Holland by transliteration. Watt, in a footnote¹³, and McCarthy¹⁴, in the endnotes of his translation, add an extratextual gloss for the term. Abūlaylah translates the same term as “*the direction of the Kibla*” which is an example of translation by intratextual gloss (the original term is transliterated and the words “the direction of” are added within the target text to help the reader to understand the meaning of the original term). He, in the endnotes of his translation, added an extratextual gloss for the term¹⁵. This is another case of a CSI that is rendered through preservation of the original term through transliteration, intratextual and extratextual gloss by the translators of *Munqidh*.

8.2.15 Example (15) أركان الحج (*arkān al-ḥajj*)

The term أركان الحج (literally pillars or elements of pilgrimage) is a term that refers to the ceremonies that Muslims perform when they go on pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina as prescribed and detailed by the Qur’an and the traditions of the Prophet (see Saleh, *ibid*: 72-73). In *Munqidh*, the term is mentioned only once.

7.2.15.1 Translation of *arkān al-hajj*

Table (15)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	the elements of the Pilgrimage	the principal ceremonies of the pilgrimage	Basic elements of pilgrimage	Basic elements of the Pilgrimage
procedure	-	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss	Literal translation	Literal translation

Watt, Abūlaylah and Holland believe that literal translation is an effective method for the translation of this term, because it adequately communicates the content of the source term. Thus, the term is translated by Watt as “*the elements of the Pilgrimage*”, by Abūlaylah as “*Basic elements of pilgrimage*”, and by Holland as “*Basic elements of the Pilgrimage*”. McCarthy’s translated the same term as “*the principal ceremonies of the pilgrimage*”, which is a sort of intratextual gloss, where the original term is literally translated and then the word “ceremonies” is added within the text for more clarification.

8.2.16 Example (16) ذكْر الله (*dhikr Allāh*)

The term *dhikr Allah*, *dhikr* for short, is derived from the verb *dhakara* meaning ‘to mention’, or ‘to remember’ in Arabic. *Dhikr Allāh* means thus to ‘mention’ [the name of] God as stated in the verse “Therefore glorify the name of your Lord, the Supreme” (Quran, 56: 74, Khan’s translation, 1925: 413). This can be done through mentioning His name in particular phrases or formulas such as لا إله إلا الله (there is no god, but God) or سبحان الله (praised is God). Even when the notion of “making mention of the name of God” is not explicitly indicated by the Qur’an, such as in the following verse: “Remember Me; and I [God] will remember you” (2: 152), Muslim scholars as well as ordinary Muslims take this to simply mean that they should use the Name of God as part of their worship. In other words, to ‘remember’ God is more about doing something (for example, praising God by saying سبحان الله repeatedly) than simply pondering on Him or His actions mentally. William Chittick illustrates this point:

These Koranic verses help explain why the expression “remembrance of God” is normally interpreted as requiring the mention of His name, even if “name” is not part of the phrase. As a practice, *dhikr* demands an articulation of the divine in the form of one of His revealed names, whether this occurs vocally or mentally. *Dhikr* has never been understood as a vague or general recollection of God’s presence or activity (2000: 65-66).

Although mentioning the names of God or praising Him through the mention of specific phrases such “there is no god but God” by tongue or by heart is a ritual that is practiced by Muslims in general, the term *dhikr* is more closely associated with the Sufis. For Sufis, *dhikr* is generally understood as somewhere between prayer and meditation, involving a constant and a tireless repetition of God’s name or other religious formulas, often in groups, used to achieve mystical purposes. Ridgeon, for example, points out that through the constant invocation of the name of God the Sufi will “focus his concentration upon God alone” in an attempt to purify his heart from earthly distractions which stand as “a veil between him and God” (1996: 128; see also Chittick (2000: 69).

Thus, *dhikr* in Sufi contexts, first of all, implies the constant invocation of the name of God, or specific formulas that contains the name of God, individually or collectively, aloud or silently, to attain mystical ends (for example, purification of the heart, achieve direct experience of the divine, ecstasy). But the word *dhikr* can also be used to refer to the mental or spiritual state that the Sufi achieves through performing *dhikr*, the impact *dhikr* makes upon the soul (having God ever in mind and heart or being only with Him). Thus, exact translation of this term should capture these two features perfectly, the incessant remembrance of God through the pronunciation of His name.

7.2.16.1 Translation of *dhikr Allāh*

Table (16)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	invoking the name of God	recollection of God	remembrance of God	glorify God	The constant remembrance of God
Procedure of translation	intratextual gloss	Literal translation	Literal translation	Limited universalization	intratextual gloss

Although remembrance of God in the sense of having Him in mind and heart is a concept that Islam and Christianity share, the practice of the constant repetition of God’s names as a prayer or as somewhere between prayer and meditation as practiced by the Sufis is something specific to Islam. In translating this term, Field uses the phrase “*invoking the name of God*” which is an example of translation by intratextual gloss (the words *dhikr* and *Allāh* are translated literally as “invoking” and “God” but the word “name” is added within the target text to indicate that it is the name of God that is invoked). A literal translation of the same term is adopted by Watt who translates it as “*recollection of God*” and McCarthy who translated it as “*remembrance of God*”. Abūlaylā’s translation of the same term as ‘to glorify God’ is translated by using a limited universalization procedure because the phrase ‘to glorify God’ is more general in meaning than ‘to remember God’, although it is still recognized as belonging to the source culture. McCarthy¹⁶ and Abūlaylah¹⁷ add a note about this term in their translations, pointing out that *dhikr* is a distinctive Sufi practice. Holland’s translation of the term as “*constant remembrance of God*” is an example of translation by intratextual gloss. The translator believed it necessary to add the word ‘constant’ to the original term to indicate that the performance of *dhikr* is often understood, especially in Sufi contexts, as being a tireless repetition of God’s name, thus it corresponds to the analysis given to the term in the first two paragraphs of this section.

8.2.17 Example (17) التحريم *tahrīm*

The term التحريم (*tahrīm*) literally means “forbiddance, interdiction”, but technically refers to the beginning of prayer (the daily formal prayers that Muslims perform) in which the Muslim starts by saying الله أكبر (God is greater) with his or her hand raised (Saleh, *ibid*: 333). The term expresses a concept specifically related to worship in Islam.

7.2.17.1 Translation of *tahrīm*

Table (17)

Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
the cry "Allahu Akbar" (God is great)	The opening act of adoration in prayer (<i>tahrīm</i>)	the beginning of [the Prayer]	the state of <i>sacralization</i> which opens prayer	The initial consecration [the affirmation of Allāh's Supreme Greatness by declaring “ <i>Allāhu Akbar!</i> ”]
intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss plus naturalization	intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss

As shown in table (17), the translators of *Munqidh* decided to translate this term by literally preserving the original term or through transliteration as well as by adding further words in the target text to bring the term closer to the target reader. Watt¹⁸, McCarthy¹⁹ and Abūlaylah²⁰ add further information in the endnotes of their translation. Watt is the only translator who adds a transliteration of the source term in the translation. Watt also adds a footnote about the term in which he gives more information about its content. The shortest translation of the term *tahrīm* is given by McCarthy and the longest by Holland. *Tahrīm* is another term that is rendered by intratextual and extratextual gloss.

8.2.18 Example (18) الخليل (*al-khalīl*)

The term الخليل literally means “the friend”, but in an Islamic context it refers to Abraham, the Prophet (see Classé, *ibid*: 18). This term occurs only once in *Munqidh* in the context of describing the places al-Ghazālī visited in Syria and Hejaz after his abandonment of Baghdad. The text in which the term occurs is the following:

وزيارة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعد الفراغ من زيارة الخليل عليه السلام (المنقذ: 104).

7.2.18.1 Translation of *al-khalīl*

Table (18)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	The Friend of God (Abraham)	al-Khalil, the Friend of God	the Friend of God	the tomb of Abraham -- the friend of God	The Friend of God (Abraham)
procedure	intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss	intratextual gloss

Table (18) shows that all translators of *Munqidh* maintain the term *al-khalīl* (friend) in the translation, but add further words to make the source term clearer for the reader. A literal translation of the term as “the friend” would not naturally imply reference to Abraham, hence the addition of the words “God” and “Abraham” within the translation. In the endnotes of their translations, Watt²¹, McCarthy²² and Abūlaylah²³ added extratextual notes for this term. In a footnote about this term, Watt explains that *al-khalīl* is the Hebrew name given to Abraham who is buried under a mosque in the cave of Machpelah.

8.2.19 Example (19) عين النبوة (*‘ayn al-nubuwwah*)

In *Munqidh*, al-Ghazālī refers to what he considers to be a stage of knowledge beyond reason and sense-perception, only given to ‘prophets’ and Sufis. Prophets and Sufis have a unique ‘eye’ or faculty through which they can comprehend directly things beyond human reason. Al-Ghazālī uses the term عين النبوة (*‘ayn al-nubuwwah*, literally, the eye of prophecy or Prophethood) to refer to this phenomenon or faculty (see *Munqidh*: 115-17).

7.2.19.1 Translation of ‘*ayn al-nubuwwah*

Table (19)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	The eye of prophecy	the “eye” of prophecy	The prophetic eye	The eye of Prophethood
procedure	-	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation	literal translation

Watt, McCarthy and Holland preserve the source term through literal translation, rendering it as “the ‘eye’ of prophecy or Prophethood”. Abūlaylā’s translation of the same term as “*The prophetic eye*” is less literal than the terms used by the other translators, although it is still literal because the source term is literally translated without any additional words. Both McCarthy²⁴ and Abūlaylah²⁵ add an extratextual gloss about the term in their endnotes. Because this term is well defined in the source text, a literal English translation will be easily understood by the target reader.

8.2.20 Example (20) السجود *sujūd*

The word سجود (*sujūd*) is an Arabic word that literally means prostration, and technically refers to prostration during the daily prayers that Muslims perform. It “means putting one’s forehead and nose on the floor, supporting the body with the open palms, the knees and the toes, all of which should touch the floor” (Saleh, *ibid*: 204). During prostration, Muslims repeat specific religious formulae in which they praise God. It is an Islamic concept that is closely related to worship.

7.2.20.1 Translation of *sujūd*

Table (20)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	the prostration (<i>sujud</i>)	prostration	<i>sujūd</i>	The act of prostration [<i>sujūd</i>]
Procedure	-	Literal translation plus transliteration	Literal translation	transliteration	intratextual gloss plus transliteration

This term, which is not translated by Field, is preserved in translation by the subsequent translators through transliteration (Abūlaylā), literal translation (McCarthy), literal translation with transliteration (Watt), and translation by intratextual gloss with transliteration (Holland). Holland maintains the original term (prostration) but adds the words “the act of” which is, in fact, redundant within the translation because its meaning is implicit in the word ‘prostration’.

8.2.21 Example (21) صلاة الصبح (*ṣalāt al-ṣubḥ*)

The term صلاة الصبح (*ṣalāt al-ṣubḥ*) is defined in Wehr’s dictionary as “morning prayer (at dawn)” (*ibid*: 500). It is the first of the five daily prayers that Muslims perform.

7.2.21.1 Translation of *ṣalāt al-ṣubḥ*

Table (21)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	morning worship	Morning prayer	Morning prayer	The dawn prayer
Procedure	-	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation

As can be seen from table (21), the translators of *Munqidh* all adopt a literal translation method in the rendition of this term into English. McCarthy and Abūlaylah use “the morning prayer” whereas Watt uses “morning worship”. Here, Watt seems to agree with some scholars who prefer to use the word ‘worship’ for the Arabic word *ṣalāt* and the word ‘prayer’ for the Arabic word دعاء (*du’ā’*) which Wehr defines as “call, invocation of God, supplication, prayer, request, plea, good wish” (*ibid*: 283). But prayer remains a literal rendition of the word *ṣalāt* (*ibid*: 524).

Holland’s translation of the term as “the dawn prayer” is also a literal rendition as can be illustrated by Wehr’s definition of the Arabic term. Thus, it is clear that this CSI is preserved in translation by all of the translators of *Munqidh*.

8.2.22 Example (22) صلاة العصر (*ṣalāt al-‘aṣr*)

The term صلاة العصر (*ṣalāt al-‘aṣr*) is the middle prayer which Muslims perform in the afternoon, before sunset. (see Saleh, *ibid*: 205).

7.2.22.1 Translation of (*ṣalāt al-‘aṣr*)

Table (22)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	the afternoon worship	Afternoon prayer	A prayer in the afternoon	Afternoon prayer
Procedure	-	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation

Watt, McCarthy, Abūlaylah and Holland render the term *ṣalāt al-‘aṣr* by literal translation as table (22) shows.

8.2.23 Example (23) الظهر (*ẓuhr*)

The term الظهر (*ẓuhr*) is a shortened form of the term صلاة الظهر (*ṣalāt al- ẓuhr*) which is a name also given to the noonday prayer that is performed daily by Muslims. “Noon prayer time starts a few minutes after mid-day”. (*ibid*: 207).

7.2.23.1 Translation of *ẓuhr*

Table (23)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	midday	Noon prayer	at midday	midday prayer
Procedure	-	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss

As seen in table (23), Watt literally translates the term *al-zuhr* as ‘midday’. McCarthy and Holland translated the same term as “*Noon prayer*” and “*midday prayer*” respectively. These two translations are examples of intratextual gloss because of the addition of the word ‘prayer’ within the translation. Abūlaylah uses “*at midday*”, also a literal translation similar to Watt’s translation. The literal translations adopted by both Watt and Abūlaylah facilitate comprehension because the context in which this term occurs leaves no doubt that it is referencing Islamic midday prayer. In the endnotes of their translations, McCarthy²⁶ and Abūlaylah²⁷ added extratextual notes for this term.

