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## Transliteration System

### Constants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>آ</td>
<td>a, a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vowels

- ﴾fatHa﴿ a
- ﴾kasra﴿ i
- ﴾Damma﴿ u
- ﴾shadda﴿ if a constant is doubled it means that this symbol sits on top of it

### Long Vowels

- ﴾‘alif﴿ aa
- ﴾waaw﴿ uu
- ﴾yaay﴿ ii

Arabic names and words are transliterated throughout the thesis using the above system unless in quotations or part of the data. The following names remain as they commonly appear in English and are not transliterated to avoid confusion: El-Saadawi, Naguib Mahfouz, Hanan al-Shaykh, Salim Barakat, Tawfik al-Hakim, Assia Djebar, Fatima Mernissi, Khalida Said.
Abstract

Intercultural contacts that allowed for cross-cultural fertilization were made possible through translation. Translation, in the main, has been understood as an activity that requires knowing the source and target languages to achieve the same informational and emotive effects of the source language in the target one. Yet, the search for equivalence led translators to realize that linguistic terms do not appear in isolation; they are part and parcel of a culture. Fairclough’s stipulation, from a critical discourse analysis point of view, that language as discourse is invested with ideologies that organize socially shared attitudes, engages language in a complex relationship with social cognition, power and culture. The characterization of language as such leads to the production of a master discourse through which identity, similarity and difference are identified. Within the context of globalization, intercultural translation, particularly between cultures that are unequal politically and economically, adheres to a master discourse of translation and representation through which the other is received, accepted and/ or refused then reproduced. Consequently, source texts and people are transformed into signs familiar to the translating community constructing as such domestic identities of foreign cultures. Drawing on translation from Arabic, and in light of critical discourse analysis approaches, the translation of culture and the culture of translation, the research considers the case of Nawal El-Saadawi. The aim is to explore and examine how the constraints and disciplinary demands of the master discourse of translation and representation affect the translation traffic from Arabic into English. In a rapidly globalizing world, the ethics of translation postulate that translation should create a readership that is open to cultural differences for a true globalization of cultures, and improve cultural relations rather than being a tool for reinforcing and diffusing existing representations and images of one culture about the other.
Chapter One

1 Introduction

For centuries, translation has been taken, in the main, to mean the transfer between languages, even though there has been no consensus as to what this apparently simple task actually involves. Most concerned parties would agree that translation is a process whereby a text in one language is transferred into another with preservations of the meaning and message that the original text conveys. The aim of translation according to Marge E. Landsberg (1976: 235, cited in Sanchez-Ortiz 1999: 89) is ‘to produce in the TL, as faithfully as possible (i.e. at all levels: morphological, phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic- and even stylistic) all the linguistic features of which the SL is composed’. Similarly, according to Hartmann and Stork (1972: 713, cited in Bell 1991: 6) translation is ‘the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language’. Catford (1965: 20) defines translation as ‘the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)’. For Nida and Taber (1969: 12) translating ‘consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and second in terms of style’. These definitions of translation and many others are all focused on one particular goal which is obtaining equivalence between the source language and target one. They mention the concept of equivalence as the key factor in the process of transferring a text between two languages. However, it is attempting to define what equivalence really means that
marks this concept as one of the most controversial concepts in the field of Translation Studies. The concept becomes even more controversial as theorists try to establish a distinction between what equivalence stands for in contrast to adequacy. However, it has been apparent for a long time that 'the ideal of total equivalence is a chimera' because languages are different from each other (Bell 1991: 6). Nonetheless, this does not mean that equivalence is all impossible.

The focus on equivalence has been mainly the result of the work of theoreticians in the 1950s and 1960s who began to attempt more systematic analysis of translation after the centuries of circular debates around literal and free translation (Munday 2001: 34). The 1970s and the 1980s, however, were periods of fundamental shifts in translation. With the vast and fast increase in technology, the increased international and cross-linguistic contacts, the cultural, political and economic inter-relations of a rapidly globalizing world, an unprecedented need for translation has resulted. Translation has become a concern not only for language experts but also for a variety of scholars from different fields ranging from literary criticism, philosophy, anthropology, sociology, computer science and most importantly cultural studies. It was the 1976 conference in Leuven that formally ushered in the cultural shift in translation.

The shift has been labelled the 'cultural turn'. It was the result of the merger between Translation Studies and Cultural Studies, which promoted discussions of power relations and representation of Others in and through translation. But, as Bassnett and Lefevere (1990: 11) maintain, 'cultural transfer is not a simple process'. It questions the role played by translators, publishers, patrons, editors and the ideologies or agendas behind choices and strategies for translating, particularly from
the so-called Third World or the South vis-à-vis the North. These issues have acquired particular importance, as translation became a site for competing ideologies of representation between those doing the translating and those being translated. This is especially true in cases of literary translation in which translators play a key role by suggesting foreign works for translation, the eventual selection of which implies the work is representative of that foreign culture and that the publishers believe there is a market for that literary work (Bush 1998: 128).

Much of the cultural exchange throughout history has been due to the contact between cultures. This contact is made possible through translation. Medieval Arabic translation is one of the great translation enterprises that the history of translation records. It played a very important and well-known role in the transmission of science and knowledge to the Arab/Islamic world and from there to medieval Europe at a later stage (Salama-Carr 1997: 385). Successive rulers sponsored it and made it part of their government with its own budget and institutions. In its historical development Medieval Arabic translation moved from a necessity phase to a phase of pride before it declined. Medieval Arabic translation was a culturally motivated move regulated by the intellectual and ideological orientations of the different Caliphs. In addition, it was normalized by the limitations of the religion and the culture. The Arabs translated virtually from any language they came across covering almost all areas of knowledge available at the time into a language that was predominantly literary and of limited geopolitical influence (Baker 1998c; Didaoui 2001). But they translated little literature and were selective in their choices of sensitive texts and the strategies they adopted in the process of translation. However, notwithstanding the demands of its ideological agenda, Medieval Arabic
translation managed to strike a balance between transferring knowledge, and knowing its others in a less violent framework.

But certainly the world has changed on a global scale. It has never been as easy as it is today to gain access to the entire world. Through satellites, computers, telephones and faxes, people are able to communicate. As a result, we often hear about projects of ‘bridging cultural gaps’, of which translation remains the most obvious and important, for a better understanding of the other. Seemingly, a phenomenon labelled ‘cultural globalization’ has surfaced. Cultural globalization cannot be seen in isolation from political or economic globalization. The unequal power relations that came as a result of the military and economic domination by the Anglo-American world led to their inevitable dominance on the cultural sphere. Within this traffic, dichotomies such as dominant/ dominated, us/ them, etc., were created and confirmed through and in translation. Translation thus became a tool used by different institutions to manipulate a given society in order to construct the kind of culture that would conform to the already existing images of a specific culture (Gentzler 1998). Within this context, translations often operate under different constraints that include manipulations of power relations and aim at constructing an image of the source culture that preserves or extends the hegemony of the dominant one (Lefevere 1990: 16). Tharu and Lalita (cited in Kamala & Prasad 1997: 452) recognize that ‘there are always relationships of power involved when one work is represented for another in translation’. The representation of Otherness through translation in the global context as such does not enhance cross-cultural understanding, nor does it narrow the gap between cultures. Indeed, the representation of the Arab/Islamic world, for example, through translation has been confined within definitions such as violent, oppressive, terrorist, etc. The constraints
and demands of the dominant culture ultimately lead to a master discourse through which the dominant culture selects only foreign texts and voices that conform to its already-formulated framework with its linguistic network. These texts and voices are then rewritten largely according to the appeals and expectations of the domestic constituencies. In doing so, translation includes and globalizes certain foreign voices and texts but localizes the cultures through domesticating texts and voices. Arab women writers are a case in point. Few names are repeatedly mentioned in the Western discourse about Arab women and Islam. Occasionally a new name is added but the subjects remain the same: Arab women, the Arab Islamic culture and, more recently, Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism. Their books are constantly translated into mainstream European languages. In addition they are rewritten in a way that further confirms their position as native informants. Their books therefore are represented, to a domestic audience who is saturated with stereotypes, as truthful and convenient sources of information. In doing so, translation confirms the domestic identity of a foreign culture from the tongue of the natives, naturalizing and normalizing, as such, its stereotypical nature. Translation hence, not only confirms domestic identities of foreign cultures, but also promotes writers to write specifically for translation. To illustrate, the thesis considers the case of the Egyptian female writer Nawal El-Saadawi and the translation of her latest novel *Love in the Kingdom of Oil*.

El-Saadawi is the most translated Arab writer after Naguib Mahfouz. She is a feminist, a novelist and a medical practitioner. She is also a well-spoken political figure. In the West, it can be argued that El-Saadawi is ‘overcited’ and ‘overexposed’ on Arab women and Islam (Said 1990: 280, cited in Amireh 2000: 239) and some of her novels are included in universities’ syllabuses. In the Arab world, however, she
is not considered a representative of the Arabs, Arab culture, or Islam, and her books were once banned and are still censored. Her novel *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* was confiscated from the 43 Cairo International Book Fair that was held on the 24th of January 2004.

Given the complexity of cross-cultural translation and the complex network of relations that exists between the Arab/Islamic world and the West, the thesis perceives intercultural interaction through translation as a two-ways process: translating, *per se*, and the culture that governs translation. Chapter Two *Translation: A Cultural Milieu* observes translation as a cultural necessity shedding light on Medieval Arabic translation in terms of its culture and how it dealt with accommodating foreign cultures into Arabic. Due to the increased interaction between the major and minor languages and cultures, the vocabulary and culture come under immense pressure. However, contrary to what is believed, dominant languages also experience what minority languages experience. Therefore, it would be instructive if the dominant language, which is English in our case, can benefit from the responses of previously dominant languages to the presence of other languages and cultures. Arabic, once a minor language operating in a multilingual world with vast information flows from dominant languages, translated continually in order to retain its viability and relevance as living language that it has become a major language, the lingua franca of science and knowledge and the language of an empire that stretched from the borders of China in the East to the borders of France in the West. However, once it detached itself from other languages and cultures, it eventually declined.
Chapter Three *Translation and Culture in a Global context* is divided into four sections. It sheds light on the global hegemony of the Anglo-American world on the cultural, political and economic spheres and how it affects the representation/globalization of cultures through translation, which is itself a culturally motivated process. It attempts to illustrate how the forces of globalization influence translation and translators and tries to understand the role of translation within this particular context. The argument is that although the Arab/Islamic world and the West both have at their disposal systems of representation burdened with stereotypes and accusations, the West has had, and continues to do so, the upper hand in disseminating its representations of its Others because of its unequalled economic, cultural and political power. This chapter precedes Chapter Four *Translation as a Norm-Governed Activity* in order to explain how the norms, models and strategies employed in a given society cannot be understood in isolation from the dominant cultural environment in which the translation takes place and has to function. Chapter Four discusses the concept of equivalence as a norm which has for a long time been a tool of assessing translations as good or bad. The chapter discusses equivalence with reference to Arabic and English postulating that cases of deviation from the norm can explain how and why power relations between the translating and translated culture can determine the very concept of translation. Given that selecting and translating literary works as part of the foreign culture’s products are generally goal-oriented activities designed to correspond to constraints and fulfil needs of the translating culture, Chapter Five *The Discourse of Translating Culturally* discusses the effects of a master discourse of representation on translating foreign cultures on the grounds that, according to critical discourse analysis, any discourse is invested with ideologies that organize socially shared attitudes, and engages in a complex
relationship with social cognition and power. It is assumed that all translation activities from selecting a foreign text for translation to publishing it are guided and shaped by norms, constraints and demands which are prevalent in a given society at a given time. Elaborating on the previous chapters, Chapter Six Analyzing Translation sheds light on the conceptual and textual grids that determine how and what texts and voices travel to other contexts, and sets a methodology for the analysis. Chapter Seven The Case of Love in the Kingdom of Oil analyzes the reception of Nawal El-Saadawi and the translation of Love in the Kingdom of Oil foregrounding translation traffic from Arabic into English. Drawing at guidelines from critical discourse analysis which stipulate that three elements must be taken into consideration for the analysis of a communicative event; economic, political and cultural, the analysis is carried out in terms of the cultural context of the writer’s reception, and the language, the structure and reference in the novel.