8.2.24 Example (24) المغرب (*maghrib*)

The term المغرب (*maghrib*) is a shortened form of the term صلاة المغرب (*ṣalāt al-maghrib*) which is the name of the sunset prayer that is performed by Muslims every day. Saleh defines it in this way: “Technically, as a prayer time, “maghrib” means the time between actual sunset and the disappearance of the evening dusk”. (*ibid*: 139).

7.2.24.1 Translation of *maghrib*

Table (24)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	Sunset	the sunset prayer	At dusk	sunset prayer
Procedure	-	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss

Watt’s translation of the term *al-maghrib* as ‘*Sunset*’ and Abūlaylā’s translation of the same term as “*at dusk*” are literal translations. The term is translated by McCarthy and Holland as “*the sunset prayer*” and as “*sunset prayer*” respectively. This is yet another example of translation by intratextual gloss because both translators deem it necessary to include the word ‘prayer’ in order to clarify the term for the target reader.

8.2.25 Example (25) أهل الإباحة (*ahl al-ibāḥah*)

The term أهل الإباحة (*ahl al-ibāḥah*) is composed of two words, *ahl* literally means “people of” or “followers” and *al-ibāḥah* literally means “permissiveness”, or “licentiousness”, or “libertinism”.

In Islamic studies, and in *Munqidh* in particular, the term refers to a Sufi sect who claim that following the interior spiritual meaning of the sacred scripture (Qur'an) exempts one from adhering to the letter of the law (doing everything that the religious laws prescribe or avoiding whatever they prohibit) (Hodgson, 1979: 662). According to al-Ghazālī, these Sufis are only “masqueraded” Sufis who “Misled by lust and laziness, had dropped all prescribed ritual observances and embraced total sexual promiscuity” (Karamustafa, 2007: 160).

7.2.25.1 Translation of *ahl al-ibāḥah*

Table (25)

Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Ibahat	'Latitudinarians' (<i>Ahl al-Ibahah</i>)	the licentious libertines	Libertines	The advocates of libertinism
Transliteration	Naturalization plus transliteration	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation

As table (25) shows, Field translates the term '*ahl al-ibāḥah*' by transliteration as "*Ibahat*" without giving any sort of explanation to facilitate understanding for the reader. Watt translates the same term as "latitudinarians" and adds a transliteration of the source term. The *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* defines the word 'latitudinarian' as anyone who shows latitude or tolerance, especially in religious matters (2010: 998). This is an essentially different meaning to that of the original term. Watt's translation can be considered an example of naturalization because the English word he uses denotes something specific to the target culture. It seems that Watt was conscious of the problematic nature of using of the word "latitudinarians" in this context. For this reason, he puts the word "latitudinarians" between speech marks and provides a transliteration of the original term within the text. Although Watt adds an extratextual gloss²⁸ about the term in the footnote, the footnote does not contain information about the concept of '*ahl al-ibāḥah*', apart from referring the reader to the *Encyclopedia of Islam* for more detail about the term. Abūlaylah and Holland translate the term '*ahl al-ibāḥah*' as "libertines" and "the advocates of libertinism" respectively. The *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* defines the word "libertine" as "a person [who] freely indulges in sensual pleasures without regard to moral

principles” or as “a freethinker of matters of religion” (*ibid*: 1018). It is the first sense of this English word that closely captures the denotation of the original term. Hence, the translations Abūlaylah and Holland can be considered as literal translation. McCarthy’s translation of the same term as “*licentious libertines*” is a sort of intratextual gloss where the original term is translated literally as “libertines” and the word “*licentious*” is added for more clarification.

8.2.26 Example (26) الركوع (*rukū'*)

The term *rukū'* means bowing, but as a technical term it refers to bowing in the Islamic canonical prayer, which is “coupled with a litany of short recited passages and phrases in which we praise God and remind ourselves of our mission here” (Emerick 2005: 125).

7.2.26.1 Translation of *rukū'*

Table (26)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	bowing (<i>ruku'</i>)	bowing (<i>ruku'</i>)	Bow (<i>ruk'a</i>)	bowing [<i>rukū'</i>]
Procedure	-	Literal translation plus transliteration	Literal translation plus transliteration	Literal translation plus transliteration	Literal translation plus transliteration

As table (26) shows, all translators of *Munqidh* preserve the original term in translation, through literal translation with transliteration.

8.2.27 Example (27) الركعات (*rak'āt*)

The term *rak'āt* is closely related to the term *rukū'* which is discussed in the previous section. The *Short Encyclopedia of Islam* explains it as: “the *ṣalah* is composed of a series of movements repeated several times. Each series, or cycle of sacred speech and movement, is called a *rak'ah* (pl. *rak'āt*), a “bowing”” (Classé, *ibid*: 345). Therefore, the term denotes a distinctive ritual act in Islamic worship.

7.2.27.1 Translation of *ruk'āt*

Table (27)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	<i>Ruk'ahs</i>	<i>rak'as</i>	<i>Rakas</i> (bows in prayer)	Cycles [in the formal prayer]
Procedure	-	transliteration	Transliteration	Transliteration plus intratextual gloss	absolute universalization plus intratextual gloss

In translating the term *ruk'āt*, both Watt and McCarthy retain the original term through transliteration. Abūlaylah uses two procedures in translating the same term, transliteration and translation by intratextual gloss, rendering the term as “*Rakas (bows in prayer)*”. Holland translates the original term as “*Cycles [in the formal prayer]*”. Initially, the word *ruk'āt* is translated by a general word in the target language: ‘cycles’, then further words are added into the target text to bring the source term closer to the reader’s understanding. Holland’s translation can be considered as translation by absolute universalization plus intratextual gloss.

8.2.28 Example (28) رمي الجمار (*ramy al-jimār*)

Performing pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina is one of the five pillars of Islam for Muslims who can afford it. During the Muslim pilgrimage which lasts three days, pilgrims must perform certain rites. One of these is to travel to a valley in Mecca known as *wādī al-jamarāt* and throw three stones on three walls that symbolize Satan (see Glassé, *ibid*: 330). In Arabic, this practice is called رمي الجمار or رمي الجمرات (literally, throwing the stones). It is a ritualistic action that represents the curse of Satan, who not only symbolizes evil in Islam but also in other monotheistic religions. However, this practice has no equivalent in Christianity and therefore the concept is only known to Muslims.

7.2.28.1 Translation of *ramy al-jimār*

Table (28)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	the casting of stones (in the valley of Mina during the Pilgrimage),	the throwing of the stones	the ritual throwing of stones	The casting of the pebbles [during the pilgrimage]
Procedure	-	Intratextual gloss	literal translation	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss

As seen in table (28), McCarthy’s translation of the term *ramy al-jimār* as “*the throwing of the stones*” is an example of literal translation that will only be understood by those who have a good background knowledge of Islamic practices. Abūlaylah’s translation of the same term as “the ritual throwing of stones” is slightly clearer than McCarthy’s translation because of the addition of the word ‘ritual’ within the target text. However, Abūlaylah adds an extratextual gloss about this term in the endnotes of his translation of *Munqidh* for more clarification²⁹. Watt’s and Holland’s translations of the same term as “*the casting of stones (in the valley of Mina during the Pilgrimage)*” and “*The casting of the pebbles [during the pilgrimage]*” respectively fully capture the content of the term through the use of additional words, thus creating a clearer definition. Their translations are an example of translation by intratextual gloss.

8.2.29 Example (29) the term الزاوية (*zawiya*)

The word الزاوية *zawiya* (literally, corner) can be used in Arabic to refer to a small mosque, a prayer room in a home, or a special place in which Sufis gather and perform prayers and *dhikr* (remembrance of God) (Wehr, *ibid*: 387, and Classé, *ibid*: 432). In *Munqidh*, the word is used once without any indication of its intended meaning, i.e. whether it refers to a small mosque, a prayer room at home, or a Sufi meeting place.

7.2.29.1 Translation of *al-zāwiyah*

Table (29)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	the <i>zāwiyah</i> (hospice)	religious retirement	hiding place	The cell of retreat
Procedure	-	Transliteration plus naturalization	Absolute universalization	Absolute universalization	Intratextual gloss

No matter to what location the term *zāwiyah* refers, it is culturally specific, and the translators of *Munqidh* dealt with it in various ways as shown in table (29). Watt translates the term *zāwiyah* as “the *zāwiyah* (hospice)”. First, he transliterates this term in English then he translates it as “hospice”. In English, the word ‘hospice’ has a specific Western cultural meaning. The *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* defines it as: “1. a house providing care for the sick and the terminally ill; 2. Archaic, lodging for travellers, especially one run by a religious order” (2011: 688). Thus, Watt’s translation can be considered a combination of transliteration and naturalization. McCarthy translates the same term as “religious retirement”. In English, the word ‘retirement’ can refer to seclusion in some contexts, and the addition of the adjective ‘religious’ clarifies the reference as a type of seclusion for religious purposes. However, the term “*religious retirement*’ is more general in meaning than the term *zāwiyah*, because the latter possibly refers to a meeting place for the Sufis rather than to religious seclusion in general. For this reason, McCarthy’s translation can be categorized as translation by limited universalization. The term *zāwiyah* is rendered by Abūlaylah as “*hiding place*”. This English expression is also more general than the meaning designated by the source term. It is an expression that has no religious connotation in comparison to the term *zāwiyah*. Therefore, Abūlaylah’s translation can be considered as an example of absolute universalization. Abūlaylah, as shown in table (31), adds a transliteration of the original term in the endnote of his translation of *Munqidh*, but does not give any further explanation. Holland translates the same term as “*cell of retreat*” which is an example of translation by intratextual gloss, where the word *zawiya* is translated literally as ‘cell’ but the word ‘retreat’ is added to specify the type of ‘cell’ designated.

8.2.30 Example (30) the term أهل التعليم (*ahl al-ta'līm*)

In Islamic studies, the term أهل التعليم (*ahl al-ta'līm*) is a technical term that refers to the major doctrine among the Ismā'īlī sect at the time of al-Ghazālī. According to this group, truth, mainly religious truth, is only disclosed to the infallible Imam. The infallible Imam is divinely gifted with true knowledge beyond human reason. Those who adhere to this doctrine are called أهل التعليم (literally, people of teaching). In *Munqidh* the term occurs in this form but also in other forms such as أصحاب التعليم (*aṣḥāb al-ta'līm*, masters of teaching), or مذهب التعليم (*mathhab al-ta'līm*, literally, doctrine of teaching). The term أهل التعليم is defined clearly in *Munqidh*, referring to a group of people who believe that truth can only be attained through following the infallible Imam (see *Munqidh*: 95-100).

7.2.30.1 Translation of *ahl al-ta'līm*

Table (30)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Ta'limites	party of <i>ta'līm</i> (<i>authoritative instruction</i>)	the devotees of <i>ta'līm</i> ,	Those who defended <i>ta'līm</i> (teaching)	the scholarly teachers
procedure	Transliteration	Intratextual gloss plus limited universalization	Transliteration	Transliteration plus literal translation	Limited universalization

As can be seen from table (30), Field renders the term *ahl al-ta'līm* by transliteration. The reader will not find it difficult to understand the term in context because it is defined clearly in the source text. Watt translates the same term as “party of *ta'līm* (*authoritative instruction*)” which is a combination of transliteration and translation by limited universalization. The term ‘(*authoritative instruction*)’ is more general in meaning than the term *ta'līm*, but still retains something of the original term because of the use of the modifying adjective ‘authoritative’. McCarthy translates the same term as “the devotees of *ta'līm*” which can be considered as translation by transliteration. Abūlaylā’s translation is similar to that of Watt’s. The word *ahl* is first translated into English as “*those who defended*”, whereas the word *al-ta'līm* is given an English transliteration. Abūlaylah adds an extratextual gloss in the endnotes of his translation of

*Munqidh*³⁰. Finally, Holland translates the term *ahl al-ta'līm* as “the scholarly teachers”. This translation is a sort of translation by limited universalization. For, although the English expression “the scholarly teachers” is more general in meaning than that of the original term, it can still be considered as belonging to the source text and culture.

8.2.31 Example (31) المشايخ (*mashāyikh*)

The word المشايخ (*mashāyikh*) is an Arabic title that is only used in a plural form to refer to Islamic religious men or scholars. In *Munqidh*, al-Ghazālī refers to the masters of Sufis as مشايخ (*Munqidh*: 101). The word *mashāyikh* is closely related to the word شيوخ (*shuyūkh*, plural of *sheikh*) as they are both derivatives from the same root, but the latter is broader in meaning than the former because it can be used to refer to a clergy man in Islam, a head of a tribe, or even to a Muslim ruler in some countries.

7.2.31.1 Translation of *mashāyikh*

Table (31)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Leaders	leading men	Masters	Sheikhs	Sheikhs
procedure	absolute universalization	absolute universalization	limited universalization	Literal translation	Literal translation

As table (31) shows, the word *mashāyikh* is rendered by Field and Watt as “leaders’ and “leading men” respectively. These two expressions are more general in meaning than the original term, because they can be used to refer to all kinds of leaders, whereas the Arabic word *mashāyikh* refers specifically to the Sufi masters. McCarthy’s translation of the same word as ‘masters’ is less specific in meaning than ‘leaders’, but still more general in meaning than *mashāyikh* because it could reference religious or secular master alike. Therefore, Field’s and Watt’s translation can be considered as translation by absolute universalization, whereas McCarthy’s translation can be considered as an example of translation by limited universalization. To translate the term *mashāyikh*, both Abūlaylah and Holland use the English word, sheikhs, which is originally

borrowed from Arabic. In context, the word *sheikhs* has the same denotation as that of the word *mashāyikh* in the source text, and thus can be considered translation by literal translation.

8.2.32 Example (32) الصخرة (*al-ṣakhrāh*)

As used in *Munqidh*, the term الصخرة (*al-ṣakhrāh*) is a short version of the Arabic term قبة الصخرة. It refers to the Mosque of the Caliph ‘Omar in Jerusalem (Wehr, *ibid*: 506). It enshrines the rock from which the Prophet Muhammad is said to have ascended to heaven.

7.2.32.1 Translation of *al-ṣakhrāh*

Table (32)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Sanctuary of the Rock	the Rock	the Dome of the Rock	the Dome of the Rock	the Dome of the Rock
Procedure	Intratextual gloss	Literal translation	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss

The term *al-ṣakhrāh* occurs in *Munqidh* only once, and is translated by Field, McCarthy, Abūlaylā, and Holland using intratextual gloss where the word *al-ṣakhrā* is translated literally into English as “Rock”. However, further words (sanctuary and dome) are added within the target text to make the reference clearer. The same term is translated literally by Watt as “the Rock”. The context in which the word *al-ṣakhrā* occurs provides the reader with an indication that the reference is made to a place in Jerusalem where al-Ghazālī spent time in prayer and meditation. As can be seen from table (32), all translators use capitalization in translating this term to indicate that this is a specific place.

8.2.33 Example (33) جبل حراء (*jabal ḥirā*)

In Islamic context, the term جبل حراء (*jabal ḥirā*, literally mountain of *ḥirā*) refers to a place in Mecca where the Prophet used to meditate and in which Muslims believe he received his first revelations (Saleh, *ibid*: 61). The term appears in some Islamic contexts in another form, غار حراء (*ghār ḥirā*, literally the cave of *ḥirā*). The cave is situated on the mountain, 600 metres above ground level.

7.2.33.1 Translation of *jabal ḥirā'*

Table (33)

Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Mount Hira	Mount Hirā'	Mountain Hirā'	Mount Hirā	Mount Hirā'
Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss	Intratextual gloss

The term *jabal ḥirā'* occurs in *Munqidh* in its short version as حراء, and as the table (33) shows, all translators of *Munqidh* render it through preservation of the word *ḥirā* using transliteration and adding the words “Mount” or “Mountain” in the target text, clearly referencing a particular mountain. The context in the source text adds further information: the fact that the Prophet Muhammad went to Mount *Hirā* to meditate.

8.2.34 Example (34) الإمام المعصوم (*imām ma'ṣūm*)

The term الإمام المعصوم (*al-imām al-ma'ṣūm*) literally means “the infallible Imam”. The infallibility of the Imam is a key doctrine for Shiite Muslims and the Ismā'īlī sect to which al-Ghazālī refers in *Munqidh* (see *Munqidh*, 95-100).

7.2.34.1 Translation of *imām ma'ṣūm*

Table (34)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	Infallible Imam	Infallible Imām	Infallible Imām	Infallible Imām
Procedure	-	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation

As table (34) shows, all translators of *Munqidh* literally translate the term *imām ma'ṣūm* as “infallible Imam”. The context in which this term occurs provides further information about the denotation of this term, thus a literal translation will be sufficient to fully communicate the content of this term in the translation.

8.2.35 Example (35) شق القمر (*shaqq al-qamar*)

The term شق القمر (*shaqq al-qamar*) literally means splitting the moon. It refers to a miracle attributed to the Prophet Muhammad (Saleh, *ibid*: 300-01).

7.2.35.1 Translation of *shaqq al-qamar*

Table (35)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylah	Holland
Translation	the moon has been split	the cleaving of the moon	the splitting of the moon	breaking the moon in half	the splitting of the moon
procedure	Literal translation	Literal translation	Literal translation	intratextual gloss	Literal translation

As shown in table (35), the term *shaqq al-qamar* is translated literally by Field, Watt, McCarthy, and Holland. Abūlaylah preserves the original term through literal translation but adds the expression “in half”, because it is believed that the Prophet broke the moon into two (Beverley 2005: 423). Field³¹, McCarthy³², and Abūlaylah³³ use an extratextual gloss to relate the story of the miracle.

8.2.36 Example (36) الفقه *fiqh*

الفقه (*fiqh*) is a key term in Islamic legal studies, literally meaning “understanding”, but it specifically refers to a religious science which aims to deduce Islamic law (behaviour that God prescribes for a Muslim’s daily life) from scriptural sources (the Qur’an and hadith) (see Glassé, *ibid*: 126).

7.2.36.1 Translation of *fiqh*

Table (36):

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Jurisprudence	Law	jurisprudence	Jurisprudence	jurisprudence
Procedure	Limited universalization	Limited universalization	Limited universalization	Limited universalization	Limited universalization

As table (36) shows, the words “*jurisprudence*” or “*law*” are used by the translators of *Munqidh* in the rendition of the term *fiqh*. These words or terms are more general in meaning than the term *fiqh*: they refer to the study of law in general rather than the study of the religious Islamic law.

8.2.37 Example (37) دينار (*dinār*)

The term دينار (*dinār*) is a word that was used in the Abbasid Caliphate to refer to a golden coin that weighs approximately 1.5 drachms (Wehr, *ibid*: 354).

7.2.37.1 Translation of *dinār*

Table (37)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	a piece of gold	shilling	dīnār	a coin (dīnār)	Gold coin
Procedure of translation	absolute universalization	Naturalization	Transliteration	Absolute universalization plus transliteration	Limited universalization

As shown in table (37), Field renders this term into English as “a piece of gold” which is a more general term, i.e. a piece of gold could be a coin or could be something else. Watt translates the same term by naturalization as “shilling”, although he informs the target reader that the word al-Ghazālī used is *dinār* in a footnote. His translation can be considered as translation by naturalization with extratextual gloss. McCarthy prefers to retain the term *dinār* through transliteration, and adds an endnote about the term which contains further information about its content³⁴. Abūlaylah uses two procedures in translating the same term. First, he uses the general word in English: ‘coin’, and, secondly, he uses transliteration: *dinār*. Holland removes the source term, replacing it with a more general term: ‘Gold coin’. However, ‘gold coin’ still belongs to the source culture, therefore it can be considered as an example of translation by a limited universalization.

8.2.38 Example (38) الحجام (*hajjām*)

الحجام (*hajjām*) is an Arabic word used to refer to a specific profession known as حجامة (*hijāmah*). It describes a medical procedure where ‘polluted’ or ‘dirty’ blood is extracted from the body by a suction cup that is lightly attached to the surface of the skin (Saleh, *ibid*: 82). It was, and still is, practiced in the Muslim World, especially amongst conservative and uneducated Muslims.

Translation of *hajjām*

Table (38)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	Surgeon	Surgeon	cupper	one who lets blood	phlebotomist
Procedure of translation	Naturalization	Naturalization	Literal translation	intratextual gloss	Limited universalization

As table (38) shows, Field and Watt translates the word *hajjām* as “*surgeon*” which has a specific meaning in English, different from that of the source term. McCarthy’s translation of the Arabic word *hajjām* as ‘*cupper*’ is a literal translation of the original term, which he deems comprehensible because of the explanation about the practice of *hijāmah* in the source text. Abūlaylah’s translation removes the original term, replacing it by the phrase “*one who lets blood*”. This is more general in meaning than the original term, although it still retains something of the sense of the original term. Thus, his translation can be considered limited universalization. Holland translates the term *hajjām* as “*phlebotomist*”. In English, this word is generally used to refer to a doctor or medical professional who draws blood samples from a patient for a health check. Therefore, Holland’s translation can be considered as translation by limited universalization.

8.2.39 Example (39) ثريد (*tharīd*)

The word ثريد (*tharīd*) denotes an ancient Arabic dish (still known by its original name in Iraq). It consists of meat and broth or gravy that is mixed with bread (Davidson, 1999, 415).

7.2.39.1 Translation of *tharīd*

Table (39)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	Food	Food	Solid food	Broth
Procedure of translation	Deletion	Absolute universalization	Absolute universalization	Absolute universalization	Absolute universalization

In translating the word *tharīd* into English, Field uses deletion, whereas the other translators use words that have a more general meaning than that of the original term, and thus this can be considered translation by absolute universalization.

8.2.40 Example (40) دانق (*dāniq*)

In classical Arabic, the word دانق (*dāniq*) means “eight grains”, or “a sixth of a dram”, or “a small coin” (Wehr, *ibid*: 269). In *Munqidh*, although the intended meaning is not clear, it is important that the classical Arabic culture-specific word denotes a specific coin or weight.

7.2.40.1 Translation of *dāniq*

Table (40)

Translator	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylā	Holland
Translation	-	a <i>danig</i> (about eight grains)	<i>Daniq</i>	a sixth of a dram	Pennyweight
Procedure of translation	-	Intratextual gloss	transliteration	Naturalization	naturalization

As shown in table (40), Watt renders the word *dāniq* by Transliteration then adds further lexis in the target text to help the reader understand the original word. McCarthy translated the same term using transliteration, and then adds an extratextual gloss about the term in the endnotes of his translation of *Munqidh*³⁵. Abūlaylah³⁶ and Holland translate the same term as “a sixth of a dram” and “Pennyweight” respectively. Because the cultural term is replaced by references specific to the target culture, these two translations can be considered examples of translation by naturalization

8.3 Concluding Remarks

This section contains concluding remarks that aim to interpret results found in section two. Table (41) shows the procedures the translators use in translating CSIs contained in *Munqidh*.

As shown in this table, Field translates a total of 28 terms. The procedures he uses are translation by intratextual gloss (9 cases), literal translation (4 cases), transliteration (2 cases), limited universalization (3 cases), absolute universalization (2 cases), naturalization (1), deletion (2), and literal translation with extratextual gloss (1). All terms, except one, are rendered by Field using one translation procedure. Thus, out of 28 CSIs, Field translates 16 terms using source-oriented procedures. This constitutes approximately 58% of the total number of translated items. He translates 8 CSIs using target-oriented procedures, which constitutes about 29% of the total number of translated terms.

The most common procedure of translation that Watt uses is literal translation: used in the translation of 13 terms. This constitutes approximately 30% of the total number of translated terms. He also uses intratextual gloss for the translation of 8 terms. This constitutes approximately 21% of the total number of translated terms. The use of two simultaneous translation procedures is also a common practise in Watt's work. There are 10 terms that he renders in this manner by using two procedures in translation, the most common of which is "literal translation with transliteration": used 3 times. The terms that he renders by two procedures constitute approximately 23% of the total number of translated terms. 31 of the 40 terms Watt renders using source-oriented procedures: literal translation, transliteration, intratextual gloss, extratextual gloss, or a combination of these procedures. This constitutes approximately 78% of the total number of translated terms. This suggests that Watt adopts a source-oriented method or strategy in translating the cultural references in *Munqidh*. There are only 4 terms in Watt's translation that he renders using target-oriented procedures (limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization, deletion, or any combinations of these procedures). This constitutes approximately 10% of the total number of translated terms, compared to 29% in Field's translation. The remaining terms are rendered using a combination of source-oriented and target-oriented procedures (for example, naturalization with extratextual

gloss or intratextual gloss plus limited universalization). Therefore, generally speaking, Watt's translation of CSIs can be considered as a more source-oriented translation than that of Field's.

As shown in table (41), the most common procedure of translation McCarthy uses in translating cultural references of *Munqidh* is literal translation which he uses in translation of 15 terms, approximately 40% of the total number of translated terms. McCarthy uses two procedures at the same time in the translation of 15 terms, which constitutes approximately 38% of the total number of translated terms. The most common dual procedures being literal translation with extratextual gloss, which he uses to translation 7 items out of 15, and transliteration with extratextual gloss which he uses to translate 6 items out of 16.

McCarthy renders 36 terms using source-oriented procedures. This constitutes approximately 90% of the total number of translated terms, compared to 78% in Watt's translation. McCarthy prefers target oriented procedures in translating 4 terms (3 terms by limited universalization, and one term by absolute universalization). He does not employ naturalization or deletion, which are extreme cases of target-oriented translation that Field used in translation of 3 terms and which Watt uses once. This strongly indicates that McCarthy leans toward source-oriented translation when dealing with the CSIs in *Munqidh*, and that his translation is closer to the source text and culture than that of Watt's translation and, consequently, than Field's.

As shown in table (41), Abūlaylah translates 8 terms by using literal translation, 7 terms by using intratextual procedures, and one term by using transliteration. He uses a combination of these procedures or a combination of one of these procedures with extratextual gloss in translating 15 terms. The most common combination of procedures Abūlaylah uses is intratextual with extratextual gloss (6 cases) and literal translation with extratextual gloss (3 cases). In two instances, the translator uses three procedures to translate a single term. These are a combination of literal translation, transliteration and extratextual gloss. Thus, there are 31 terms which Abūlaylah translates using source-oriented procedures. Although this constitutes about 78% of the total number of translated terms, it is less than the terms that McCarthy translates using the same strategy. Thus, Abūlaylah's translation of CSIs is not as close to the source text and culture as that of McCarthy's translation. Consequently, this shows that there is no linear tendency toward bringing these cultural items closer to the source text and culture.