Chapter Eight concludes with recommendations for making translation a tool for a better understanding of cultures and a more fruitful dialogue. It is hoped that this research will help in understanding some of the factors underpinning the image of the Arab/ Islamic culture in the West and how/ why this image is constantly overplayed and confirmed through many means of which translation which plays a major role. The argument is for the existence of different kinds of modernity and the impartial acknowledgement of the much cultural and linguistic diversity for a true globalization of cultures.
Chapter Two

2 Translation: A Cultural Milieu

2.1 Introduction

The term ‘translation’ is an extremely broad notion with a wide range of definitions that often stir hot debates. Such a state is attributed to the inherent complexity of translation both as a process and a product as well as the various ideologies that have underpinned translation theory and practice.

Up until the seventies of the last century, translation has largely been taken to stand for a linguistic process that takes place between two languages. However, the vast number of definitions attributed to this term suggests that there is no unified definition and that translation certainly involves far more than the lexical and grammatical replacement of items between languages. In fact, in the last thirty or so years, translation attracted the attention of researchers from a variety of backgrounds, which enabled it to sway from a strictly prescriptive linguistic attitude to a descriptive one that encompasses the cultural context as a whole in which a language operates. Within these axes, ideology and power too, as elements of culture, have come to be seen as vital components of translation.

Given that translation has always contributed to different human civilizations, this chapter is dedicated to looking at translation in terms of how it dealt with accommodating foreign cultures. In order to capture this, it is the purpose of this chapter to review the nature of translation and the Medieval Arabic Translation,
which was central to the rediscovery of Greek knowledge and philosophy by the Europeans in the 12th century. Renovations of the technique of translating did not happen haphazardly. Rather, they came as the result of the necessity to translate from other cultures and the need to find strategies for selecting and dealing with the cultural products of that Other. Learning from previous cultures’ encounter with translation, as a culturally motivated activity with its own guidelines and norms, can be beneficial in achieving non-violent and objective translations in the current world affairs.

2.2 A Historical Synopsis

As a rewriting activity, the history of translation is as old as the history of human beings. According to Newmark (1981), translation goes back to an old Egyptian Kingdom 3000 BC but it became notable in 300 BC with the Romans translating the works of their Greek predecessors. The Roman contribution, attributed to Horace and Cicero, brought to attention a distinction between two types of translation, which they referred to as word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation. But with the spread of Christianity, translation flourished and acquired a vital role that required accuracy. Thus, St Jerome, a famous translator of the time and author of one of the famous translations of the New Testament, declared that he translated sense-for-sense rather than word-for-word (Bassnett 1991: 46).

Besides spreading the word of God, translation was central to the rediscovery of Greek knowledge by Western Europe in the 12th century leading ultimately to the European renaissance. The acquisition and adaptation of Greek knowledge by scientists from the Arab empire was crucial to the transmission of knowledge to Europe. The Arabs were amongst the first in history to develop a government-
funded school devoted to translation (cf. Didaoui 2001). With the spread of Islam and the establishment of an Islamic Ummah in the 7th century, the Arabs appreciated the importance of translation in facilitating communication and exploiting their predecessors' science and knowledge. Successive rulers thus, apart from some exceptions, encouraged translation and translators by spending generously, building institutions and paying translators generously (Bin Omar 1997). Translation reached its zenith in the 9th and 10th centuries. The Arabs translated from virtually any language they came in contact with or sought knowledge from, although their main source was Greek, so they covered a diverse range of sciences including astronomy, medicine, geography, mathematics, philosophy, logic and chemistry (Didaoui 2001). ‘The Arabic-reading world was thus, in three-quarters of a century, in possession of most of the philosophical works of Aristotle and medical writings of Galen, of the leading Neo-Platonic commentators and of Persian and Indian scientific works’ (ibid.: 6).

The first Arabic translations used the literal style of the Syriac translators (Qaasim 1997; Didaoui 2001). This led to a style that was virtually word-for-word translation, doing great violence to Syriac word-order and indeed to Arabic word-order when the same technique was used. The works translated in this way cannot have been of much use for further research. Hunayn ibn IsHaq was the great translator of all. He played a major role in the first steps, which allowed Greek philosophy and knowledge to spread through the Islamic empire during the reign of the fifth Abbasid Caliph Haruun al-Rashiid. Hunayn’s innovation was to abandon the literal tradition of translation and concentrate on making the sense of the Greek writers comprehensible to the Arabic reader. Hunayn was skilled in Arabic, Syriac and Greek.
It should not be thought, however, that Arab translators simply sat down with piles of Greek manuscripts and translated them. They faced many problems from finding manuscripts to rendering foreign works into Arabic, which was not a scientific language before the spread of Islam. ‘Textual analysis of Medieval Arabic translations, with reference to their Greek or Syriac originals, indicates how Greek concepts were incorporated into the Arabo-Muslim system of thought, and the resources of the Arabic language were mobilized in order to accommodate these foreign abstractions’ (Salama-Carr 2000: 99). In terms of translating foreign terms, for example, they had to assimilate new ones and find appropriate equivalents for which they adopted three main strategies: literal, semantic and gist (Faiq 2000). In the literal translation, technical terms were transliterated. Semantic translation, however, meant reading, comprehending then re-writing in Arabic semantically, but not necessarily lexically, equivalent texts. Gist translation is a strategy that involved summaries rather than full translation and which came into use when the Arabs’ need for translation diminished as they began producing their own science and knowledge. Therefore, translators were selected according to rigid rules. Al-JaHiDH, a medieval Arab scholar and critic, stipulated the following requirements for a good performance (cited in Didaouï 2001: 17):

1- thorough knowledge of the subject;

2- perfect command of source and target languages;

3- knowledge of customs and traditions (culture);

4- improvement of the text by the translator, through an adaptation to the TL;

5- revision, verification and comparison of different copies (in SL);
6- translation for the reader (the style adopted for a well-informed reader should be different from that aimed at students);

7- conciseness, clarity, simplicity and elegance (what al-JaHiDH refers to as bayan);

8- translation should be sentence based.

Al-JaHiDH reached the following equation for translation (cited in Didaoui 2001: 11): translation quality = bayan in rendering + knowledge of the subject matter. Bayan is an Arabic word which is described as ‘elegance of expression’ according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica (ibid.: 13). It is a word mentioned in the Holy Qur’aan in Surat al-RaHmaan and is interpreted as ‘intelligent speech; power of expression: capacity to understand clearly the relations of things and to explain them’. For al-JaHiDH, bayan, as in his book al-Bayan wa al-Tabyin, means keeping sentences short, elegant and clear and keeping away from ‘artificial and far-fetched ornamentation’ and ‘expressing ideas ‘clearly and simply’ (Didaoui 2001: 11). Hunayn ibn IsHaaq, who was the dean of the faculty of medicine that was established within Bayt al-Hikmah and who was the best known and appreciated translator/scholar, embodied al-JaHiDH’s guidelines in his translations (ibid.: 13). Towards the 10th century Greek science had passed to the Arabs, and the Arabs were writing Arab science, and the scientists themselves who became masters of the languages and sciences carried translations. Translators, therefore, opt for gist translation, in which they conducted abstract transmissions. By the tenth century, Pope Sylvester II took up the torch of learning. He introduced the Arab astronomy and mathematics, and launched Arabic numerals in place of the Roman ones. Many followed him, of which Constantinus Africanus in the 11th
century, and Bishop Raymond (Raimundo) and Gerard of Cremona in the 12th century (Bin Omar 1997).

As early as the 11th century, Toledo became a centre for the transmission of Arabic/ Islamic culture to Europe. The early translations were primarily made into Latin and some into Hebrew. Subsequent translations were done from Latin or Hebrew into the vernacular languages of Europe. Many translators at Toledo had neither command over the Arabic language or sufficient knowledge of the subject matter. They translated word-for-word and, where they failed to understand or find equivalents, they Latinized the Arabic words (for example, algebra ‘aljabr’, alchemy ‘alkimia’, alcohol ‘al-kuHuul’) (Bu Zainab 1997).

Besides science and knowledge, Bible translation remained a major translation move well into the 17th century. But with the coming of the Reformation and the growth of concepts of national cultures, translation became a weapon in dogmatic and political conflicts as nation-states began to emerge (Bassnett 1991: 46). The sixteenth century saw the translation of the Bible into a large number of European languages, especially with the advent of printing in the fifteenth century. With this printing wave, the role of translation underwent significant changes along some serious attempts into formulating a theory of translation (ibid.: 54). One of the first writers to formulate a theory of translation was the French humanist Etienne Dolet who, in 1540, published a short outline of translation principles entitled *La manière de bien traduire d’une langue en une autre* (How to translate well from one language into another) and established five principles for the translator (ibid.):

1. The translator must fully understand the sense and meaning of the original author, although he is at liberty to clarify obscurities.
2. The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL.

3. The translator should avoid word-for-word renderings.

4. The translator should use forms of speech in common use.

5. The translator should choose and order words appropriately to produce the correct tone.

Dolet’s principles meant, clearly, that the translator must seek sense-for-sense in any translation while mastering knowledge of both source language and target language to achieve it best. The key word for translators in Dolet’s principles is ‘knowledge’.

The Renaissance, however, added a new flavour to texts by way of additions, omissions and aimed alterations. At that stage, translation was in no way a secondary activity, but a primary one. In the 17th century, John Dryden (Bassnett 1991: 60) formulated three basic types of translation:

1. Metaphrase, which is turning the author line for line and word for word into another language (i.e. literal translation).

2. Paraphrase, which is sometimes called translation with latitude. In other words, sense-for-sense translation.

3. Imitation, where the original text can be abandoned if deemed fit by the translator.

Although Dryden’s views on translation do not differ much from those of Dolet as they both give translators absolute liberty, he seems to have theorized
translation by giving it rather separate definitions and isolating each type unlike Dolet. By mid 17th century many French writers were translated into English as France witnessed an age of writing classics.

In the 18th century, though, a new concept that overlooked the relation between the translator and his target readers became widespread leading Alexander Fraser Tytler, towards the end of that century, to publish a volume entitled *The Principles of Translation*, which is considered to be the first systematic study in English of translation processes. He set up three basic principles (Bassnett 1991: 62):

1. The translation should give a complete transcript of the idea of the original work.

2. The style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original.

3. The translation should have all the ease of the original composition.

Tytler’s principles avoid Dolet’s clear cuts between free/literal and Dryden’s loose holds and gives translators full liberty in choosing what is best to reproduce a comprehensible and fluent original in the target language with the same ideas and effects.