Abūlaylah uses target-oriented procedures (limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization, deletion, and a combination of two or more of the previous procedures) in translating 4 terms, compared to the 3 terms in McCarthy's translation, which demonstrates the fact that his translation is not as close to the source text and culture as McCarthy's.

In the case of Holland, the most common procedure used is literal translation. He uses this for 15 terms. This constitutes approximately 38% of the total number of translated terms. Another common procedure that he uses is translation by intratextual gloss which he uses for 11 terms, constituting approximately 28% of the total number of translated terms. Holland renders only 4 terms using two procedures simultaneously in his translation. He uses source-oriented procedures in translating 32 items, which constitutes approximately 80% of the total number of translated terms, compared to 78% in Watt's and Abūlaylā's translations, and 90% in McCarthy's translation. Holland uses universalization (limited and absolute) in translating 5 terms, naturalization for 1 term, and deletion for 1 term, constituting approximately 18% of the total number of translated terms, compared to 13% in Abūlaylā's translation and 10% in McCarthy's translation. Again, it can be noted that Holland's translation of CSIs is a less source-oriented translation than McCarthy's translation.

Among other things, these results show that the translation of CSIs by the English translators of *Munqidh* does not support the logic of Retranslation Hypothesis, because although Watt's translation is closer to the source text and culture than that of Field's, and McCarthy's translation is closer to the source text and culture than Watt's, Abūlaylā's and Holland's translations are less source-oriented translations than that of McCarthy.

Table (41) Procedures of translation

No.	Translation procedure	Field	Watt	McCarthy	Abūlaylah	Holland
1	Transliteration	2	5	2	1	3
2	Literal translation	4	13	11	8	15
3	Intratextual gloss	9	9	7	7	11
5	limited universalization	3	1	3	2	4
6	absolute universalization	2	2	1	1	1
7	Translation by Naturalization	1	1	-	1	1
8	Translation by Deletion	2	-	-	-	1
9	Literal translation plus transliteration		3	1	2	1
11	Literal translation plus extratextual gloss	1	1	7	3	-
12	transliteration plus literal translation	-	-	-	1	1
13	Transliteration plus intratextual gloss	-	-	-	1	-
14	transliteration plus extratextual gloss	-	-	6	1	-
15	Transliteration plus naturalization	-	1	-	-	-
16	limited universalization plus transliteration	-	-	-	1	-
17	Limited universalization plus intratextual gloss				1	

18	Limited universalization plus extratextual gloss	-	-	-	1	-
19	absolute universalization plus intratextual gloss	-	-	-	-	1
20	absolute universalization plus extratextual gloss	-	-	-	1	-
21	Intratextual gloss plus transliteration	-	-	-	-	1
22	Intratextual plus extratextual gloss	-	1	2	6	-
23	Naturalization plus extratextual gloss	-	1	-	-	-
24	Naturalization plus transliteration plus extratextual gloss	-	1	-	-	-
24	Literal translation plus transliteration Plus extratextual gloss	-	-	-	2	-
25	Translation by intratextual gloss plus naturalization plus extratextual gloss	-	1	-	-	-

CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding chapters, the presentation and analysis of data has been reported. This chapter presents a summary of the study and important conclusions drawn from the data presented in chapter six and seven of this thesis. It also aims to present suggestions for further research targeting the understanding of the translation and retranslation of *Al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl* and similar texts into English.

9.1 Overview

The purpose of this study was to investigate the English translations of the intellectual autobiography of Abu Ḥamid al-Ghazālī, known as *Al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl*, or *Munqidh* for short, through investigating the translators responsible for the various renderings of the text, where and when the various translations were published, the manner in which different individual translators approached their task, why they translated the text according to particular strategies, and how they presented the text and its author in the translating culture in a specific way. In other words, the study strived to situate the English translations in the socio-cultural and historical context in which the text was produced, re-produced and received. The study aimed also to explain why *Munqidh*, which was translated for the first time in English in 1909, was later chosen by different translators to be retranslated into the same languages four times in a century, and to what extent the Retranslation Hypothesis, which states that retranslations emerge to restore first translations and bring them closer to the source text and culture, can be used to accurately and fully explain the production of these retranslations and their related features.

The thesis has established a methodology for situating the English translations of *Munqidh* in their broader socio-cultural and historical context, and for testing the Retranslation Hypothesis with reference to *Munqidh* and its five English translations. To achieve the first purpose, this study adopted a descriptive-explanatory methodology in which multiple causal explanations, textual and socio-cultural, play a major role in understanding the production and reception of the translated texts.

With regard to testing the Retranslation Hypothesis against the data of the five English translations of *Munqidh*, this thesis divided this major hypothesis into four sub-hypotheses and

tested each using appropriate data from the source and target texts. The first hypothesis states that the retranslations of *Munqidh* followed a linear development toward literalism. The second hypothesis states that the retranslations of *Munqidh* followed a linear progression towards source-oriented translation. The third hypothesis states that each new translation of *Munqidh* tends to bring culture-specific items (CSIs) closer to the source text/culture, i.e. the retranslations of *Munqidh* follow a linear development toward foreignizing the cultural features of the source text. The fourth hypothesis states that the presence of the translators of *Munqidh* became increasingly more ‘visible’ in the paratextual materials (translators’ introductions and notes).

The study has found, first, that the translation and retranslation of *Munqidh* can be better understood if situated mainly in context of introducing classical Arabic and Islamic literature to the West in the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century, and, second, that the data of *Munqidh* and its five English translations do not confirm the Retranslation Hypothesis, and, third, that there are multiple causes, textual and socio-cultural, that provide a more productive perspective to account for the emergence of these retranslations and the features that are related to them.

9.2 Achievements

In the following sections the achievements of this study are highlighted. These achievements revolve around the production and reception of *Munqidh* in English, the role of translation in construction of specific representations about *Munqidh* and its author and testing the Retranslation Hypothesis and methodology.

9.2.1 *Munqidh* in English

This thesis has traced the history of translating and retranslating *Munqidh* into English by situating the translated texts in the socio-cultural, political and historical conditions that have occasioned their production, reproduction and reception. The study constructed a historical context into which the English translations can be situated and understood. This historical context was created, among other things, on the basis of events that occurred in the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century, the translated texts, the paratextual materials which were

published with or in response to these texts and the bibliographical materials about the translators who produced them. In chapter six of this study it has been found that the translation and retranslation of *Munqidh* was part of, and shaped by, the emergence and development of Islamic and Arabic studies in the United Kingdom and the United States in general, and Islamic philosophy and mysticism in particular in the 20th century up to date. The translation of classical religious and philosophical texts from Arabic into English, including those of al-Ghazālī, was motivated by mainly academic purposes, particularly Western academic interest in introducing and studying Islamic philosophy and mysticism in general, and al-Ghazālī's philosophy and Sufism in particular. This explains why the translators of *Munqidh* were all specialists in Arabic and Islamic studies and why they mainly addressed other specialists or would-be specialists (students) in the English-speaking world. This academic trend started first in the United Kingdom to which the first two translations of *Munqidh* were addressed, and then flourished in the United States to which the last three translations of the same text were addressed.

The increasing interest in *Munqidh* is better understood in light of the fact that the text was commonly considered to be the most important text that can be used to create a realistic historiography of al-Ghazālī, whose life, personality and attitudes toward philosophy and mysticism have been a constant subject of debate, past and present. Investigating al-Ghazālī, especially his self-portrayal as a Sufi and the extent of it in *Munqidh*, is “a continuing concern within the field of Islamic studies” (Belhaj, 2015: 387), and this seemed to play an important role in introducing and re-introducing this text into English by these translators/scholars.

A narrower objective of this study was to examine why these scholars/translators decided to retranslate *Munqidh* into English or how they justified the undertaking of new translations of the text. The study has found no general cause for retranslating this text, and that there were different reasons behind the undertaking of each new translation of the text into English. The study found that the translated texts are not merely passive translations, only aimed at updating the language of first translations, but rather active retranslations that were undertaken for specific reasons. However, the empirical evidence of this thesis seems to point to the translating agent as perhaps the single most important active cause of retranslation. It is the translator who ultimately seems to have the upper hand in taking the decision to retranslate *Munqidh*, determine which strategies to follow, and present the text in a particular way. Although the editors and/or publishers of the

retranslations of *Munqidh* seemed to have played a role in constraining the translated texts through emphasizing a particular norm of translation and through the way they wanted the text be read and interpreted in the translating language, it is not clear to what extent they played a role in selecting the text to be retranslated into English.

The first retranslator of *Munqidh*, the noted Scottish Arabist William Montgomery Watt, did not mention why he retranslated the text. However, he seems to be motivated by producing a new translation of *Munqidh* that is at the same time accurate and readable. McCarthy, another prominent Arabist, published his new translation of *Munqidh* in 1980, using three reasons to justify his translation. The first is personal relating to the fact that he developed his own translation of the text over several years as he was teaching it to his students at Oxford University. The second is that he based his translation not only on the available edition of the text in Arabic, but also on a new manuscript of the text that dates back five years after the death of al-Ghazālī. The third is that he thinks classic texts deserve to be retranslated for each generation. The justifications that Abūlaylah, an Egyptian scholar, used to justify his retranslations of *Munqidh* were considered controversial, to say the least. For example, Abūlaylah's claim that he wanted to create a 'perfect' translation that can surpass previous translations, especially McCarthy's translation, the chronologically nearest 'rival', was found dubious because when the two translations are compared, Abūlaylah's translation has been found less faithful in translation than that of McCarthy's. The study consolidates the remark made by Koskinen and Paloposki (2010: 296) that claims of deficiency in previous translations may be made in some cases for the purpose of a strategic repositioning and not due to actual deficiencies in these translations. In other words, such claims have been found to be premised on social and ideological considerations rather than on linguistic or literary defects in first translation(s). The publisher of Holland's translation did not give justifications for undertaking a new translation of *Munqidh* apart from saying that the new translation by Holland will be welcomed from the readers who enjoyed other translations by the same translator. It is very likely that the publisher wanted to capitalize on the success of *Munqidh* in English, turning cultural capital into economic capital.

The study has found that the producers and co-producers of *Munqidh* sought to increase the acceptability of their translations in English against other translators by using particular means.

For example, McCarthy achieved this through giving the impression that his translation was not only based on different versions and manuscripts of the source text, but also different translations of the text in English and other European languages. His translation came with two hundred and eighty four endnotes. In the majority of these notes, the translator compares his translation of particular terms or portions of *Munqidh* with the English, French and German translations of the same text. The translator seems to indirectly suggest that his new translation is a very close rendition of the source text because it is the fruit of this collective effort to introduce the text to the West. With regard to Abūlaylah's translation, this translation was published in English, supported by three patrons including UNESCO, and is prefaced with a long scholarly introduction by a professor of religious studies and philosophy in the United States. In addition to this, Abūlaylah deliberately chose to construct a romantic narrative about the relationship between his translation and previous translations in order to increase the acceptability of his translation into English. Thus, he presented each subsequent translation of *Munqidh* as being a development on the previous translation, and his own translation as the best of all. The publisher of Holland's translation, the fourth retranslation of *Munqidh* in English, chose a different strategy, focusing on the translator and his method which he describes as a pane of glass. He seems to capitalize on the discourse of 'fluency' to promote the new translation, arguing that the readers of the new translation by Holland will be reading the translated text as if they were reading the original text.

Generally speaking, the retractions of *Munqidh* were all found very close and faithful. They also adopted, less or more, the dominant reading or representations of the text and its author in English (see section 8.2.2 of this chapter). Thus, and rather than seeing retractions as following a linear development toward improving first translations, retranslation may actually capitalize on the status quo: preserving rather than improving or progressing on earlier translations of a canonized classic (Koskinen & Paloposki, *ibid*: 296).

9.2.2 The Representations of Al-Ghazālī and *Munqidh*

The study has emphasized the important role of the translators of *Munqidh* as intercultural agents who played a crucial role in shaping the reception of the text, i.e. determining how the text should be read and interpreted in the translating language and culture. These translators created

specific representations of the text and its author in accordance not only with their religious background, but also the dominant thoughts and values in the translating language and culture. Initially, they portrayed al-Ghazālī as a seeker for truth whose search for certain knowledge or Truth led him to the conviction that truth, mainly religious truth, can only be achieved by walking in the way of the Sufis: to live a life that is wholly dedicated to God. They suggest that al-Ghazālī presents in his *Munqidh* the story of one who is personally concerned with salvation and who is passively saved by God in a way that is much similar to St. Augustine in his *Confessions*. Consequently, *Munqidh* was regarded by them as a faithful account of the intellectual and spiritual journey that led al-Ghazālī to adopt Sufism and live like wandering Sufis or mystics. The image that emerged from their work is that of “a solitary seeker whose spiritual motives were unsullied by worldly aims or even worldly connections” (Garden, 2014a: 64), and who is “a selfless and otherworldly figure who had interrupted a life of seclusion only to guide his fellow men to the salvation that he, uniquely, had discovered” (Garden, 2011: 595).

These representations are so dominant in the Western reception of the text to the extent that they have concealed, or at least downplayed, the fact that *Munqidh* was crafted by its author in such a way to be self-presenting and self-serving. In fact, al-Ghazālī wanted to create idealized images about himself as a seeker for truth, a true Sufī and a reviver of Islam to achieve ideological and personal agendas. In chapter five of this study, it has been argued that there is good evidence that al-Ghazālī wrote and used *Munqidh* to respond to his opponents who accused him of adopting philosophical views contrary to Islam. By suggesting in *Munqidh* that he reviewed the views of theologians, the Ismā‘īlī and philosophers and found them unsatisfying he seems to respond to these very accusations. His defence of Sufism and prophecy can also be situated into this context. In addition, the idealized image that he created about himself as a revival of Islam is taken to be a mere justification for his acceptance to return to teaching in Nīsābūr’s college in so far as this “would enable him to promote the agenda of his *Revival of the Religious Sciences*” (*ibid*: 587). From this perspective, *Munqidh*, far from being a simple and transparent personal account of the interior spiritual and intellectual journey of al-Ghazālī, is better seen as a polemical text. In other words, the text was premised on political and personal agendas and should not, according to this interpretation, be regarded as a simple and transparent story about

al-Ghazālī's personal and introspective search for truth and conversion to Sufism as the English translators of *Munqidh* posit.

The study also examined the reviews of the English translations of *Munqidh* as well as the secondary literature which mentioned the text and found that the images the translators of *Munqidh* posit about al-Ghazālī is widely accepted by others in the English-speaking world.

Finally, although *Munqidh* was mainly taken in English to be the perfect starting point for anyone interested in studying al-Ghazālī, his life and work, especially his search for truth amongst the schools of thought of his time and his conversion to Sufism, the text has been also used to support other purposes or interpretations in the translating language and culture. In chapter six of this study, it has been shown, for example, that *Munqidh* was seen as a perfect text that can give a tolerant and non-jihadist image of Islam and Muslims in the face of an increasingly politicized and radicalized image of Islam and Muslims in the West in the late 20th century. It was also seen as a means to understanding the eminently political power Muslim thinkers and leaders have on the majority of Muslims, past and present. Such readings emphasise, on one hand, the important fact that the translating language and culture may impose on the translated text new and different interpretations that can hardly be rooted in the source language and culture, and, on the other hand, that even the translators cannot completely determine or control the ways a particular translated text is read or used in the target language.

9.2.3 Testing the Retranslation Hypothesis

As pointed out previously in this chapter, one of the main objectives of this study was to test the Retranslation Hypothesis against the English translations of *Munqidh*. The Retranslation Hypothesis, as shown in chapter three of this study, can take different forms or interpretations: 1) retranslations tend to be more literal to the source text than first translations; 2) retranslations tend to be closer to the source text than first translations; 3) retranslations tend to show more respect for the cultural features of the source text and culture than first translations; and 4) the paratextual visibility of the translator increases gradually in translation, i.e. retranslations tend to follow a linear development toward increasing the presence of the translator in the paratextual materials (translator's introductions and notes). Each of these interpretations or sub-hypotheses

has been examined with reference to the English translations of *Munqidh* in order to yield more decisive results, that is, in order to test the hypothesis from different angles, using different units of translation and criteria.

With regard to literalism in translation, the Retranslation Hypothesis posits that each retranslation becomes more literal than the first translation(s). By literalism it is understood that each retranslator tends to show more respect for the content and form of the source text. The criteria of literalism are measured by examining how each translator deals with denotative and connotative meaning, semantic repetition, word order, and to what extent he tends to prefer literal meaning in translation over non-literal meaning, as well as whether he adds or omits words and phrases in translation which are not in the original. From this perspective, the study has found that the Retranslation Hypothesis is not confirmed by the data of *Munqidh* because although Watt's translation (1953) seems to be more literal than Field's translation (1909), and McCarthy's translation (1980) seems to be more literal translation than Watt's translation, Abūlaylah's (2000) seem to be less literal than McCarthy's translation, and Holland's translations (2011) seems to be more literal than Abūlaylah's.

With regard to closeness or accuracy in translation, this study has showed that the retranslations of *Munqidh* do not follow a linear progression from target-oriented translation to source-oriented translation. Source-oriented translation was measured mainly by the number of instances that can be considered as inaccuracies or loses of semantic and pragmatic meaning. According to the empirical evidence of this study, Watt's translation seems to be closer to the source text than Field's translation, and McCarthy's translation seems to be closer to the source text than Watt's, Abūlaylah's translation, the third retranslation of *Munqidh*, seems to be less source-oriented translation than McCarthy's translations, the second retranslation of *Munqidh*. This result is also confirmed by the fact that the fourth retranslation of *Munqidh* by Holland seems to be closer to the source text than the third retranslation of the same text by Abūlaylah (see details in chapter seven of this study).

With regard to the cultural features of the text, the study has found that the English translators of *Munqidh* did not follow the logic of the Retranslation Hypothesis when they rendered CSIs contained in the source text. For, although Watt's translation of these items is closer to the

source-text and culture than Field's, and McCarthy's translation of the same items is closer to the source text and culture than Watt's, Abūlaylah's and Holland's translations are less source-oriented translation in comparison to McCarthy's translation in this regard. For instance, McCarthy translated thirty six out of forty CSIs using source-oriented or foreignizing procedures (transliteration, literal translation, intratextual gloss, and extratextual gloss) which constitutes about 90%, whereas Abūlaylah translated thirty one CSIs (about 78%) and Holland thirty two CSIs (about 80%) using similar procedures. Also, McCarthy translated 3 CSIs using target oriented procedures (limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization, deletion, and a combination of two or more of the previous procedures) whereas Abūlaylah translated 5 terms and Holland 7 terms using similar procedures. This demonstrates also the fact that Abūlaylah's and Holland's translations are not as close to the source text and culture as McCarthy's. The categorizing of the procedures that are used to render CSIs into source-oriented and target oriented was based mainly on Aixelá's typology as discussed in more detail in chapter three of this study.

With regard to the fourth hypothesis which states that the presence of the translator increases gradually in the paratextual materials, namely translators' prefaces and notes, with the publication of each new translation, this study has shown that this hypothesis is not confirmed by the data of this study. The study has found that the visibility of the translator in the paratextual material published with each translation reached its peak in McCarthy's and Abūlaylah's translations, but dropped significantly with the publication of Holland's translation, the last retranslation of *Munqidh*, which includes only two pages of introduction by the publisher and no notes on the translated text. Moreover, even the third retranslation of *Munqidh* by Abūlaylah shows less paratextual visibility in comparison with the second retranslation of *Munqidh* by McCarthy. The reason for this is that the latter has more than one hundred translational notes on *Munqidh*, whereas the former has very few.

Therefore, rather than thinking of retranslation in light of the progress model of the Retranslation Hypothesis, this phenomenon is better seen as dependent on complex, multiple forces of causality, such as the time of translation, differing individuals, contexts and the function of translation.

The fact that the retranslations of *Munqidh* became generally speaking more accurate and literal can be accounted for by the fact that the goal of the retranslations of *Munqidh* was to produce an accurate translation, through adherence to norms of semantic fidelity and of natural expression. The retranslators' personal affinity with the source culture and source text writer and their linguistic and scholarly competence are strong contributory factors to the accuracy of their retranslations of *Munqidh*. This explains the literal translation method and the emphasis on accuracy that the translators concerned themselves with. The higher status of al-Ghazālī's autobiography in the United States and the United Kingdom may also have played a role in adopting this method of translation.

9.2.4 Methodology

This study has found that explaining translations and the features related to them by reference to a plethora of reasons, textual and socio-cultural, proved to be useful in making sense of the translation and retranslation of *Munqidh* in English during the period from 1909 to 2011, and that it is necessary to consider translations themselves as causes for other effects. This broad perspective of translation emphasizes the fact that translations are not isolated texts that are produced in a vacuum, and that reducing the explanation of translations and the features related to them to one category, such as equivalence to the source text, will result in limiting the field of research and leave much data unexplained. This applies to retranslation as well, which is better understood and explained with reference to different levels of causation. This includes, among others, the relationship between the new and old translation, the role and background of the translator, the function of the retranslated text, the method or norm of translation and the historical context within which the retranslation was produced and received. This approach proves to have a strong explanatory force in accounting for retranslation outcomes, i.e. the retranslated texts and the features related to them because it connects the translated texts not only with previous translations, but also the social, cultural and historical conditions in which they were produced, reproduced, and received. It goes against Berman's reduction of retranslation into a linguistic process of 'improving' first translation.

This study also shows the usefulness of treating translation, as well as retranslation, as a social process that is shaped by human agency and objective socio-cultural structures. This

demonstrates translation as a *relational* activity “in the sense that it is the site of interactions between different agents and forces, which include not only the producers and co-producers of translation, but also, the structure of the field of translation” (Ghindy, 2012: 244). Thus, relational understanding of translation, derived originally from the sociology of Bourdieu, also takes into account the social space in which the field of translation is situated, and within which translation is produced. In addition, this study found the concept of translation as a location for struggle within the translation field a useful concept in understanding the strategies each translator uses to establish his own translation as the proper representation of the source text and its author in the translating language and culture.

The study has also found that the analysis of the paratextual materials that were published with the English translations of *Munqidh* or in response to them (for example, the reviews of the translated texts) is an important method for examining how these texts were seen by those who produced them, namely translators, editors, and publishers, and how these texts were presented and received in the target language and culture. In addition, the analysis of these materials proved to be useful in disclosing the different conceptions of translation that the producers and co-producers of these texts hold, and how subsequent translators responded to previous translators within the receiving system.

Moreover, the study has emphasized the fact that translation is frequently collaborative in nature. It has been shown that the English translations of *Munqidh* were shaped, less or more, not only by translators but also the editors and publishers of these texts. For example, the producers of these texts seem to agree on the method or norm of translation. This is clear from the fact that they wanted the translation to be faithful and readable at the same time. They also wanted the translated text to be read and treated in particular way, that is, to be read as a personal account of the intellectual and spiritual journey of al-Ghazālī rather than as an apologetic response to accusations against its author and a means to justify his political and personal agendas.

Finally, the study has found that there is a need for testing the Retranslation Hypothesis by using, on one hand, multiple units of translation or criteria, depending on the nature of the data of a particular research, and, on the other hand, by examining how socio-cultural influences impinge on retranslations and the feature that are related to them.

9.3 Limitations of this Study and Future Research

This study is intended essentially as a case study and should not be used to arrive at generalizations about the translation of a whole population, namely the translation of classical philosophical texts or autobiographies from Arabic into English. However, its research conclusions will be relevant to many other instances of similar texts. Further research is still needed to examine the translation and retranslation of philosophical texts from Arabic into English. This does not only include the major philosophical works of al-Ghazālī, but also those of other philosophers such as al-Kindī, al-Fārābī, Ibn Sina (Avicenna) and Ibn Rushd (Averroes), to mention only the well-known among them.

This study could have included a larger sample of theological and philosophical retranslations from Arabic into English. This would yield more fruitful results about the applicability of the Retranslation Hypothesis with reference to a more representative data.

The study has contributed to the discussion of retranslation and its importance as a topic in its own right. Although retranslation was examined here with reference to a single text into a single language, the Retranslation Hypothesis was examined using different concepts or forms of ‘closeness’. These are linguistic closeness (literalism), accuracy (semantic and pragmatic equivalence), cultural closeness (the translation of CSIs) and paratextual closeness (the visibility or the translator’s presence in paratextual materials). This proved to be more useful in bringing this hypothesis into confrontation with specific data using different criteria and units of translation. However, approaching the Retranslation Hypothesis with reference to the status and respect in society of the translators of *Munqidh*, notably in the media, was beyond the scope of this study.

Although this study has combined textual and contextual analysis, i.e. analysing the translated texts as well as the paratextual materials to account for the English translation of *Munqidh*, the analyses could have been more productive had we found further information about the agents involved in the translation and retranslation of *Munqidh*. The study has made use of translators’, editors’, and publishers’ prefaces and notes about the translated texts but further materials such as interviews with some of these agents could have taken the analysis further. The biographical material about the individual translators of *Munqidh* proved to be useful for this research as they

provided an indication of how these translators came to the translation of this text, but the lack of biographical material about the first translator and the limited biographical information about the other translators made it difficult for this study to provide a richer and more universal picture of the individual translators involved in the translation of *Munqidh*.

Endnotes for Chapter Eight

¹*Al-mu'tazila*: The Mu'tazilites have been called-incorrectly, I believe- the “freethinkers” and “rationalists” of Islam. In their *kalām* they made use of notions and methods derived from Greek philosophy. After ruling the theological roost for many years they were finally ‘vanquished’, as much by their own intransigence and illiberalism as by the polemic efforts of the Ash'arī and his school [...] (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 98-99).

² *Mutazilites*: reflect the *kalām* (theology) in its formative period. Their doctrine is marked by the following positions: 1) the committer of a greater sin is neither an infidel nor a believer, but between the two. 2) one is responsible for his or her own actions due to free will; 3) the absolute unity of God, with no distinction between Essence and Attributes; 4) the ability of reason to distinguish between good and evil; and 5) they gave importance to Greek philosophy (*Munqidh*: Abūlaylah: 121-22).

³*Tariq*: method, way and road. Usually I have reserved the capitalized “Way” for the Arabic *ṭarīqa*, a more particularized “way”, and a Sufī (order). (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 91).

⁴*Ṭarīq*: method, way and road (generally capitalized) to indicate a more particular “way”, or a Sufī (order) (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 124).

⁵*Bāṭinī*: from *bāṭin* (interior, inner): in general one who finds an “inner”, or esoteric, or allegorical meaning beneath the obvious, literal, or outer (*ẓāhir*) meaning of the text. [...] ((*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 84).

⁶One who looks a deeper, inner and esoteric or allegorical meaning beneath the certitude regarding the revealed teaching. Its meaning as a principle for one's interior life is found only by penetrating to the deep, hidden sense of the dogmatic formula. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 124).