Contrary to the previous centuries, the 19th century focused on the source language promoting the translator to serve it with complete commitment. It emphasized the importance of taking the target language reader to the source text by means of translation. However, this century also witnessed a growth in national pride, especially for the European community, as the Ottoman Empire began to collapse and Western colonial powers gathered momentum. Consequently,
Europeans, mainly French, British and Germans, saw no value in translation as a way of enriching their own cultures (Bassnett 1991). Two well-known translators of that century are Edward Fitzgerald who is best known for his translation of *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* from Arabic to English in 1858 and Richard Francis Burton who translated the *Arabian Nights* (original Arabic title: One Thousand and one Nights) in 1885. According to Abdulla (1999: 11) Fitzgerald followed an ‘amusement’ strategy in which he gave himself absolute liberties to reshape the Rubayyi\at the way he deemed fit regardless of what the source text carries within. Burton seems to have adopted the same strategy too as Byron Farwell (cited in Carbonell 1996: 80) wrote the following about his translation, which stands as a masterpiece:

The great charm of Burton’s translation, viewed as literature, lies in the veil of romance and exoticism he cast over the entire work. He tried hard to retain the flavor of oriental quaintness and naïveté of the medieval Arab by writing ‘as the Arab would have written in English’. The result is a work containing thousands of words and phrases of great beauty, and to the Western ear, originality.

But the 20\textsuperscript{th} century witnessed a great move in the history of translation that led some scholars to call it ‘the age of translation’ (Newmark 1981: 3). This great interest in translation came as a result of the increased contact between countries as part of the economic and political boom. The 20\textsuperscript{th} century also witnessed a technological growth that needed to be mobilized across the world. This move had enhanced the position of both translation and translators and even opened doors for new concepts such as machine translation. In addition, much of the discussion on translation theory was the product of that century. In the 1970s, the Tel Aviv School, in particular, whose main contributors are Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury, has contributed much to the field, especially the development of the notions of
polysystem. The school introduced methodologies through which the absorption of a text from one culture into another is investigated; Even-Zohar suggested that a marginal, new, insecure or weak and/ or weakened culture tends to translate more texts than a culture that is in a state of strength (Bassnett 1991: xii).

In the 1980s, in particular 1985, the appearance of the collection of essays entitled *The Manipulation of Literary Fame* edited by Theo Hermans raised a great deal of debate and research as it suggested that translation as a form of rewriting has manipulative powers (ibid.). This idea led to the creation of the Manipulation School. The school, with its main contributors André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett, looked closely into the effect of the source text on the target culture by examining what takes place during the processes of reading and rewriting in another language and certainly the subsequent reception of the translated text. Translation, hence, developed into a discipline of its own right that is successfully able to interact with other fields.

Since it found its way into other fields, translation has attracted researchers from a variety of backgrounds ranging from historical, anthropological, psychological, political, cultural and economic to even more technical ones such as computer science. Accordingly, it has witnessed massive changes and is determined to continue developing well into the 21st century especially with the current world affairs.

### 2.3 Translation: A Cultural Necessity

The history of translation registers a number of different needs, separate or combined, that promoted people to translate. In the early centuries, the need to spread Buddhism in China employed interpreters who would deliver the explanation
of the Buddhist Sutras by Buddhist monks to Chinese Recorders to transfer it into Chinese (cf. Baker 1998a; Katan 1999). Likewise, the Arabs, on the official and individual levels, devoted a great deal to translators and interpreters whose efforts, besides translating knowledge from their Greek predecessors, led to the spread of Islam and the Arab/ Islamic culture and heritage from the Arab peninsula to the borders of China in the East and the borders of France in the West. Similarly, spreading Christianity in Europe, Latin America and the Far East required enormous efforts to translate the Bible besides knowledge and classics from Arabic and Greek. And apart from some cases of execution for misconduct, translators and interpreters were often praised. In the colonial context, for example, interpreters had many different roles. They acted as guides, explorers, brokers, diplomats, ambassadors and advisors on local affairs which is as well why they were sometimes considered traitors (Baker 1998a: xv). Also, in the eighteenth century Turkey, the Naval Drogman besides being an interpreter his duties included the collection of taxes from non-Muslim subjects until nearly 1839 (ibid.). Dragomans in Turkey between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries were highly respected that there was even a Translators' Mosque built in Istanbul in the sixteenth century, and they earned very high incomes (ibid.). In the Islamic world, translators and interpreters who belonged to religious minorities were exempt from the capitation tax levied on non-Muslims (ibid.). Translation projects were selective in their choices of material for translation. Often, only works deemed of interest to the culture doing the translation were translated. Medieval Arab translators, for example, translated much science, philosophy and even mythology but little literature or theology from other cultures presumably for two reasons: because it contained ‘religious myths which conflicted with Islamic teachings’ and because they ‘already had a strong literary tradition of
their own' (Baker 1998c: 318). Nonetheless, the strategies by which works were chosen were not hostile (cf. Didaoui 2001). There was a concern about importing and imposing alien concepts and contortions on the culture and structure of Arabic (Salama-Carr 2000: 103). Al-JaHiDH, who was the first Arab to regulate translation (Didaoui 2001: 5), for example, in his *Kitaab al-Hayawaan* (Book of Animals) expressed his devastation at the poor language and lack of subject knowledge by translators (Salama-Carr 2000: 103). In addition, some commentators held the view that translation constituted a form of subversion as they did not see it to be at all positive or enriching (*ibid.*). Indeed, most translation projects in the early epochs were promoted by the urgent need to satisfy the necessities of young nations.

Towards the end of the Middle Ages, however, and in conjunction with the decline of the Ottoman Empire, colonialism had begun crawling into many areas and translation took another form and shape. Since 1500 translation has been contributing to the construction of dichotomies and building of the colonial difference between Western European languages (languages of science, knowledge and the locus of enunciation) and the rest of the languages in the planet (languages of culture and religion and the locus of the enunciated) (Mignolo and Schiwy 2000). Cultures and societies affected by colonization were translated/ represented primarily as weak, primitive, naive and inhuman (Sengupta 1995). ‘Such a rendition clearly justifies the colonizer’s “civilizing mission”, through which the inherent superiority of the colonizer’s culture is established’ (*ibid.*: 160). Within this context, foreign literature, the cultural product of the colonized, attracted relatively small investment and little notice in English (Venuti 1998a: 88). This little notice paid to foreign languages and cultures usually conducted translations ‘in such a way as to disguise the fact that translation is taking place’ (Bassnett 1997). The translation outcome of this period,
with English growing into a world language as a result of its extended sphere of influence and it being the language of science and technology, witnessed a decline in translations from minor languages into English in terms of quality and quantity as opposed to translations from English into minor languages. In addition, the images that such translation projects reflected about the Other formulated ‘an identity of the source culture that is recognizable by the target culture as representative of the former’ (Sengupta 1995: 159). The 1990s' notion of translation, in particular, argues Bassnett (1991: 15), ‘was based on the idea of a master-servant relationship paralleled in the translation process- either the translator takes over the source text and ‘improves’ and ‘civilizes’ it or the translator approaches it with humility and seeks to do it homage’.

The colonial approach to cross-cultural translation led ultimately to the creation and regulation of stereotypes, and to resistance from discourses by the Other questioning the transparent and fluent strategies and practices of translating. In this regard Venuti argues that the Anglo-American strategies of translating foreign cultures have been particularly violent as they were predominantly governed by domesticating and foreignizing approaches that deprived source texts producers of their voices, and deprived target text readers of knowing a foreign culture (1995; 1996; 1998). The Manipulation School (see section 2.2 above) developed a framework in which the process through which a text is chosen then transported from one set of cultural/linguistic system into another is investigated. Some of the key words that became crucial to the study of translation are identity, power, stereotyping, representation, asymmetries, difference, ideology, etc.

As such, different periods throughout history have produced different concepts of translation, and different handlings of its practice. The role of translators
too changed, hand in hand with the ongoing changes in the geopolitical, socio-economic and ideological factors that govern each period of history. Andrè Lefevere (1998a: 12) appropriately remarks,

Histories of translation in the West have shown increasingly that the technique of translating in Western cultures has changed repeatedly over the centuries, and that what was accepted as ‘obvious’ at one particular time was, in fact, little more than a passing phase. The important point is that shifts and changes in the technique of translating did not occur at random. Rather, they were intimately linked with the way in which different cultures, at different times, came to terms with the phenomenon of translation, with the challenge posed by the existence of the Other and the need to select from a number of possible strategies for dealing with that Other.

According to Lefevere (1998a), it has finally become clear that different methods of translating as well as different approaches to translational practice are being seen as changeable not eternal or fixed, and that they have changed over centuries. Indeed, seeing translation as such makes it possible to realize the essential position it has always enjoyed in defining and developing cultures (ibid.: 12). Investigating the definition of translation in any translation tradition in any one culture highlights the role it played in looking at and introducing other cultures.

Medieval Arabic translation played a vital role in the cultural development of the Arab/ Islamic world as well as other worlds. As a culturally motivated enterprise, Medieval Arabic translation facilitated a fruitful dialogue between the Arab/ Islamic nation at the time and other cultures through striking a balance between acquiring knowledge and knowing the Other, and the guidelines of its culture and religion. In light of Lefevere’s argument that translation practices are changeable not fixed, considering Medieval Arabic translation can be beneficial in rendering the encounter
between the translated and translating cultures less hostile and impartially. Translation must be a channel of transmission as well as a means of instant communication and appreciating Others (Cronin 2003: 3). The following section, therefore, focuses on Medieval Arabic translation and highlights some of its relevant characteristics.

2.4 Medieval Arabic Translation: A Cultural Consideration

What distinguishes the experience of this movement from any translation activity the world had known before according to al-Khury (1988: 24, cited in Baker 1998c: 318) is three factors: (i) a wide range of source language; (ii) a large selection of topics and subjects; and (iii) a government that sponsored, supported, organized and institutionalized the translation movement. During its long history, the Arab/Islamic civilization came into contact with many of its neighbouring countries whether by way of trade or conquest. As mentioned earlier, one of the great civilizations that the Arabs were in contact with even before the birth of Islam is the Greek civilization. Greek philosophy had been known in the East for many centuries and there were centres in that part of the world through which Greek thought passed to the Arabs such as Jundishapur in Persia, Harran in Mesopotamia and Alexandria in Egypt (Qaasim 1997).

Historically, Greek science was studied as early as the fourth century mainly by the Arab Syrian Christians (cf. Bin Omar 1997). De Boer (cited in Bin Omar 1997: 47) remarks, ‘The Syrians, it is true, produced nothing original; but their creativity as translators was of advantage to Arab-Persian science. They cultivated Greek sciences before they transmitted them to the medieval philosophers’. Later, it was the Syrians again who had a great role in transmitting the Islamic intellectual
culture to medieval Europe. Without the Arabs, argues Montgomery Watt (cited in Peled 1979: 129), ‘European science and philosophy would not have developed when they did’. It is worth mentioning here that since the Umayyad Caliph ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marawaan (reigned 685-705) declared Arabic the sole administrative language of the Islamic empire, Arabic has been the official language of all Arab countries thus integrating the variety of religious and ethnic backgrounds as ‘Arabs’.