⁷ *Zahir*: from *ẓāhir* (outer, external, exterior, evident): one who holds to the literal and immediate sense of the revealed text (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 84).

⁸ The problem of “leading astray” arises from the fact that in the Qur'ān God is often said to “lead astray” whomever He wills- e.g. 16.95/93. If God had willed, He would have made you one nation; but He leads astray whom He wills, and guides whom He will.”. One can understand how such texts created difficulties, and various ingenious answers were excogitated” [...] (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 102).

⁹ The problem of *Iḍlāl* (leading astray) arises from the Qur'ān 16.95/93 “He leads astray who

He wills”. Al-Ghazālī is a strong predestnarian (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah, 124).

¹⁰ *Sunna*: this usually means “custom” or “usage,” and especially the customary way the Prophet acted (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 112).

¹¹ *Sunna*: etymologically refers to ‘custom’, ‘way’ or ‘traditional rules of conduct’, but technically refers to Hadith or verbal, actual and tacit teaching of the Prophet and the established practice of the community (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 117).

¹² *Fiṭra*: an interesting term about which there has been considerable discussion within Islam and outside of it (see Encyclopedia of Islam, (2), 931-32). The word is from a root meaning to cleave or split and to create. So *fiṭra* means: creation, nature, natural disposition, constitution, temperament, etc., what is in a man at his creation (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 85-86).

¹³ The direction in which Mecca lies, in which a Muslim must face in saying his prayer (*Munqidh*, Watt: 49).

¹⁴ The *qibla* is the direction to be faced when one is performing the Prayer, i.e. the direction of Mecca and the *Ka’ba* (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 101).

¹⁵ The direction of Mecca toward which one should turn in prayer (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 123).

¹⁶ *Dhikr Allāh*: *dhikr* means: remembrance, mentioning, invoking God. It is issued to designate a well-known practice of the Sufis which consists in the constant repetition of the name of God, or certain formulas or verses [...] (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 99).

¹⁷ *Dhikr Allāh*: is derived from *dhikr* meaning remembrance, invoking; namely, the Sufi practice of repeating the name of God, or certain formulas or verses (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 122).

¹⁸ *Tahrīm* literally means ‘prohibition’ but technically referring to the opening words of the Muslim Worship. It was called *tahrīm* because it forbids to the worshiper what was previously allowed” (*Munqidh*, Watt: 63).

¹⁹ *Al-tahrīm*: the opening formula of the Prayer (*Allāhu akbar*: God is greater, i.e. greater than all else) (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 106)

²⁰ *Al-tahrīm*: the opening formula of the Prayer (*Allāhu akbar*: God is greater, i.e. greater than all else) ((*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 106).

²¹ This is Abraham who is buried in the cave of Machpelah under the mosque at Hebrew, which is called *Al-Khalīl* in Arabic [...] (*Munqidh*, Watt: 62).

²²*Al-Khalīl*: e.i. Abraham. The “visit” would have been to his tomb in Hebron (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 105).

²³*Al-khalīl*: Abrahām- the Tomb in Hebrew (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 125).

²⁴ The eye cannot see if there is no light. So the new “eye” of prophecy needs a special “light” for its functioning (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 108).

²⁵ Just as the eye cannot see without light, the eye of the prophets needs a special “light”. Many Islamic philosophers speak of a reception of ‘species’ or impressions from the active intellect (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 126).

²⁶*Ṣalāt al-zuhr*: the noon prayer. [...] the *ṣalāt al-ṣubḥ* (or *al-fajr*) has two *rak’as* (series of formulas and postures) whereas *ṣalāt al-zuhr* and *ṣalāt al-’aṣr* have four *rakās* (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 111)

²⁷ McCarthy has *ṣalat al-zuhr* (the noon prayer), like *salat al-ṣr*, has four *rakās* (series of formulas and postures) (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 129).

²⁸ See *ahl al-ibāḥāt*; cp. Encyclopedia of Islam (*Munqidh*: Watt: 77).

²⁹ Before entering the Ka’ba; one of the practices of pilgrimage (*ḥajj*) which in turn is one of the five pillars of Islam. 227. Qur’ān (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 130).

³⁰*Alta’līm*: teaching, instruction; the authoritative instruction of the infallible Imām. The charismatic leader of the Shi’ites and Bātinītes (Interiorists), or other founders of schools of law. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 113).

³¹ A miracle ascribed to Muhammed (*Munqidh*, Field: 55).

³² The splitting of the moon is a miracle attributed to Muḥammad on the basis of the Qur’ān 54.1 (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 110)

³³ Splitting the moon is said of Mohammed based on the Qur’ān, 16.93. (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 128).

³⁴ The *dīnār* of al-Ghazālī’s time was a relatively small gold coin (*Munqidh*, McCarthy: 88).

³⁵*Dāniq*: Hava: weight of two carob-grains; Wehr: an ancient coin, one sixth of a dirham, a small coin; also a small silver coin; [...] (*Munqidh Munqidh*, McCarthy: 114).

³⁶*Dāniq*: two carats, an ancient coin; drachme (dirham): an eighth of an ounce (*Munqidh*, Abūlaylah: 129).

Bibliography

Al-Ghazālī, A. (1873). *The Alchemy of Happiness*. (H. A. Homes, Trans.). Albany, New York: J. Munsell.

Al-Ghazālī, A. (1909). *The Confessions of Al Ghazzali*. (C. Field, Trans.). New York: E.P. Dutton. Retrieved 03 July, 2012 from: <https://archive.org/details/confessionsofal00ghaziala>

Al-Ghazālī, A. (1910). *The Alchemy of Happiness*. (C. Field, Trans.). London: The Octagon Press.

Al-Ghazālī, A. (1967). *Al-Munqidh min al-Dalal*. Jamīl Ṣalībāh and Kāmil ‘Ayyād (Eds.). Beirut: Dār al-andalus.

Al-Ghazālī, A. (2001). *Al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl: Deliverance from Error* (M. Abūlaylah, Trans.). Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Al-Ghazālī, A. (2011). *The Savior from Error [al-Munqidh mina 'd-Dalāl]* (M. Holland, Trans.). Florida: al-Baz Publishing, INC.

Al-Saidi A. H. (2013). Problems of Translating Cultural Signs with Reference to English and Arabic. *Journal of University of Thi-Qar*, 8(3), pp. 27-40. Retrieved 12 June, 2014 from: <http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=81482>

André, J. S. (2003) 'Retranslation as Argument: Canon Formation, Professionalization, and Rivalry in 19th Century Sinological Translation', *Cadernos de Tradução* 11(1), pp. 59-93.

Baker, M. (1998). Norms. In: M. Baker and G. Saldanha (Eds.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, (pp. 189-193). London and New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. (2004). *The Status of Equivalence in Translation Studies: An Appraisal*. Retrieved 15 June, 2015 from: <http://www.researchschool.org/intranets/Baker%20Equivalence.pdf>

Bassnett, S. (1993). *Comparative Literature: a Critical Note*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Belhaj, A. (2015). [Review of the book *The First Islamic Reviver: Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī and His Revival of the Religious Sciences*, by Kenneth Garden]. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 26(3), pp. 387-388.

Berman, A. (1992). *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*, (S. Heyvaert, Trans.). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Berman, A. (2000). Translation and the Trials of the Foreign, (L. Venuti, Trans.). In: L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, (pp. 284-297). London and New York: Routledge

Beverley J. A. (2005). Muhammad. In: O. Leaman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Qur'an*, (pp. 419-428). London and New York: Routledge.

Birdwood-Hedger, M. (2006). *Tension between Domestication and Foreignization in English language Translations of Anna Karenina*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh. Retrieved 10 July, 2014 from:
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.121.5545&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Branco, S. (2001). *A New Look Upon the Use of Borrowing Brazil: the Linguistic/Cultural Border*. Retrieved 12 January, 2016 from:
<https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/4925368.pdf>

Brisset, A. (2000). The Search for a Native Language: Translation and Cultural Identity. In: L. Venuti (Ed.), *Translation Studies Reader*, (pp. 343-375). London and New York: Routledge.

Brisset, A. (2010). Cultural Perspectives on Translation. *International Social Science Journal*, (61), pp. 69-81.

Brownlie, S. (1998). Descriptive and Committed Approaches to Translation, in M. Baker and G. Saldanha (Eds.) *Routledge Encyclopidia of Translation Studies*, (pp. 77-80). London and New York: Routledge.

Brownlie, S. (2003a). Berman and Toury: The Translating and Translatability of Research Frameworks. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 16(1), pp. 93-120.

Brownlie, S. (2003b). Investigating Explanations of Translational Phenomenon, a Case for Multiple Causes. *Target* 15(1), pp. 111–152.

Brownlie, S. (2006). Retranslation and Narration Theory. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 7 (2), pp. 145–170.

Buendía, C. T. (2005). Listening to the voice of the translator: A description of translator's notes as paratextual elements. *Translation & Interpreting* 5(2), pp. 149-162.

Burrell, D. (2000). Preface. *Al-Ghazālī's Path to Sufism: his Deliverance from Error, al-Munqidh min al-Dalal*, (R. J. McCarthy, Trans.), (pp. 9-13). Louisville, Kentucky: Fons Vitae.

Cain, L. (2001). *Reading Culture: the Translation and Transfer of Australianness in Contemporary Fiction*. Ph. D. Thesis, Queensland University of Technology, Australia. Retrieved 30 Auguste, 2015 from: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/15785/1/Lara_Cain_Thesis.pdf

Calder, N. (1982). [Review of Freedom and Fulfillment: an Annotated Translation of al-Ghazālī's *al-Munqidh min al-ḍalāl* and Other Relevant Works of al-Ghazālī by R. J. McCarthy]. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 27 (1), pp. 124-125.

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation* (Vol. 31). London: Oxford University Press.

Chan, S. W. (2004). *A Dictionary of Translation Technology*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

Chesterman, A. (2000). A Causal Model for Translation Studies. In: M. Olohan (Ed.), *Intercultural Faultlines*, (pp. 17-27). Manchester: St Jerome.

Chesterman, A. (2004). Hypotheses about translation universals. In: G. Hansen *et al* (Eds.), *Claims, Changes, and Challenges in Translation Studies*, (pp.1-14). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Chesterman, A. (2007). What is a Unique Item? In: Y. Gambier *et al* (Eds.), *Translation studies: doubts and directions*, (pp. 3-13). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chesterman, A. (2010). *The Space Between the Data and the Concepts*. Retrieved 09 July, 2013 from: http://www.sktl.fi/@Bin/40686/Chesterman_MikaEL2010.pdf

Chesterman, A. (2012). Models in Translation Studies. In L. Doorslaer and Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 3, (pp. 108-113). Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Chesterman, A. and Williams, J. (2002). *The Map. A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Cheung, A. (2011). *Functionalism and Foreignising: Applying Skopos Theory to Bible Translation*. Ph. D. Thesis, Birmingham University, England.

Cheung, A. (2012). *Foreignising Bible Translation: Retaining Foreign Origins when Rendering Scriptures*. Retrieved 23 August, 2014 from: http://www.tyndalehouse.com/Bulletin/63=2012/06_Cheung-18.pdf

Chittick, W. (2000). *Sufism: a Beginner's Guide*. England: Oneworld Oxford.

Classé, C. (1989). *The New Encyclopedia of Islam*. Stacey International: London.

Cuéllar, B. S. (2007). *Source Language Text, Parallel Text, and Model Translated Text: A Pilot Study in Teaching Translation*. Retrieved 19 October, 2014 from:
file:///C:/Users/lap/Downloads/formayfuncion20Textolengua%20origen%20texto%20paralelo%20y%20texto%20traducido%20modelo.pdf

Damanhoury Y. (2015). *Translation of the Quran from Arabic to Japanese: A Study of Translation Techniques Usage in Translating Cultural References*. Master thesis, Leiden University, Leiden. Retrieved 10 February, 2015 from:
[https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/36008/Transltion%20of%20the%20Quran%20from%20Arabic%20to%20Japanese%20\(EI%20Damanhoury\).pdf?sequence=1](https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/36008/Transltion%20of%20the%20Quran%20from%20Arabic%20to%20Japanese%20(EI%20Damanhoury).pdf?sequence=1)

Davidson, A. (1999). *The Oxford Companion to Food*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davis, M. (2012). “*Living in Negligent Ease*”: *Evidence for al-Ghazālī’s Crisis of Conscience in His Iqtiṣād fī al-i’tiqād*. Retrieved 03 May, 2015 from:
http://publications.maxwellinstitute.byu.edu/publications/bookchapters/Bountiful_Harvest_Essays_in_Honor_of_S_Kent_Brown/BountifulHarvest-Davis.pdf

Deane, S. (2011). *Confronting the Retranslation Hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British Literary System*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh. Retrieved 08 December, 2012 from: <http://ethos.bl.uk/>

Deane-Cox, S. (2014). *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Devi, G. (2010). *The Politics of Translation: A Critique of the Orientalist Translations of Eastern Classics*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Sanskrit, Kalady, India. Retrieved 19 February, 2016 From: <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/40723>

Devi, R. & Panda, A. K (2015). The Skopos Theory: A Heterogeneous Approach to Translation. *American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 9(3), pp. 281-283. Retrieved 11 March, 2016 from: <http://iasir.net/AIJRHASSpapers/AIJRHASS15-198.pdf>

Dickins, J., *et al* (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation: a Course in Translation Method: Arabic to English*. London: Routledge.

Dickins, J. (2012). Procedures for Translating Culturally Specific Items. In A. Littlejohn & S. R. Mehta (Eds.) *Language Studies: Stretching the Boundaries*, (pp.43-60). United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dollerup, C. (2014). *Relay in Translation*. Retrieved 12 November, 2014 From: http://bwpl.unibuc.ro/uploads_ro/762/BWPL_2008_2_Dollerup.pdf

Dukāte, A. (2009). *Translation, Manipulation, and Interpreting*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Dukmak, W. (2012). *The Treatment of Cultural Items in the Translation of Children's Literature: The case of Harry Potter in Arabic*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leeds., Leeds. Retrieved 18 July, 2015 from: <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/6761/1/581882.pdf>

Even-Zohar, I. (1978). *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Tel Aviv: University Publishing Projects.

Even-Zohar, I. (1979). Polysystem Theory. *Poetics Today* 1 (1-2), pp. 287-310.

Extremera, J. J. A. (2015). Fitting Culture into translation process research. *Translation & Interpreting*, 7(1), pp. 26-46.

Feng, L. (2014). Retranslation hypotheses revisited: A case study of two English translations of Sanguo Yanyi. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, Vol. 43, pp. 1-16.

Field, C. (1909). *Tales of the Caliphs*. London: Murray.

Field, C. (1911). *Mystics and Saints of Islam*. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Field, C. (2011). *A Dictionary of Oriental Quotations: Arabic and Persian*. New York: Swan Sonnenschein, Macmillan.

Field, C. (1912). *Persian Literature*. London: Herbert & Daniel.

Flotow, L. (2009). This Time “the Translation is Beautiful, Smooth, and True”: Theorizing Retranslation with the Help of Beauvoir. *French Literature Series*, 36(1), pp. 35-49.

Flotow, L. (2012). Translating Women: From Recent Histories and Re-translations to «Queerying» Translation, and Metramorphosis. *Quaderns. Revista de Traducció*, pp. 127-139. Available from: http://ddd.uab.cat/pub/quaderns/quaderns_a2012n19/quaderns_a2012n19p127.pdf

Författare, T. (2009). *Realia, Translation Strategies, and Subtitling: a Study of Two Comedy Sketch Shows on DVD*. Master thesis, University of Helsinki, Helsinki. Retrieved 12 August, 2016 from: <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/19312/realiatr.pdf?sequence=1>

Garden, K. (2005). *Al-Ghazālī's Contested Revival: Iḥyā' 'ulūm al-Dīn and Its Critics in Khorasan and the Maghreb*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Chicago, Illinois.

Garden, K. (2011). Coming Down from the Mountaintop: Al-Ghazālī's Autobiographical Writings in Context. *The Muslim World*, Vol. 101, pp. 581-596.

Garden, K. (2014a). Duncan Macdonald Pioneering Study of al-Ghazālī. *The Muslim World*, 104, pp.1-2.

Garden, K. (2014b). *The First Islamic Reviver: Abu Hamid al-Ghazālī and his Revival of the Religious Sciences*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Garrett, R. L. (2011). *Medieval Anxieties: Translation and Authorial Self-representation in the Vernacular Beast Fable*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Iowa. Retrieved 04 June, 2015: <http://ir.uiowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2352&context=etd>

Ghindy, A. (2013). Translation and the Construction of the Religious Other: a Sociological Approach to English Translations of Islamic Political Discourse. Ph.D thesis (Salford University).

Gledhill, J. R. M. (2001). *Strategies in Translation: A Comparison of the Helen Lowe-Porter and David Luke Translations of Thomas Mann's Tonio Kröger, Tristan and Der Tod in Venedig within the Context of Contemporary Translation Theory*. Ph. D thesis, University of Erfurt, Germany. Retrieved 22 September, 2013 from: <http://www.db-thueringen.de/servlets/DerivateServlet/Derivate-2786/gledhill.pdf>

Greenland, P. (2000). *The Spirituality of Abu Hamid Muhammad al- Ghazali (1058 - 1111 CE). An examination of Al-Ghazali's writing and teaching and its relevance for the Islamic Community in the contemporary world*. Master Thesis. University of Southampton, Southampton.

Griffel, F. (2009). *Al-Ghazali's Philosophical Theology*. Oxford University Press.

Griffel, F. (2012). Al-Ghazālī's Use of "Original Human Disposition" (*Fiṭra*) and Its Background in the Teachings of al-Fārābā and Avicenna. *The Muslim World*, Vol. 102, pp. 1-32.

Groff, P. S., & Leaman, O. (2007). *Islamic Philosophy: A to Z*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gürçağlar, Ş. T (1998). Retranslation. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, (pp. 232-235). London and New York: Routledge.

Gutas, D. (1994). Ibn Ṭufayl on Ibn Sīnā's Eastern Philosophy. *Oriens*. Vol. 34, pp. 222-224.

Hackett, N. (1988). Autobiography. In: S. Mitchell (Ed.) *Victorian Britain (Routledge Revivals): An Encyclopedia*, (pp. 57-58). New York and London: Routledge.

Halloran, M. (2000). "Beannacht libh, cried Miss Ivors" *Translating James Joyce: Culture-Specific Items in Translation*. From:
http://french.chass.utoronto.ca/SESDEF/pages/2005/articles/halloran_2005.pdf

Hanna, S. (2006). *Towards a Sociology of Drama Translation: A Bourdieusian Perspective on Translations of Shakespeare's Great Tragedies in Egypt*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Manchester, Manchester.

Harvey, K. (2003). *Intercultural Movements: American Gay in French Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hassan, M. (2004). Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid. In R. C. Martin (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Islam and Muslim World*, Vol. 1, (pp. 97-99). The United States: Macmillan.

Hatim, B., and Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: an Advanced Resource Textbook*.

Hermans, T. (1998). Hermeneutics. In: M. Baker & G. Saldanha, (Eds), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, (pp. 130-133). London and New York: Routledge.

Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Hodgson, M. G. S. (1965/1979). Ibḥāh. In: L. Gardet (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Islam*, (pp. 662-663). Brill: Leiden.

Holes, C. (2000). Arabic. In P. France (Ed.) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*. United States: Oxford University Press.

-
- Holmes, D. (1996). *French Women Writers 1848-1994*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Horne, C. F. (1917). *The Sacred Books and Early Literature of the East*, V. 6. New York and London: Parke, Austin, and Lipscomb.
- Hourani, A. (1991). *The History of Arab People*. London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Hozien, M. (2009). A Philosopher's Toolkit: A Review Essay. *Journal of Islamic Philosophy*, Inc. pp. 99-104.
- Hue, W. (1998). Postcolonial Approaches. In M. Baker and G. Saldanha (Eds.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, (pp. 200-203). London and New York: Routledge.
- Inghilleri, M. (1998). Sociological Approaches. In: M. Baker, and G. Saldanha (Eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, (pp. 279-82). London and New York: Routledge.
- Ivir, V. (1998). Linguistic and Communicative Constraints on Borrowing and Literal Translation. In: Levý, J, P. *et al* (Eds.). *Translators' Strategies and Creativity: Selected Papers From the 9th International Conference on Translation and Interpreting, Prague, September 1995*, (pp. 137-144). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ivir, V. (2003). The Translation of Culture and the Culture of Translation. *SRAZ XLVII-XLVIII*, pp. 117-126.
- Izutsu, T. (2002). *Ethico-religious Concepts in the Qur'an*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Kalėdaitė, V. (2015). *Domestication, Foreignization, and Lexical Density: English Translations "Metai" (Seasons of the Year) by Kristijonas Donelaitis*. Retrieved 12 October, 2015 from: <http://www.journals.vu.lt/knygotyra/article/viewFile/8225/6096>
- Kamaruddin, R. (2004). Politics in the Works of al-Ghazzālī. *Intellectual Discourse*, 12 (2), pp. 113-136. Retrieved 16 July, 2015 from: <file:///C:/Users/lap/Downloads/267-546-1-PB.pdf>
- Karamustafa, A. T. (2007). *Sufism: the Formative Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kerr, D. A. (2002). *Christian Mission and Islamic Studies: Beyond Antithesis*. Retrieved 4 July, 2015 from: <http://www.internationalbulletin.org/issues/2002-01/2002-01-008-kerr.pdf>

Keuninckx, K. (2011). *Cultural transference and other translation challenges in Red Dragon*. Master Thesis, Utrecht University, Netherlands. Retrieved 10 October, 2015 from: <http://dspace.library.uu.nl:8080/handle/1874/198415>

Khan, W. (1925). *The Quran*. New Delhi: Goodword Books.

Kittel, H. & Poltermann, A. (1998). German Tradition. In: M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, (pp. 411-418). London and New York: Routledge.

Klinkhammer, G. (2009). Sufism Contextualised: the Mevlevi tradition in Germany. In: L. Stenberg, and C. Raudvere (Eds.) *Sufism Today: Heritage and Tradition in the Global Community*, (pp. 209-228). London and New York: I. B. Tauris.

Kolebacova, R. (2007). *Culture-bound Issues in Subtitling: a Comparative Study of Films for Adult vs. Young Audiences*. Retrieved 12 August, 2015 from: http://is.muni.cz/th/53124/ff_m/?lang=en;id=230676

Koskinen, K. (2000). *Beyond Ambivalence: Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Tampere, Tampere. Retrieved 11 January, 2016 from: <http://uta32-kk.lib.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/67049/951-44-4941-X.pdf?sequence=1>

Koskinen, K. & Paloposki, O. (2004). A Thousand and One Translations, Revisiting Retranslation, in G. Hansen *et al* (Eds.), *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, (pp. 27-38). Denmark: John Benjamins.

Koskinen, K. & Paloposki, O. (2010). Retranslation. In Y. Gambier & L. Van Doorslaer (Eds.) *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol. 1), (pp. 294-298). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Koskinen, K. and Paloposki, O. (2015). Anxieties of influence: The voice of the *first* translator in retranslation. *Target*, 27(1), (pp. 25–39).

Kylä-Harakka, P. (2008). *Crime stories from the country of huopatossu and juhannusruusut — Translation strategies for Finnish cultural realia in the English translations of two of Matti Yrjänä Joensuu's crime novels*. Master thesis, University of Helsinki, Helsinki. Retrieved 11 February, 2015 from: <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/19315/crimesto.pdf?sequence=2>

Jabir, J. K. (2006). Skopos Theory: Basic Principles and Deficiencies. *Journal of the College of Arts. University of Basrah*, 41, pp. 37-46.

Jacobson, R. (1959/2000). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

James, K. (2001). *Choose a text, translate it into your language and consider the cultural implications for translation*. Retrieved 23 September, 2015 from:
<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/translation-intro/james1.pdf>

Jansen, H. & Wegener, A. (2007). *Multiple Translatorship*. Retrieved 21 January, 2016:
<http://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10315/26642/YS+AEV1+Jansen+and+Wegener.pdf;jsessionid=96A28411C98078A23C83B58C8C5453B6?sequence=1>

Lahtinen, M. (2012). *Translators' (in)visibility in Language-play Translations. The Poisonwood Bible and its Finnish, Swedish and French Translations*. Master Thesis, University of Vaasa, Finland. Retrieved 17 May 2015 From: <https://www.tritonia.fi/download/gradu/5032>

Latham, J. D. (1981). Revd Dr. R.J. McCarthy, SJ (1913-1981). *Bulletin (British Society for Middle Eastern Studies)*, 8(1), pp.76-79.

Laurea, T. (2012). "How The Nanny has become La Tata": analysis of an audiovisual translation product. Master Thesis, Università degli Studi di Padova, Padua, Italy.

Lindfors, A. (2015). *West African Novels in Finnish Translation: Strategies for Africanised English*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Helsinki, Helsinki. Retrieved 27 March, 2016 from:
<https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/153241/westafri.pdf?sequence=1>

Lofti, A. (2002). Spreading the Word. In: Y. Y. Haddad and J. Smith (Eds.), *Muslim Minorities in the West: Visible and Invisible*, (pp. 3-24). Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.

Lounibos, J. (2009). My Path to Islam. In: M. Zo-Callahan and F. Ireland (Eds.), *Intimate Meanderings: Conversations Close to Our Hearts*, (pp. 372-394). New York: iUniverse, Inc.

Lunde, P. (2015). The Quest for Arabic Autobiography. *The Medieval History Journal*, 18(2), pp. 430-451.

MacDonald, D. B. (1899). The Life of al-Ghazzālī, with especial reference to his religious experiences and opinions. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 20, pp. 71-132.

Mailhac, J. (1996). The Formulation of Translation Strategies for Cultural References. In C. Hoffmann (Ed.). *Language, Culture, and Communication in Contemporary Europe*, (pp. 132-151). Clevedon, Philadelphia, and Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Majhut S. V. (2012). *Cultural Specificity in the Translation of Popular Fiction from English into Croatian During the Socialist and Transition Periods (1960-2010)*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Rovira I. Virgili. Retrieved 12 August, 2014 From:
http://www.tesisenred.net/bitstream/handle/10803/90251/veselica_majhut_PhDthesis.pdf?sequence=1

Mathijssen, U. (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)*. Ph. D. Thesis, Utrecht University, the Netherlands. Retrieved 08 January, 2015 from:
<http://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/22151/full.pdf?sequence=7>

McCarthy, R. (1980). *Freedom and Fufilment: an Annotated Translation of al-Ghazālī's al-Munqidh min al-dalāl and Other Relevant Works of al-Ghazālī*. Boston: Library of Classical Arabic Literature.

McCreadie, K. (2008). *Sun Tzu's the art of war: a 52 brilliant ideas interpretation*. The United Kingdom: The Infinite Ideas Company Limited.