The early steps of Arabic translation were recorded during the Umayyad dynasty in the seventh century AD., during the rule of Khaalid ibn Yaziid. ‘He was the first Islamic personality to order the translation of books on chemistry and medicine and the first Arab to study philosophy. He acquainted himself with existing sciences in Egypt by undertaking many trips to it, and was well aware of the intellectual treasures enshrined in the school of Alexandria, wrote on chemistry and acquired Greek and Syriac manuscripts’ (Didaoui 2001: 6). However, some translation activity into Arabic seems to have taken place albeit on a small scale prior to the rise of Islam (al-Namlah 1992: 53-55). Also, in the very early days of Islam (in the seventh century) some translation as well as interpreting activity have taken place as there are records that the Prophet (and later the four Guided Caliphs also) sent delegates with messages to many emperors and political rulers introducing them to Islam (ibid.: 56-61). But translation reached its zenith by the end of the ninth century, particularly in the time of the Abbasid Caliph al-Ma’muun when Greek sciences became widely available in the Muslim world. Al-Ma’muun and his father Haaruun al-Rashiid were two of the prominent Caliphs of that age. Al-Rashiid adopted the skills of paper printing from China and spent generously on developing them that the first ever book-like copy of knowledge was distributed and knowledge became at easy reach. His son, al-Ma’mun, is considered the greatest Caliph of all
with regard to translation. In 830 A.D. al-Ma’mun founded the most important institute of higher learning in Islam (Baker 1998c: 320; Didaoui 2001: 12). Bayt al-Hikmah (The House of Wisdom), which was established in Baghdad, functioned as an academy, a library and a translation bureau with a personnel of 65 translators working from Syriac, Greek, Persian, Sanskrit and Aramaic that it became the most eminent centre of translation in Arab history (ibid.). It is not so surprising that Baghdad attracted scientists and that Damascus had not; although Damascus was physically closer to the Byzantine Empire, Baghdad was a good deal closer to the strongholds of Nestorian learning at Nisibis and Jundi-Shapur, which had already begun to influence the new Mesopotamian cities of Kuufa and BaSra (Bin Omar 1997; Qaasim 1997).

The institute translated foreign knowledge, philosophy, medicine, literature and mathematics. Al-Ma’mun appointed the best translators and teachers and sent delegations to Byzantium to select Greek texts that were then ordered to be translated into Arabic. A well-known translator of that time is Hunayn ibn IsHaq. He, and others in the institute, was paid by the Caliph the weight of his work in gold as an appreciation and encouragement (Baker 1998c: 320). Hunayn was later provided with three fully furnished houses by Caliph al-Mutawakil for the same task (Bin Omar 1997: 47). Translation activities at these times were made under the command of Caliphs and other Muslim patrons of learning.

Hunayn ibn IsHaq is a Christian from Hiira who had been expelled from Jund-Shapur after disagreeing with his teacher YaHya ibn Masawayh, and had then spent time in the Greek lands learning the language. Hunayn is important for the many excellent translations of Greek texts that he made into Arabic. He also revised earlier translations, even his own, and was a model of al-JaHiDH’s concept of
translation (Didaoui 2001: 17). In particular he translated Plato and Aristotle. These translations were spread widely through Mesopotamia, Syria and Egypt. Hunayn’s son IsHaq also contributed, as did his nephew Hubaysh ibn al-Hasan. Hubaysh translated the texts of Hippocrates and the botanical work of Dioscorides, which became the basis of the Arab pharmacopoeia. Hunayn’s contribution to translation resided in his adoption of a rather sense-for-sense translation. He and his school translated the entire Alexandrian medical curriculum into Arabic. While Hunayn was bringing new ideas to translation, new movements were stirring in Baghdad. Al-Khawarizmy the mathematician was combining Greek and Indian mathematics to produce what is now called algebra (from his book, al-Jabr wa'l-muqaabalah), and working in geography and astronomy; al-Kindi, the philosopher was still using the translations but producing a new philosophy.

The next generation produced two more outstanding translators, Qusta ibn Luqa who translated works on medicine and astronomy and produced a spherical astrolabe, and Thabit ibn Qurra, a mathematician and astronomer from the city of Harran. From this point on the translation movement was declining because the Arabs were producing their own science, which was superior to that of their predecessors. The crucial period of adoption was during the rules of al-Mansur, Haruun al-Rashiid, and al-Ma’mun. Thus, by the tenth century, most of the Greek knowledge and science as well as philosophy were translated into Arabic. Aristotle’s logical Organon including Categories, De Interpretatione and Topica, and many of his works on natural science, psychology and ethics had been translated into Arabic (Bin Omar 1997: 48). Likewise, the medieval Arab philosophers also, who practiced translation as a second profession, translated Plato, Prophry, Proclus, Galen and their likes (ibid.).
Early Arab scientists were constrained to follow the fields mapped out for them by the Syriacs and Greeks, and by the Indians and Persians, since this was the only scholarly literature available to them. Nonetheless, not all Greek, Syriac, Persian or Indian knowledge was translated. The Arabs, regulated by their culture and ideology, were selective in what to translate and how. They needed to translate everything to strengthen their Ummah apart from the religious and theological. To achieve this, Medieval Arab translators opt for strategies that were neither invisible nor violent, rather lied within their culture of translation agenda (al-Namlah 1992). ‘The Arabs not only assimilated the ancient lore of Persia and the classical heritage of Greece but also adapted both to their own peculiar needs and ways of thinking’ (Hitti 1940: 363, cited in Didaoui 2001: 6).

As Islam spread, the role of translation between the Arabs and other cultures was vital. The Arabs carried their knowledge, science, thought and culture with them. They were fierce warriors; but also poets, philosophers, astronomers, mathematicians, scientists, doctors, nurses, and theologians. The package of the Arab/ Islamic civilization found its way to Europe mainly through the intercultural exchange between Andalusia and the Arab peninsula during the Arab rule of Andalusia and the Iberian Peninsula, which lasted for eight centuries. During which, the Toledo School of Translation in Spain was established. However, unlike Bayt al-Hikmah, which translated directly from Syriac, Greek, Persian and Indian languages into Arabic, translations from Arabic into Latin in the Toledo school usually took place through a third language, Spanish. Also, because Arabic was the language of science at the time with a well developed linguistic system, it influenced Spanish in terms of grammar and terminology.
Medieval Arabic translation was mainly carried over under the supervision of Caliphs whose ideological and philosophical beliefs and interests shaped translation as a process and product. In addition, translators were controlled by the limitations of their culture and Islamic teachings. Nonetheless, Medieval Arabic translation and translators as cultural mediators managed to transfer knowledge cross-culturally without bringing violence to foreign cultures. In the worst of cases, bits of information were either deleted or replaced with ones that suited the culture and religion; ‘traces of paganism were eliminated and substituted by references more in accordance with their own beliefs’ (Kurk 1976: 18, cited in Faiq 2004).

Medieval Arabic translation, a culturally motivated state sponsored translation enterprise, acted as a mirror through which the Arab/ Islamic nation evaluated itself, hence building through the manipulation of foreign works, a unique cultural identity and intellectual heritage. Arab translators were selective in their choices of material and strategies, specifically with regard to literature, but they did not try to domesticate foreign cultures in the sense Venuti (1998a/b) assigns to domestication. Rather, they opt for strategies of elimination and/ or substitution in accordance with their culture’s demands. In other words, as selective, even violent at times, as these strategies were, they did not lead to negative stereotypical representation.

2.5 Conclusion

Intercultural contact between civilizations has been made possible through translation. Translation has been taken as a vital means in the evolution and strengthening of societies. Medieval Arabic translation is one of the great translation enterprises that have resulted in the great cultural shifts of history. In addition, as the
Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies (1998: 321) tells us, ‘the flowering of knowledge that took place in the Islamic World during the tenth and eleventh centuries...later provided the impetus for the development of all branches of knowledge in the West, including natural science and philosophy’.

Medieval Arabic translation was part of the cultures and ideologies that surrounded the Arab/Islamic lands. It was restricted by the dictates of the culture, the new religion and the language, which was also mainly a literary language and of limited geopolitical influence. Notwithstanding the complexities, Medieval Arab translators managed to strike a balance between the norms of their Arab/Islamic culture and the necessity to transfer knowledge and communicate with their others in terms of how they dealt with accommodating foreign cultures into Arabic. The Arabs translated virtually from any language they came in contact with (Persian, Syriac, Greek, Indian, Sanskrit) and covered almost all areas of knowledge available at the time. However, at times they excluded certain subjects and manipulated others. The ideological agenda of their culture of translation compelled them, for example, to translate little literature, which was also a direct result of their cultural hegemony. Nonetheless, they did not attempt to refuse or deny foreign cultures, nor domesticate them in the sense Venuti (1998a/b) assigns to the concept. Postulating the concepts of domestication and foreignization, Venuti (1995; 1996; 1998) argues that normalizing and naturalizing effects have stamped Anglo-American translations of foreign cultures. These effects deprive source text producers of their voices and re-present foreign cultures according to selective discursive strategies to meet Western readers’ assumptions and expectations of foreign cultures. The stereotypes that such translation projects produce suppress cultural diversity.
Medieval Arabic translation in general did not incorporate antagonistic or offensive measures in its handling of foreign cultures although the cultures it was dealing with were very much different from the Arab/Islamic one which was also at a critical point of empire-building. ‘The new empire lay at the intersection of Eastern and Western civilizations and brought together the most sophisticated cultural traditions of the period: Greek, Indian, Persian and Egyptian’ (Baker 1998c: 318). The contemporary reality is inescapably multicultural and multinational. Small cities have become global ones with inhabitants from other global cities. In addition, the dramatic changes in technology and in the organization of economies, policies and societies both at the national and international level have resulted in the contemporary phenomenon of globalization which is sometimes referred to as a new colonialism or the spread of sameness. It is in this context that an argument is advanced in favour of attaching due importance to translation and the role it plays between cultures. Martha Nussbaum (1997: 10) states that ‘cultivating our humanity in a complex, interlocking world involves understanding the ways in which common needs and aims are differently realized in different circumstances’ (cited in Cronin 2003: 6). Indeed, a mono view of the world hinders the possibility for genuine understanding and flowering of knowledge. The Arab/Islamic culture and language could not have become as rich as they are had they not opened up to other cultures and languages where openness does not mean the end of diversity. Some good examples include the Qur’aan itself which includes many words borrowed from Greek, Persian, Syriac and Hebrew, and some exciting literature like the Thousand and One Nights which is widely attributed to Arabic in the West although it is based on an old Persian work, Hazar Afsani (Thousand Tales), which in turn contained several stories of Indian origin, and Kalilah wa Dimnah, another famous book
attributed to the Arabs, which is actually based on a translation from Middle Persian, which is in turn based on Sanskrit sources (Baker 1998c: 318-319). Although the context in which Arabic functioned differs from the one in which English functions today, it is argued here that since Arabic was once the lingua franca of knowledge just like English today, perhaps English can benefit from the experiences of Medieval Arabic translation. In dealing with other cultures, Medieval Arabic translation was selective, manipulative and cautious especially as the region was in a state of empire building, nonetheless and despite some incidents of misconduct, in most cases it respected foreign cultures. In addition, it often questioned the validity and appropriateness of translated texts as reliable sources of information (ibid.: 321).

The following chapter, *Translation and Culture in a Global Context* aims to examine the consequences of the different aspects of globalization for translation, languages, cultures and translators.
Chapter Three

3 Translation and Culture in a Global Context

3.1 Introduction

Language is the heart within the body of culture, and it is the interaction between the two that results in the continuation of life - energy. In the same way that the surgeon, operating on the heart, cannot neglect the body that surrounds it, so the translator treats the text in isolation from the culture at his peril.

Bassnett (1991: 14)

Translation, in the main, has been understood as an activity that requires knowing the source and target languages. Translators’ main target has been to achieve equivalence. Yet, the search for equivalence led translators to realize that linguistic terms do not appear in isolation; they are part and parcel of a culture. In general terms, culture is the totality of knowledge, value systems and attitudes towards events, other cultures and people shared by a social group of people. Language, on the other hand is a complex communicative event that gives its users the tools to realize their culture. Within the context of globalization, however, culture in translation takes another direction. Translation can be an enemy or a friend. It can either present to a domestic culture the true essence of a cultural other hence facilitates the globalization of cultures, or it can play a role in the formation and confirmation of domestic cultural identities of foreign cultures. The shift in the role of translation came as a result of the huge interest in its ideological ramifications between the politically and economically unequal cultures.
After World War II, Britain and France weakened by the war were economically and militarily unable to sustain global influence. Their spheres eventually passed to the United States. The militarily and economic domination of the United States led to its inevitable dominance on the cultural sphere. American consumer goods and cultural products touched almost every part of the world, assuming a global spirit. In addition, English became a global language. Within this traffic, dominant/dominated, superior/inferior, us/them, etc., spheres were created. Consequently, the unequal power relations affected intercultural translation.

"Translations, rather than being a secondary and derivative genre, were instead one of the primary literary tools that larger social institutions—educational systems, arts councils, publishing firms, and even governments—had at their disposal to "manufacture" a given society in order to "construct" the kind of "culture" desired" (Gentzler 1998: 10). Thus, the representation of otherness per se through translation in this global context does not enhance cross-cultural understanding, nor does it narrow the gap between cultures. Cronin (2003: 6) argues that, "we cannot understand the ways in which needs and aims are differently realized if... we have no way of knowing what these aims and differences are... if we have no way of reading the books, watching the plays, looking at the films produced by others". The current global image of the Arabs, for example, has been defined throughout translations as terrorist, fundamentalist, violent, oppressive, etc. This negative stereotypical representation is related to the process of selection and the strategies adopted when translating. Selections and strategies are decided according to the dictates of a master discourse of translation and its norms.

Politically, economically and culturally global, the West constructed representations of the Other to fit within its domestic and international agendas.
Satisfied with what it has achieved, the West finds no reason why it should reconsider its representations. In a rapidly globalizing world politically and economically, globalizing cultures through translation is precarious. Intercultural translation, if conducted impartially and without restraints, can contribute to a better understanding of other cultures and eliminate any violent attitude of resistance. In a world transformed by the forces of globalization, this chapter looks at the different aspects of globalization which have impacted on translation in an attempt to examine the role of intercultural translation but within a global context.

3.2 Globalization

It seems very difficult to achieve an accurate definition for the term due to the different ideological backgrounds that consider it. For example, some researchers on globalization define it as, 'the powers of the NGOs (Non Governmental Organizations) that cannot be challenged', while others define it as, 'the freedom of exchange of goods, human resources, capitals and information between national and regional boundaries' (MaHmuud 2000: 24, my translation). Burhan Ghuliuun (1999: 28) on the other hand, says, globalization means, 'entering, as a result of the information, technological and economic revolution, a phase of a cultural and civilisational revolution in which the fate of the whole humanity is one or tending to be united' (my translation). Because of its contentious nature, some scholars attempted to recognize general definitions of the term. According to Scholte (2000: 15-16) at least five varying definitions of globalization can be distinguished. These definitions yield conceptions that are in some ways related and to some extent overlapping.
a. Globalization as internationalization. Global in this context is another adjective to describe cross-border relations between countries while globalization designates a growth of international exchange and interdependence. Examples of such globalization include the flow of trade, capital investment and movements of people, messages and ideas across countries.

b. Globalization as liberalization. Here globalization refers to a process of removing government-imposed restrictions on movements between countries in order to create an open and borderless world economy; i.e. open markets.

c. Globalization as universalization. Global here means world-wide, and globalization is the process of spreading objects and experiences to people around the world. The globalization of the Gregorian calendar, automobiles, Chinese restaurants, McDonalds, Hollywood movies, and much more can been seen as evidence of this type of globalization.

d. A fourth definition equates globalization with westernization or modernization. This type is especially visible in an ‘Americanized’ form. Globalization in this sense takes its definition from the roaming of one social structure across the world, normally destroying pre-existent cultures in the process. Globalization here is sometimes described as an imperialism of McDonald’s, Hollywood and CNN (Scholte 2000: 16). Some like Martin Khor (cited in Scholte 2000: 16) go further to declare that ‘globalization is what we in the Third World have for several centuries called colonization’.

e. A fifth interpretation defines globalization as deterritorialization (or according to Scholte (2000: 16), a spread of supraterritoriality). In this
interpretation, globalization entails a remaking of geography, so that social space is no longer wholly mapped in terms of territorial places, territorial distances and territorial borders.

Globalization as *westernization* and globalization as *universalization* very much overlap in the sense that they both indicate the universalization of certain elements of life but those elements are Western ones in most cases as evident from the common consumer products and life style. These two definitions are often related to culture although Waters (1995), Breidenbach and Zukrigl (1999), Altwaijri (1998) and B’Iqaziiz (1998) all see culture and globalization as a two-dimension subject: the globalization of cultures and the culture of globalization. The culture of globalization is what Scholte (2000) refers to as *westernization* and *universalization*. The globalization of cultures is sought to introduce cultures to each other making the world one global village with a variety of diverse cultures. This too would be equated with universalization but only if it gives all cultures equal rights to be universal (global) regardless of their superiority or inferiority. However, in spite of some overlap between these five definitions of globalization, their main interests are significantly different. For example, those who identify it as internationalization or see it as deterritorialization both talk about borderless relations but have different understandings of world affairs.

Whether people agree or disagree on the general definition of globalization, they often hold differing assessments regarding the extent of the development. Analysts who might be characterized as ‘globalists’ tend to regard globalization as the most important fact of the 20th century. Others who are not globalists but have interest in studying the matter regard it as a continuity of older facts, such as imperialism, yet under a different name.
3.2.1 Globalization in History

Another principle issue in debates about globalization is chronology. The chronology of globalization is very much dependant on what definition is adopted. For example, those who describe globalization in terms of internationalization often regard the process as a trend that has appeared at several stages in modern history. They argue that globalization started on a small scale 100 to 500 years ago but reached unexpected rates in recent decades (Scholte 2000). Others suggest that globalization is entirely new to present times and that global relations only began with airplanes and computers. However, what is more likely the case is that today’s globalization is a continuity of events from earlier centuries, but only since the mid twentieth century they began to affect everyday activities (ibid.). Thus, there are two theses: an ‘all-change’ which does not look beyond the current generation and presume that globalization is entirely a recent historical turn, and an ‘all-continuity’ which highlights the background of the contemporary developments (Scholte 2000).

According to some scholars three phases of globalization to date can be distinguished (cf. Scholte 2000; Waters 1995). First, awareness of global relations began half a millennium ago. Second, supraterritoriality made its first appearance from the middle of the nineteenth century and spread gradually to the present day. Third, global relations have reached their peak since the 1960s. However, there is nothing that suggests globalization will progress or retreat.

a. Early Globalization

Globalization has no origin. It has a long history but under different definitions. The means of producing international goods, as is the case today, may have become available in the 19th century but awareness of global reality had already entered some imaginations well before that time. Ideas of the earth as a single place
are witnessed in the very identification of the main religions. The first of these faiths emerged during the fifth and sixth centuries BC with Buddhism still surviving in many parts of the world (Scholte 2000: 63). Jews have for centuries held a notion of supraterritorial community that unites their Diaspora, wherever on earth it might extend (ibid.). Meanwhile Christianity manifested globalist aspirations long before Isaac Watt published his hymn ‘Jesus Shall Reign Where’re the Sun’ in 1719 (Scholte 2000: 64). The Muslim faithful of the eighth and subsequent centuries were too inspired by a vision of one world of Islam. On the other hand, secular global thinking can be tracked back half a millennium. Notions of international law, which arose from the 16th century onwards, believed that a single set of secular rules should apply across the civilized world (ibid.). Prior to the 19th century globalization had little existence outside the mind. Supraterritorial communications, markets, monies, organizations and intercultural communications were limited as the means of global communication and global organizations were not available at the time to implement regulations that could be applied instantly anywhere on earth. Translation was predominantly the only means through which supraterritorial communication was made possible and knowledge from one culture was made global to others.

b. Globalization Today

The means to take globalization from imagination into reality began to develop from the middle of the 19th century with the birth of communication technologies. It saw the emergence of the first global markets, elements of global finance, and a degree of globality in certain organizations (cf. Scholte 2000; Waters 1995; Tomlinson 1991) as in the UN, Amnesty International, World Bank, UNESCO, UNISEF, etc. In extent, however, there is no comparison between the degree of this globalization and the accelerated rise of international relations witnessed since the
middle of the 20th century. Three fields are often considered when talking about globalization; politics, economics and culture, although the term is often associated with economics. These three fields, although separate, are strongly interdependent.

3.2.2 Political Globalization

Waters (1995: 113-4) argues that International Relations in the 19th century operated much as the two games ‘diplomacy’ and ‘risk’ that spread in the 1970s in some of the university campuses of North America. According to him, participants in these games would play the role of nation-states and would act without morality or loyalty in furthering their interests. In reality, he continues, it was almost the same. Britain, for example could fight against France in the Napoleonic War, then with France forty years later in the Crimea, and stay neutral during the Franco-Prussian War of the 1870s (ibid.: 114).

In 1916 both Britain and France signed the Sykes-Picot Agreement, which divided the Arab region into zones of influence. Lebanon and Syria were assigned to France, Jordan and Iraq to Britain and Palestine was to be internationalized. France and Britain sought to maintain a distant international leadership; America isolated itself; Germany was attacked and excluded; and Russia was an off cast state. ‘For all Western intents and purposes the rest of the world, including China and Japan, did not exist’ (Waters 1995: 114-5). The Second World War gave these relations a global cut (Waters 1995: 115; Scholte 2000). First, any conflict in any nation-state threatened the rest whether they chose to be involved or not. Second, only the collective security of the coalition could protect states from aggression. Third, military and economic conflicts in any state affected the politics, economics and cultures of distant nations. The conferences that took place between the three main victorious powers (Britain, USA, USSR) at the end of that war constructed a global
system of international relations by explicitly dividing the world into spheres of influence and assigning them to the victors: Eastern and Central Europe to the Soviet Union; Western Europe to Britain, France and the USA; the Middle East, Africa, South-East Asia to Britain and France; the Asia-Pacific region and Latin America to the USA (Waters 1995: 115).

Eventually Britain and France proved to be too weak, economically and militarily, to sustain global influence and their spheres passed to the USA (Waters 1995: 115). A united power called 'Rapid Reaction Forces' supported by the UN was formed, however, in a global sense. And global reach, with the 'Rapid Reaction Forces', facilitated military interventions by states of the North in conflicts in the South and East, which they deemed of territorial interest (Waters 1995: 115). The domination of the United States, in particular, militarily and economically led to its inevitable dominance on the cultural sphere. American consumer goods, cultural products and life style characterise today's societies. The Washington Post of October 25, 1998 wrote, 'America's biggest export is no longer the fruit of its fields or the output of its factories, but the mass-produced products of its popular culture; movies, TV programs, music, books and computer software'. This universalization of Western, mainly American, culture relies heavily on the diplomatic and economic relations between the cultures involved. Coca-Cola and Marks & Spenser, for example, were boycotted in Saudi Arabia until the Gulf War in 1991. Their acceptance in the Kingdom's market coincided with the Saudi-American alliance during the war and the Kingdom's new policy towards Israel.

3.2.3 Economic Globalization

The most talked about aspect of globalization is economics as in trade. Trade is sought to link together geographically distant producers and consumers. It
establishes a relationship of identification and interdependence between them. The British taste for tea for example, could not have been cultivated had it not been able to export its cheap textiles to Southern Asia, sell them in captive colonial markets, along with common law, cricket and railways (cf. Waters 1995). Despite the collapse of colonialism, the cultural ties of trade remained.