McRae, E. (2011). *Translation of the Siclianta in the Fictional Language of Giovanni Vergá and Andera Camilleri*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved 29 December, 2014 from:
<https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/2292/6974/whole.pdf?sequence=2>

Meldrum, Y. F. (2008). *Source-Based Translation and Foreignization: A Japanese Case*. Retrieved 16 February, 2015 from:
http://honyakukenkyu.sakura.ne.jp/shotai_vol2/03_vol2_Meldrum.pdf

Milton, J. (2002). *Fluency and the Translated Short Story*. Retrieved 12 December 2015:
http://dml.fflch.usp.br/sites/dml.fflch.usp.br/files/2001fluency_and_the_translated_short_story.pdf

Młotkowski, L. (2006). *Mechanisms of foreignisation and domestication in translations of science fiction literature (on the basis of George Lucas's Star Wars)*. Master Thesis. Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, Poland. Retrieved 18 June, 2015 from:
http://starwars.pl/users/miagi/MA_starwars.pdf

Moi, T. (2002). While We Wait: The English Translation of *The Second Sex*. *Signs*, 27(4), pp. 1005-1035.

Moran, M. (2006). *Victorian Literature and Culture*. London: Continuum.

Munday, J. (2009). Issues in Translation Studies. In: Munday (Ed.), *Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*, (pp. 1-19). London and New York: Routledge.

Myskja, K. (2013). Foreignisation and its Resistance: Venuti theory and His Critics. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 12 (2). Retrieved 02 July, 2015 from:
<http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/njes/article/view/2201/1957>

Newmark, P. (1988). *Textbook of Translation*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Newmark, P. (1998). The linguistic and communicative stages in translation theory. In: J. Munday (Ed.) *Routledge Companion for Translation Studies*, (pp.20-35). London and New York: Routledge.

Nicholson, R. (1998). *Literary History of the Arabs*. London : Kegan Paul International.

Nida, E. (1964/2002). *Towards a Science of Translation: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, E. (1970). Formal Correspondence in Translation. *The Bible Translator*. 21 (3), pp.105-13.

Nilsson, S. C. (2014). *Lifting the Veil of Illusion: Transparency and Invisibility in English Language Translations of Pelle Erobreren*. Master Thesis, Roskilde University, Denmark. Retrieved 28 September, 2016 from:
www.rucsdigitaleprojektbibliotek.dk/.../Sophie%20Nilsson%20final...

Nord, C. (2006). Translating as a Purposeful Activity: a Prospective Approach. *TEFLIN Journal*, 17(2), pp. 131-143.

Nord, C. (2010). Functionalist Approaches. In: Y. Gambier and L. Doorslaer (Eds.) *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 1, (pp. 120-128). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

O'Driscoll, K. (2009). *Around the World in Eighty Changes: a diachronic study of the multiple causality of six complete translations (1873-2004), from French to English, of Jules Verne's novel Le Tour du Monde en Quatre-Vingts Jours (1873)*. Ph. D. Thesis, Birmingham University, Birmingham. Retrieved 12 May, 2015 From: doras.dcu.ie/15067/1/Kieran_O'Driscoll_thesis.doc

Ouyang, W. (2006). Arabic. In: S. F. Gillespie and D. W. Hopkins (Eds.), *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol. 3, (pp. 323-330). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Päivärinne, M. (2012) Translating Grotius's De jure belli ac pacis: Courtin vs Barbeyrac, *Translation Studies*, 5(1), pp.33-47.

Palumbo, G. (2009). *Key Terms in Translation Studies*. London: Continuum.

Pirnajmuddin, H. (2012). A study of the translations of terms related to practical laws of religion (furū al-dīn): Raising students' awareness of culture-bound items. *Applied Research in English*, 1(2), 71-82. Retrieved 11 April, 2015 from:
http://www.sid.ir/en/VEWSSID/J_pdf/5064020120207.pdf

Pym, A. (1995). European Translation Studies, equivalence, and une science qui dérange. Retrieved 11 June, 2014 from: http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/research_methods/1995_deranger.pdf

Pym, A. (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pym (2014). *Vinay and Darbelnet and the politics of translation solutions*. Retrieved 19 July, 2014 from: http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/2014_vinay_darbelnet.pdf

Rafiq, A. (2014). From European to American Orientalism. *Academic Research International* Vol. 5(4), (pp. 287-296). Retrieved 22 May, 2016 from:
[http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.5\(4\)/2014\(5.4-30\).pdf](http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.5(4)/2014(5.4-30).pdf)

Ramy, F. (2014). *Spiritual Reconciliation and Self-Discovery: The Autobiographies of al-Ghazali and Malcolm X*. Master Thesis, University of The American University in Cairo, Cairo.

Rassam, S. (2005). *Christianity in Iraq: Its Origin and Development to the Present Day*. Leominster, [England]: Gracewing.

Reiss, K. (1971/2000). *Translation Criticism: The Potentials & Limitations: Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment*, (E. F. Rhodes, Trans.) Manchester: Jerome Publishing.

Renard, G. J. (2011). *Islam and Christianity: Theological Themes in Comparative Perspective*. Barkley: University of California Press.

Reynolds, D. F *et al* (2001). *Interpreting the Self: Autobiography in the Arabic Literary Tradition*. University of California Press.

Richter, M. Burke, M. (2012). *Why Concepts Matter: Translating Social and Political Thought*. Leiden: Brill.

Ridgeon, L. (1996). *Nothing but the Truth: The Sufi Testament of `Aziz Nasafi*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Leeds., Leeds. Retrieved 11 April, 2014 from:
http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/534/1/uk_bl_ethos_497663.pdf

Roald, A. S., (2004). *New Muslims in the European Context: The Experience of Scandinavian Converts*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Roberts, R. P. (1988). *Toward a Typology of Translation*. Retrieved 13 May, 2015 from:
http://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/hieronymus/pdf/01/01_069.pdf

Robinson, N. (2002). The Fascination of Islam. In: *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 13:1, pp. 97-110.

Robson, J. (1953). [Review of the book *The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazālī*, by W. Montgomery Watt]. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 9(2), pp. 220-221.

Rubin, U. (2003). Prophets and Caliphs: the Biblical Foundations of Omayyad Caliphate. In: H. Berg (Ed.). *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins*, (pp. 73-100). Leiden: Brill.

Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Saleh, M. I. (2011). *Dictionary of Islamic Words and Expressions*. Riyadh: Darussalam.

Schäffner, C. (2002). Editorial. In C. Schäffner (Ed.), *The role of discourse analysis for translation and in translator training*, (pp.4-9). Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto, Sydney, Multilingual matters.

Schäffner, C. (2011). Translation Studies. In: J. Östman and J. Verschueren (Eds.) *Pragmatics in Practice*, (pp. 306-322). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shamma, T. (2009). *Translation and The Manipulation of Difference: Arabic Literature in Nineteenth-Century England*. Accessed on 10-03-15 from:

http://www.academia.edu/6586858/Translation_and_the_manipulation_of_difference_Arabic_literature_in_nineteenth-century_England

Shehadi, F. (1982). [Review of the book *Freedom and Fulfillment: an Annotated Translation of al-Ghazālī's al-Munqidh min al-dalāl and Other Relevant Works of al-Ghazālī*, by Richard Joseph McCarthy]. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 102 (2), pp. 374-376.

Simons, M. (1992). Two interviews with Simon De Beauvoir. In: N. Fraser and S.L. Bartky (Eds.). *Revaluing French Feminism: Critical Essays on Difference, Agency, and Culture*, (pp. 25-41). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Skibińska, E. (2015). [Review of *Retranslation: Literature and Reinterpretation*, a book, by S. Deane-Cox]. *Translation Studies*, November, pp.1-3.

Skreslet, P. Y. & Skreslet, R. (2006). *The Literature of Islam: a Guide to the Primary Sources in English Translation*. Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford: The Scarecrow Press Inc.

Smith, M. (1953). [Review of the book *The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazdli*, by W. M. Watt]. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for Great Britain and Ireland*, 85(3-4), pp. 1-2.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1995). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2010). Word against text. Lexical semantics and translation theory (Revisited). In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and M. Thelen (Eds.), *Meaning in Translation*, (pp. 207-217). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Sodiq, Y. (2010). *An Insider's Guide to Islam*. Indiana, USA: Trafford Publishing.

Song, Z. (2012). The Art of War in retranslating Sun Tzu using cultural capital to outmatch the competition. *Translation and interpreting studies*, 7(2), pp.176-190.

Staskevičiūtė, D, and Baranauskienė, R. (2014). *Translator and Culture*. Retrieved 07 August, 2015 from: <http://etalpykla.lituanistikadb.lt/fedora/objects/LT-LDB-0001:J.04~2005~1367151912834/datastreams/DS.002.1.01.ARTIC/content>

Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel: Aspects of language and translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Susam-Sarajeva, Ş (2001). Tropes in Translating Literary and Cultural Theories. Retrieved September, 2015 From: <http://www.soas.ac.uk/literatures/satranslations/Sebnem.pdf>

Susam-Sarajeva, Ş. (2003). Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory: retranslations of literary and cultural theories. *Target*, 15(1), pp. 1-36.

Susam-Sarajeva, Ş. (2006). *Theories on the move: translation's role in the travels of literary theories* (No. 27). Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Sweetman, J. W. (1967). *Islam and Christian Theology: A Study of the Interpretation of the Theological Ideas of the Two Religions*. England: James Clarck.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, K. (2015). A character's and (re)translators' voices in six Finnish retranslations of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. *Target* 27(1), pp. 58–74.

Thompson, T. M. (2010). Watt, William Montgomery (1909–2006). In: *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thunes, M. (2011). *Complexity in Translation: An English-Norwegian Study of Two Text Types*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway. Retrieved 16 April, 2014 from: <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/5179/41615%20Thunes%20materie.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Tian, C. (2014). *A Sociocultural Analysis of Retranslations of Classical English Novels in Mainland China 1949-2008*. Ph.D. Thesis, Rovira I Virgili (Spain). Retrieved 16 July, 2016 from: http://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/135007/TianChuanmao_TesisTDX.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Toury, G. (1980). *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Trosborg, A. (1997). Register, Genre and Text Typology. In: A. Trosborg (ed.) *Text Typology and Translation*, (pp. 3-24). Denmark: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tymoczko M. (1999). Post-colonial Writing and Literary Translation. In Bassnett and Trivedi (Eds.) *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, (pp.19-40). London and New York: Routledge.

Tymoczko, M. (2000). Translation and Political Engagement Activism, Social Change and the Role of Translation in Geopolitical Shifts. Retrieved 12 August, 2015 from: isg.urv.es/library/papers/tymoczko.rtf

Tymoczko, M. (2007). *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translator*. Manchester: Jerome.

Tyulenev, S. (2014). *Translation and Society: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.

Underhill, J. W. (2006). *Does the Translator Exist? A critique of the status of the translator throughout history with reference to Lawrence Venuti's The Translator's Invisibility*. Retrieved 27 February, 2014, from: <http://representations.u-grenoble3.fr/IMG/pdf/Underhill.pdf>

Vanderschelden, I. (2000). Why Retranslate the French Classics? The Impact of Retranslation on Quality. In M. Salama-Carr (Ed.), *On Translating French Literature and Film II*, (pp. 271-293). Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V.

Veisbergs, A. (2013). Paratexts in Translations of Canonical Texts (the Case of the Bible in Latvian). *Vertimo Studijos*, 6. Retrieved 03 January, 2014 from: http://www.vertimostudijos.flf.vu.lt/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Vertimo_studijos_6.76-87.pdf

Venuti, L. (1991). Genealogies of Translation Theory: Schleiermacher". *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 4(2), pp. 125-150.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: a History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2004). Retranslation: the Creation of Values. *Bucknell Review*, Vol. 47 (1). Retrieved 10 April, 2014 from: <http://share.pdfonline.com/c6665cd562b64db9b66b80d60d9ef7bd/TRANSLATION%20AND%20CULTURE.htm>

Venuti, L. (2012). *Interview*. Interviewed by K. Gielen and D. Monticelli. Held on 24-26 May 2012 at the University of Tallinn, Estonia. Retrieved 12 January, 2015 from: http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/translationstudies/data/Tallinn_Conference_Interview.pdf

Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.

Versteegh, K. (1997). *The Arabic Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Watt, V. (2002). *What Happens When Ones Picks up a Greek Text?* Retrieved 11 June, 2014 from: <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/actat/article/viewFile/5463/29601>

Watt, W. M. (1953/1994). *The Faith and Practice of al-Ghazālī*. London: Oneworld Publications.

Watt, W. M. (1963). *Muslim Intellectual: A Study of al-Ghazālī*, Edinburgh: The University Press.

Watt, W. M. (1965). Al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥamid. In: L. Gardet (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, (1038-1041). Leiden: Brill.

Walzer R. (1956). [Review of the book *The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazālī*, by W. Montgomery Watt]. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 6 (23), p.181.

Wehr, H. (1979). *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*. Ithaca, New York: Spoken Languages Services.

Wenjie, L. (2014). *A Study of Chinese Translations and Interpretations of H.C. Andersen's Tales: History and Influence*. Ph. D Thesis, Københavns Universitet. Retrieved 11 February, 2016 from:http://curis.ku.dk/ws/files/113619680/Ph.d._2014_Li.pdf

Wokoeck, U. (2009). *German Orientalism: the Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800-1945*. London: Routledge.

Yang, W. (2010). Brief Study on Domestication and Foreignization in Translation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1 (1), pp. 77-80. Retrieved from: <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/jltr/article/viewFile/01017780/1511>