World trade, understood as the exchange of commodities and services between nation-states, has expanded very rapidly. There are two main phases of trade growth: mid to late 19th century as the militarily and economic hegemony of Britain allowed it to set up protected markets in its colonies and 'free trade' in manufactured goods outside them; and the thirty or so years after the Second World War when the USA was so economically and militarily dominant that it imposed a freer and more secure trade regime, knowing that its own manufactured exports would succeed and that it could extend special forms of trade access to its friends, those 'most favoured nations' (Waters 1995: 66-67). This model of trade relations and internationalised goods introduced a 'globalized culture' of geographically distant societies. A globalized culture refers to a group of varying societies identified as the same by way of consuming the same goods and ultimately sharing similar life styles.

3.2.4 Cultural Globalization

Any discussion of economics, politics and globalization will involve culture. But how is the concept of culture related to globalization? In other words, does globalization make people more the same and equal or more different?

Some (Waters 1995; Opris 1999) argue that using Microsoft computers, eating McDonalds, drinking Coca-Cola and watching Hollywood movies unifies the different parts of the world. In other words, that globalization has made the
inhabitants of the world equal and the same. However, such an argument is short
sighted. To achieve a fruitful intercultural communication and discussion, different
parts need to have different ideas and views of the world as although people who
share the same ideas tend to have calmer and less violent dialogues, their discussions
are often unproductive (Thomas 1998). Others (Scholte 2000) argue that
globalization brings about cultural diversity and non-territorial cultures. However,
their argument is opposed by some (B’Iqaziiz 1998; Altwaijri 1998) who see that the
difference conveyed often classifies cultures as inferior/ superior, dominant/
dominated, developing/ developed, barbarian/ modern, etc. In addition, the
domination of a particular culture, its products and way of life eventually erases the
identity of local cultures (ATaamish 1999; Hijaazy 1999).

Certainly the world has changed dramatically. It has never been as easy as it
is today to gain access to the entire world. Through satellites, computers, telephones,
axes, people now have the ability to communicate and intercultural communication
is a mouse click away. In this respect, Bassnett (cited in Alvarez & Vidal 1996: 1)
sees translation a vital tool in the process of transmitting cultures on a global level
for the ever-increasing demand to know Others.

Globally, this is the age of mass communication, of multi-media
experiences and a world where audiences demand to share the latest text,
be it film, song, or book simultaneously across cultures.

Translation here is looked at as one of the most important means in introducing
foreign cultures to serve the global purpose. However, the question that arises is
whether the translators’ ideology, the set of values and attitudes that make up one’s
culture and shape his/ her view of Others, affect their choice of material and
strategies when translating cultures especially those which they, as members of one culture or another, do not see eye to eye with.

This is especially the case when translating from minor into major languages, specifically English. To assess the role translation plays in cultural globalization, one needs to examine what represents other cultures through translation; the number of books translated into and from English, the strategies adopted when translating foreign cultures and the type of literature selected for translation.

3.2.5 Globalization and the Arab World

Because it has no unified definition, people from different backgrounds assess globalization differently. Some Western scholars, for example, see globalization from a merely economic dimension based on profits, with cultural and political factors as means employed to serve economic goals. For some Arab scholars, the current globalization is a way of pumping monies and riches out of the rich, but politically weak, countries under the name of open markets on the expense of languages and cultures serving only the powerful nations, and is not the sort of globalization that this part of the world needs at this stage (Amiin 1999). They believe that this will, in the long run, create clashes and conflicts between the different countries as it will further enhance the gap between the superior and inferior and will demolish local identities and political powers (ATaamish 1999; Peter Martin & Schumann 1998). MuTaae Safady (1997, cited in Taraabiishy 2000: 106), for example, equates globalization with what he calls ‘absolute imperialism’. He argues that globalization is a less violent and more acceptable term than imperialism with the aim to facilitate total invasion on the cultural, economic and political levels. Taraabiishy (2000), agrees with Safady and gives the following account; the ratio of population to that of consumption (based on the UN statistics) reveals that 20% of
the world’s population own 80% of its riches while 80% of the world’s population
own just 20% of its riches putting 4/5 of its population to one side and a 1/5 on
another. According to another report (cf. Taraabiishy 2000), 20% of the world’s
population have access to 85% of its products while the remaining 20% have access
to only 1.1% of the same riches. Monies and riches, says Safady (1997), can be
transferred across countries in a matter of seconds. The collector in the other end,
according to him, is a minority in the shape of a nation that is both economically and
militarily powerful.

In terms of cultural globalization, MaHmood (2000: 26) argues that it is the
ability of cultures that are stronger technologically to dominate those that are weaker.
‘Cultural globalization’, he adds, ‘is the way in which a certain culture tries to make
its cultural products global, through influencing other cultures’ values and belief
systems, in order to impose its political and economic powers’ (my translation).
From this stand, many Arab scholars see a threat in globalization to the Arab culture
and society as it brings a package of totally foreign cultures to dominate the local one,
erasing it and replacing it for the benefit of the dominant powers. One of the means
for this cultural domination is translation. The Arabic market is flooded with
translated books from different Western languages, most of which from English. This
in turn eliminates the power of local cultures especially when the foreign cultures are
represented in such a way that appeals to the average Arab reader. Translation in the
Arab world bears a resemblance to a coin with two faces. On the one hand, it is
considered an endless source of knowledge that was once one of the reasons for this
culture’s superiority, richness and openness to other cultures. On the other, however,
it is seen as a way of bringing into the local cultures foreign values and norms that
are hardly accepted raw. Thus, the latter sees in translation a threat to the Arab/
Islamic culture and its identity. In this regard Cronin (2003: 6) wonders, ‘if speakers of majority languages are major consumers of translation products then how do they maintain their identity in a world subject to any number of homogenizing forces?’

We have discussed how during its history the Arab culture shifted from a culture that is translated from to one that is translated into. In other words, Arabic was once a major language, the lingua franca of science and knowledge. We have shown that in its golden ages, particularly during the Abbasid era around the 8th century, this culture flourished and reached a global level, which it would not have reached had it not translated from the Indian, Farsi, Greek and Syriac cultures. The medieval Arab/Islamic culture was an international donor of science and knowledge. However, satisfied with their own sciences and achievements, the Arabs began to pay little attention to translation until it severely declined. In the modern age, which began mid 19th century, Europe had taken up the lead as Arabic, although a significant language, became the receiving end instead and a minor language in translation terms. The revival and evolution of the Arab culture, once again, came hand in hand with a very active and massive translation movement in a variety of fields ranging from science to literature and arts. Indeed, the prosperity of this culture, whether it was in a state of weakness or strength and regardless of its superior or inferior status, always bedded a translation movement.

However, the translation movement that the Arab world is witnessing today seems alarming. Considering the significant number of foreign, specifically English, publications translated into Arabic, some solicitous writers argue that many of these translation products do not enrich Arab culture or add any real value to it (al-Khuuly 1998; al-Khaliij newspaper, November 13, 2003). In addition, the continuous replacement of Arabic words with foreign ones is often an element in their arguments.
that they fear cultural globalization may devastate the Arabic language. The dominance of Western, mainly English, cultural products of which films, books, plays, TV shows, cartoons, even electronic games alongside the unquestionable domination of English as the language of science and technology, ultimately associated it with the elite. This has the inevitable result that people, not only in the Arab world but almost in every place on the planet, decide to take up English as if their first language or at least include English words in their everyday speeches. Discussing the situation of Ireland, Cronin (2003: 142) rightly says, 'what happens to a people when they lose their language is not that they lose language...s/he speaks another'. According to him, 'the speaker is in effect translated into another language' (ibid.).

Nonetheless, the importance of translation, especially in accordance with globalization and the globality of English and the Western culture, is not to be ignored. Translation, first and foremost, is an essential cultural activity in response to the variable lingual and cultural diversities. To defeat claims which see translation as a benign process, the translating language must adhere to local words and try to record as much as possible of the language through translating as many and variable texts as possible into it. This will not only save the language but it will most importantly prove its capability of being a language able to fit in the modern age. For the major or global language which is English in our case, translating foreign languages and cultures is often put under the pressure of presenting mirror-images of the dominant language, its culture and image of the foreigners. The continuous presentation of mirror-images will eventually make foreign languages and cultures seem empty, have nothing new to offer, hence no longer worth translating. Failure to
signal language and cultural differences fair and square leads to the illusion of transparency and disguises the complex and hybrid nature of the world we live.

Taking it from there in a rapidly globalizing world where globalization means homogenization, many Arab, as well as Western, scholars believe that translation from Arabic undergoes a master discourse of representation that is packed with stereotypes and clichés (often negative) that any translation from Arabic should fit within ignoring thereof the true state of affairs of the Arab world and its authenticity. Jaquemond (1992: 154-5) aptly remarks on such a situation:

The translations of the Arabic literature remains determined by the global relationship between Orient, especially the Arabic Orient, and occident. The latter’s perceptions are biased by prejudices constructed through a long and complex mutual history.

Thus, does globalization mean openness and does openness mean the end of diversity? The concern of these and other scholars lies in their fear that the Arabic culture is threatened in the face of the homogenizing forces. Since Arabs are major consumers of translation products then the question is how can they maintain their identity in a world subject to the forces of globalization?

3.3 Translation, Language and Culture

Cultures have greater powers than those of politics. In fact, they have the power to direct a particular group of people towards dominating another or accepting being dominated by others. Hoogvelt (cited in Billington et al 1991: 16) writes,

No society can successfully dominate another without the diffusion of its cultural patterns and social institutions, nor can any society successfully diffuse all or most of its cultural patterns and institutions without some degree of domination.
By instinct, most people know what culture means and to which culture they belong. For example, many European countries are members of the European Union but many of their people do not feel European, rather British, French, Italian, etc., as they share with these people the language, history, the traditions, the way they see others, the way they interpret reality, etc. However, the term culture itself, as simple as it may seem, is complex and conflicting. It embraces a wide range of topics, definitions and applications. Sapir (1921) argues that there are at least two everyday common sense uses of the term. The first refers to the products of art, literature and music specific to a particular society or group of people. The second is derived from the verb ‘to cultivate’ which is an agriculture technique and refers to the artificial growth and development of microscopic organisms or species.

According to Sapir (1921: 30), culture, in terms of its first usage, has three applications. First, it is used by ethnologists to combine socially inherited practices and reactions whether material or spiritual in the life of a person. The second application of the term refers to the acquired knowledge and experiences that define a certain group of people. The third application of the term refers to the attitudes and views of life in relation to the Self and Other that recognize a group of people as distinct. The way that these beliefs and views function in the lives of the people and in the way they view themselves vis-à-vis others, which distinguishes this group of people from another, is what matters in our case. Culture, as defined by the 19th century anthropologist Tylor (cited in Billington et al 1991: 15) is,

that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by a man as a member of society.
What we can glean from this definition is the relation between culture and language, culture and identity, culture and knowledge and ultimately culture and translation. Gail Robinson (1988, cited in Katan 1999: 17), grouped the various definitions of culture into two basic levels: external and internal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours</td>
<td>Languages, gestures, customs/ habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products</td>
<td>Literature, folklore, art, music, crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>Beliefs, values, institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several approaches to the study of culture. According to Katan (1999: 18) they are: the behaviourist, functionalist, cognitive, and dynamic. The behaviourist approach tends towards ethnocentrism that is the belief that the worldview of one’s own culture is central to all reality; i.e., the belief in the superiority of the culture to which one belongs often accompanied with feelings of dislike and hatred of other cultures. The functionalist approach looks behind behaviour and is based on culture-bound evaluations made within the context of one particular culture and a judgmental frame based on one culture’s dominant or preferred values. The cognitive approach, on the other hand, sees cultures as different ways of reflecting reality.

However, as these three approaches tend to deal with culture as a solid zone they paved the way for a fourth approach; the dynamic one (Katan 1999: 21). As the name indicates, this approach perceives culture as a dynamic process in which culture ‘as a creative, historical system of symbols and meaning has the potential to fill in the theoretical gaps left by behaviourist, functionalist and cognitive theories’ (ibid.). Looking at culture as an active and lively entity means that it changes constantly not only on the individual level but most importantly on a society level. In addition, it can influence and/ or be influenced by other fields, history, even relations with other cultures. Within this context, today’s move towards a global
village and the globalization of cultures is resembled in the changes of common life styles, habits and customs, what is commonly known as McDonaldization. McDonaldization, coined by George Ritzer (1993, cited in Katan 1999: 23), 'is the process by which the principles of the fast-food restaurants are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society as well as the rest of the world'. Wearing jeans, drinking Coca-Cola and watching Hollywood entertainment programs, virtually and artificially, unite the world. Many scholars believe,

The growing significance of global communication...blurs national differences. Age and lifestyle may be more important than national culture. Thanks to satellite TV, adolescents the world over have more in common with their peers in other countries in terms of their tastes than with other age groups from the same culture.

(Katan 1999: 23)

Nonetheless, as Karamsch (cited in Katan 1999: 23) says, 'it is fallacy to believe that because Russians now drink Pepsi-Cola, Pepsi means the same for them as for Americans'. Meaning, unifying certain aspects of everyday life in the process of achieving a global village does not make every place the same. Similarly, 'ishqy (2000: 7) gives an account of the American fast-food chains in Saudi Arabia, which do not sell alcohol or pork products and close their doors during the day in the fasting month of Ramadan as part of the country's Islamic legislation. Another example would be the recent Kyoto agreement, which calls for a united move towards the reduction of greenhouse gases. Although it is a global problem, with the US the largest polluter, America refused to sign the agreement as it saw the problem differently. In other words, imported systems such as eating at McDonald's or reducing greenhouse emissions dynamically adopt to already existing ways of doing things. The same applies to translating cultures. Much has changed in the relation
between the West and the Arab world, yet very little has changed in the way this part of the world is perceived; it enriches in the target language the image of a 'complicated Orient' (Jacquemond 1997). In a functionalist approach to cultures, the politically powerful societies tend to consider themselves standards of what a civilized society means leading, thus, to a continuous assessment of other cultures vis-à-vis the self.

According to the UNESCO *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger of Disappearing* out of the 6,000 languages spoken on the planet up to half of this are either on the edge of disappearing or endangered (Cronin 2003: 141). Any language is a set of signs put forward by a group of people as a way for them to communicate. However, if culture, as mentioned above, is taken to mean the language, literature, folklore and values that make one group of people different from another, then languages are rather tools of communication and storages of the cultural products. For example, while Hatim and Mason (1990: 105) declare that 'languages differ in the way they perceive and partition reality', others argue that it is beliefs and values that determine the way we perceive reality and interpret it in words, i.e. language (al-Khuuly 1998). Words of any particular language as such are meaningless without reference to their cultural context or context of situation. Consider for example what the word 'freedom' means to a British teenager wanting to stay out late and to a Palestinian teenager living in Palestine under Israeli occupation. According to Juri Lotman (cited in Bassnett 1991: 14) 'no language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist, which does not have at its centre, the structure of natural language'. Likewise, 'language is essentially rooted in the reality of culture...it cannot be explained without constant reference to these broader contexts of verbal utterance' says Malinowski (cited in Katan 1999: 72).
What Malinowski refers to here is the fact that any language can be understood only with reference to culture, a context of culture. In 1923, Malinowski coined the term ‘context of situation’ and remarked that a language can have a meaning only if both the situation and culture context are clear to the reader or listener (Katan 1999). From a similar perspective, Sapir (1949: 207) referred to the issue of language and culture in the introduction to his essay ‘Language, Race and Culture’. He wrote, ‘language has a setting...language does not exist apart from culture’. Similarly, Hamers & Blanc (1989: 116) define language as,

a component of culture along with other entities like, for example, values, beliefs and norms. It is the product of culture transmitted from one generation to the next in the socialization process.

However, the importance of the cultural framework in which a language works was not paid much attention until the early sixties. According to Halliday and Hassan (1989: 9) it was Hymes’ work and his definition of the ethnography of communication that led to a renewed interest in the study of the different ways in which language is used in different cultures. Hymes also pointed to the importance of investigating the effect that the cultural values and beliefs have on communication (Katan 1999). Sapir and Whorf (1929) like Malinowski, Hymes and others, believed that language could only be interpreted within a culture. However, they also believed that no two languages are similar in the way they represent the same reality, nor are the worlds in which the different societies live in ‘which is why translators are not supposed to find the cultural equivalent of a term but to reconstruct its value’ (Simon 1997). In other words, bilingual people cannot automatically change the way they view the world once they shift between languages. Yet, this view is often criticized, as according to Hatim and Mason (1990: 29) if this hypothesis is to be
applied, then translators and interpreters would be prisoners of their native cultures and ultimately the aim of translation cannot be achieved. Hence issues of translation and culture, translation and ideology arise and raise with them questions as to whether the translators', as well as editors and publishers, own cultural background and ideological beliefs affect their work when translating between two different cultures?

The ideology of the translator, as a text reader, decoder then encoder, affects the way he/she handles a text for translation from another culture. A recent study carried out by Rogelio Diaz-Guerrero and Lorand Szalay (1991) shows the effect of culture on how people comprehend words. They interviewed 100 North American and Mexican college students and asked them to make a list of words they associated with a headword, or what they called 'stimulus themes', such as 'the United States' and 'Estados Unidos' (Katan 1999: 75). For the Americans, 'United States' had a technical meaning along with a strong feeling of love and patriotism while for the Mexicans, 'Estados Unidos' is a mixture of a historic frame of exploitation, war and power (ibid.). In general, it represented to the Americans something different from what it represented to the Mexicans.

Likewise, the way societies view one another is culture bound, and depends vehemently on the power relations between them, which makes the task of translators crucial. They must release what Lefevere (1999) calls the textual and cultural grids through which they see others, and act as free mediators instead, if they are to produce non-violent impartial representations of the Other.
3.3.1 The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies

One of the best results of multilingualism and multiculturalism is the importance of translation. An average person is only able to acquire a limited number of languages, which paves the way for translation to be the forerunner of the various means of communication between different cultures. Many definitions of translation have suggested that, as a means of communication, it is associated mainly with languages. However, translation has been witnessing major shifts. In particular, since the 1980s, the role of culture in translation has been conquering a more defined space away from equivalence. Many of the recent approaches to translation have become cultural rather than linguistic oriented. Such researches view translation not as a process of transfer but as an act of communication. In other words, such approaches, as Snell-Hornby (1988: 43), puts it, ‘are oriented towards the function of the target text (prospective translation) rather than prescriptions of the source text (retrospective translation)’. She adds, ‘they view the text as an integral part of the world and not as an isolated case of language’.

Culture, as discussed above, is a totality of knowledge, talent and perception. If language is an integral part of culture, translators need not only be proficient in two languages; they must also be at home in two cultures. In other words, they must be bilingual and bicultural (Vermeer 1994). ‘The extent of their knowledge, proficiency and perception determines not only their ability to produce the target text, but also their understanding of the source text’ (Snell-Hornby 1988: 42) and the way they view foreign cultures.

In the 1990s, both Bassnett and Lefevere were arguing that the practice of translation has moved from its very theoretical view to a much broader issue,
Now, the questions have changed. The object of study has redefined; what is studied is the text embedded in its network of both source and target cultural signs and in this way translation studies has been able both to utilize the linguistic approach and to move out beyond it.

Bassnett & Lefevere (1990: 11-12)

This new shift has been labelled the ‘cultural turn’ in translation. It promoted discussions of power relations, textual production and representation. Besides, it shifted the role of translators from interlingual mediators to intercultural ones, and relocated the focus from that on grammatical and lexical replacements to representing cultural differences within foreign languages. As it is today, translation tackles some of the most important cultural problems and, theoretically, makes knowing other cultures a much easier task. Nevertheless, intercultural transfer is not as simple as it may seem (Bassnett & Lefevere 1990). Representing other cultures through translation usually raises concern about the ideologies behind the translators, editors and publishers’ choices, and the strategies employed in selecting, translating and/or representing foreign texts. Looking at translation from this angle, Alvarez & Vidal (1996: 1) give translation a political outlook.

From the eagerness to consider translation as a science or the obsession to give a definitive, prescriptive and sole version of a text, we have moved on to a descriptive outlook which, whether we like it or not, is political.

Seeing translation as a manipulative power that can construct cultural identities promoted debates surrounding issues of representation of Others through translation. Approaching translation as a rewriting activity, both Lefevere and Bassnett (1990) point out that it has to do with power and manipulation as it reflects a given ideology and a poetics at work in a process of transfer. In the meantime, they see rewriting as the shaping power of one culture upon another. Having said so, we can argue that,
as a means for representing foreign cultures, translation enables a wider group of audience to view a particular culture across language barriers. Thus, it would perhaps be fruitful, given the complexity of the issues related to culture, on the one hand, and to translation on the other, to perceive intercultural interaction through translation on a global level as a two-ways process: translating, *per se*, and the culture that governs it. Theo Hermans (cited in Snell-Hornby 1988: 23) argues, ‘from the point of view of the target literature, all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose’.

Translating from or into a global language such as English in this global age, often regards foreign cultures as ‘minor’ ones. The role of translation between major and minor languages is profoundly ambiguous as it can be both, an enemy and friend. Minority is a term used to refer to the cultural or political position that is minor and inferior. It is used by some scholars, such as Venuti (1998a: 391) to describe the languages and literatures that are less translated from or that are not spoken or read by a hegemonic culture. In most cases, the inferior nations or cultures are those that were/are colonized, the marginalized because of their insignificant role in world politics, those which are not militarily and economically powerful and sometimes even those that are considered religiously backward. The distinctions are not all new. Aramaic, Persian, Greek, Latin, Arabic and French, to name but a few, are languages which have had powerful functions and where social prestige was affirmed at one level through mastery of these languages.

However, it is argued that the terms, ‘majority’ and ‘minority’ are correlated and change from one historical period to another. In other words, they are dynamic rather than static. According to Cronin (2003: 144), ‘minority is the expression of a
relation not an essence'. All languages therefore are potentially minority languages. Greek, for example, was once the language of power and knowledge; yet today, it is a language and culture that is translated into rather than from, and the language of a nation that is no longer as superior and powerful as it used to be. The same applies to Arabic but with some difference because the geopolitical location of the Arabic speaking world grants it some sort of superiority.

3.4 Translating in a Global Context

The hegemony of English in the current global economy is seen as the direct result of the spread of Western products and values, especially through the industry of Hollywood, and the political influence of the English speaking West, mainly Britain and the United States of America. The globality of one language means that other languages are inferior/ minor while English is superior/ major and so are the relevant cultures. It thus raises concerns about the relation between the hegemony of one language and the representation of foreign cultures.

Rapid developments in the computer world, such as the Internet, have accelerated the globality of English. English became global with the expansion of the British Empire, followed after World War II by the overwhelming dominance of the American political, economic and cultural power. Crystal (1997, cited in Abu Rizaiza 1998: 327) lists a number of precise facts and figures that establish the position of English. According to him, there are probably about 670 million people in the world with native or near native command of English. About 1.2-1.5 billion people, that are one third of the world’s population, have a reasonable competence in English, including some 55-56 million who speak pidgins and creoles. In 1995-1996, the British council, with language teaching units in 109 countries, gave examinations
to 400,000 students and estimated that by the year 2000 the number will rise to 1000 million. In addition, eighty percent of the world’s science and technology is in English and 85% of the international organizations use English (French is next with 49%; and of 30 other languages used, only Arabic, Spanish and German have more than 10%). One hundred and eighty national Civil Aviation organizations use English with varying consistency. Forty percent of the world’s mail, third of its newspapers, and a quarter of its periodicals are in English. The Internet with 40 million users in 1995, growing at 10% a year uses mainly English and English is the language of 80% of all-electronically stored information.

Besides executing other languages, the concept of a hegemonic language is likely to have undesirable disadvantages, as it will create a self-satisfied elite that will be dissuasive towards other languages and cultures, and isolated. Abu Rizaiza (1998: 328) argues that few Americans know any other language than English, and in effect live on an island with little or no knowledge of what goes on in the rest of the world unless the US is militarily involved. In addition, it eliminates the need to explore other cultures, which, paves the way for the powerful institutions to use translation, besides other means, to manipulate a foreign culture and construct for it the sort of domestic identity it desires.

The status of English within the context of cultural globalization raises questions in relation to translation and culture. Many scholars began questioning the relationship between translation and culture, and the effect the translators’ own cultures and the way they view the world, has on their choice of works and their choice of strategies when translating. They also question how such choices relate to what is considered global of a foreign culture’s image. A true and non-aggressive
practice of translation is therefore likely to be neglected as the foreign cultures are continuously assimilated to target codes, values, and institutions.

This has left a mark on literature produced from the so-called Third World countries as controversy always arises as to whether this literature is produced because it reflects the true essence of the foreign culture, or produced to find its way into world literature through translation. Interestingly, when major cultures come to translate minor ones, the minor texts are either chosen because they fit within the already formulated image of the foreign culture in the receiving one, or they are translated in a way so that they would read as intelligible and familiar for home readers who are not familiar with the foreign and only come into contact with it through translation. This strategy, which Venuti (1998b) refers to as 'domestication', often creates domestic identities for foreign cultures through adhering to the dominant domestic norms and values, hence confirming their marginal position among world cultures. However, Venuti (1998a: 396) argues that such domesticating translations 'do not guarantee that the target culture will remain free of "corruption" of foreign influences as any translating can bring about unexpected cultural and political changes'.

This variation between global and non-global languages and cultures, the politically powerful or weak, and the economically dominated or dominant, gives translation a political dimension in the current global economy. The current globalization of cultures through translation will do more harm than help to foreign, as well as domestic, cultures so long so it opts for strategies that adhere to a master discourse of representation.
3.5 Conclusion

The term globalization is one of the new terms that dominate most discussion groups whether academic or non-academic, political, cultural, economic, technological, or language related. It is linked with the technological, information and communication boom that the world is witnessing today but is often associated with the political variables and assessed differently by people from different backgrounds.

Translation has always played a vital role in the interaction between cultures. In this global age it is granted even more attention. In other words, translation amongst other means is one of the essential tools for globalization without which the spread of ideas and practices could not have been achieved. It assumes the role of communicating the foreign, especially when translating into English. The foreign is always regarded as the marginal in the translating culture due to the unequal relations politically and economically.

Imposed on the dominated societies, translation became compulsory for them during colonization as a result of the introduction of foreign languages and cultures. After colonization was over and with globalization that substituted it, translation becomes even more important for the cultures and societies that were marginalized by colonization in order to traffic in the new world and defend their political power, economic and cultural products, and to stimulate and enhance their cultural development and growth. For the dominant societies, however, translation was and still is a channel through which domestic identities for foreign cultures were constructed to serve their interests at home and abroad. The West, the predominantly dominant, sets fixed norms for the selection, production and circulation of foreign
texts for translation. This fixedness leads ultimately to a master discourse through which the Other is represented. Adhering to this master discourse’s requirements and constraints leads to stereotypes that are not all new, rather reinforce already existing ones. Being a strong culture, the Anglo-American translation tradition has decided on the position of other cultures. This resulted in the creation of a culture for translating which subdues certain voices but frees others.

As an art that involves the re-creation of a work from one language into another for readers from a different background and culture, the very act of translation implies an inevitable departure from the original especially with regard to literary translation. Translation activities today are regarded as having cultural significance which in turn means that translators do not just transfer texts between languages, rather play a social role. To fulfil this role translators, as well as publishers, editors and all other individuals involved, must acquire a set of norms regulated by the values and ideas shared by a community and which determine whether a certain translational behaviour is accepted or not, and decide on the quality of a translation product. Members of a community acquire these norms as part of their socializing process. These norms formulate constraints of different types and varying degrees. The adaptation, acquisition and circulation of these norms undoubtedly have a role in directing a translation activity in a socio-cultural context. Taking off from this point, Chapter Four discusses the norms that govern translation as a process and product.
Chapter Four

4 Translation as a Norm-Governed Activity

4.1 Introduction

Translation is generally conceived as an activity that involves two languages and two cultural settings. This has put translation under constraints of several types and varying degree. In fact, since its early stages translation has restrictively consisted of instructions to someone on how to translate and what to translate. Translation scholars from different backgrounds codify practice into theory offering as such different views and models of translation that then become the implicit norm. Defining what a correct, adequate or equivalent translation is and discussing the ways, means and methods of achieving that is undoubtedly normative in nature. There are also non-normative approaches to translation but the normative model is far deep-seated. Ways of assessing translation, therefore, will vary too.

Approaches to evaluating translations have adopted different perspectives ranging between theoretical and non-theoretical ones. While the non-theoretical approaches to evaluating translation maintain that translation is an art hence not open to scientific treatment, the theoretical approach to evaluation which is mainly based on translation equivalence maintains that the quality of a translation is linearly proportional to its equivalence to the source text. The notion of equivalence, however, has been one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation theory. The term has caused heated debates within the field. It has been analyzed, evaluated and extensively discussed from different points of view and has
been approached from many different perspectives. The difficulty in defining equivalence thus seems to result in the impossibility of having a unified understanding of this notion, hence a vague realization of a methodology for evaluation. Any language community at any given time of its history identifies its goals for taking up a translation project and defines its views on its function and on how to translate. In other words, the normative approaches to translation have, throughout history, always been formulated on the basis of the reigning understanding of how translation should function in the target culture. These normative conditions have proved to play a vital role that the norm of equivalence often proves to be the less obligatory requirement in practice and for a qualitative evaluation of translations. Subsequently, some of the contemporary translation studies tend to analyze norms not prescribe them for the evaluation of translations.

4.2 The Illusionary Concept of Equivalence

It is argued that, to compare two texts written in two different languages inevitably involves a discussion of equivalence at some level. However, this statement is a controversial one. The role of the concept of equivalence in the field of translation studies has been the subject of considerable debate over the past 50 odd years due to the fact that its definition, relevance and acceptability within the field have been controversial. The concept of equivalence has been interpreted by different theorists differently. There has been no real agreement between translation theorists as to what this concept means although there is a somehow general consensus that ‘equivalence denotes a relation between a source text, or some element in it, and a text or text-element in the receptor language’ (Reiss 1983: 301). The nature of the relation, however, is left vague. There are those translation scholars who are in favour of a linguistic approach to translation. They define
translation in terms of equivalence relations. However, realizing the fact that translation itself is not merely a matter of lingual transference but also involves cultures; a second group of theorists emerge who regard equivalence as being essentially a transportation of a message from a source culture into a target culture. Others, however, are more tolerable of the concept and claim that equivalence is used for 'the sake of convenience—because most translators are used to it rather than because it has any theoretical status' (Baker 1992: 5-6). Those who reject the theoretical notion of equivalence claim that it is either irrelevant (Snell-Hornby 1988) or damaging (Gentzler 1993) to translation studies (cf. Kenny 1998: 77).

Proponents of an equivalence approach to translation usually define equivalence as the relationship between a source text and a target text which approves the target text as a translation. Pym (1992: 37) notes that translation defines equivalence yet also equivalence defines translation. Nonetheless, no precise definition of equivalence has been supplied. Catford (1965: 20), for example, sees translation as the replacement of one language's textual material by their equivalent in another. For Nida and Taber (1969: 12) 'translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style'. He explains 'closest natural equivalent' as follows: 'equivalent' points towards the source language message; 'natural' points towards the receptor language; and 'closest' binds the two together to the highest possible degree of approximation (Nida 1964: 166). For Wilss (1982: 3), however, translation 'is a transfer process which aims at the transformation of a written SL text into an optimally equivalent TL text, and which requires the syntactic, the semantic and the pragmatic understanding and analytical processing of the SL text' although he does not explain what defines optimality. According to Vinay and
Darbelnet (1995: 342), and in a similar vein, a translation that adopts equivalence ‘replicates the same situation as in the original, whilst using completely different wording’. They also say that ‘the need for creating equivalence arises from the situation, and it is in the situation of the SL text that translators have to look for a solution’ (ibid.: 255) which means that a dictionary equivalent of an expression is not guaranteed to produce a successful translation unless the situation dictates that. On the other hand, Newmark (1982: x) defines the concept of translation equivalence as ‘a dead duck- either too theoretical or too arbitrary’ (cited in Abdul-Raof 2001: 5). Postulating a similar view, Snell-Hornby (1988: 22) rejects the concept and regards it ‘imprecise and ill-defined’. Equivalence on the level of the words of the source and target language is impossible since ‘the semantic map of each language is different’ (Weinreich 1963: 142, cited in Alexieva 1993: 103). Even when words are commonly used as translation equivalents, they often differ significantly in their meanings. The word عزّ for example, is commonly translated as ‘honor’ although it should not be translated only as such because in Arabic it has connotations more than just honor in English means. Also consider which are commonly translated as ‘killed’ and ‘God’ respectively. ‘God’ seems to be both a formal and functional equivalent for in Arabic. However, a closer look at these two lexical items will show that the concept of ‘God’ in Christianity is different from that in Islam; the concept of oneness is an inherent attribute to (ALLAH) but it is not of ‘God’ because Christians believe in the concept of Trinity. So for example, the phrase لا إله إلا الله cannot be translated as ‘There is no God but God’. Similarly, consider the following Arabic sentence translated as ‘MaHmood’s mother was happy because her son was killed’. The English sentence will sound very horrible and against nature. The back translation of the English
sentence will be 'fell martyr'. A more appropriate equivalent in this case would be 'fell martyr'. The commonly used equivalent 'killed' may seem appropriate in 'Five Palestinians were killed in Gaza yesterday'. Because these words, like many others, have completely different connotations, they cannot be translated by relying on their linguistic context without taking into account the general context in which they are used. Schopenhauer (1800: 32, cited in Joseph 1998: 86) succinctly says, 'Not every word in one language has an exact equivalent in another. Thus, not all concepts that are expressed through the words of one language are exactly the same as the ones that are expressed through the words of another'. Bassnett (1997: 38) gives an interesting example of the phrase 'Buon appetito' in Italian. This phrase, spoken before eating, has no equivalent in English because English has no such phrase. She offers a variety of phrases that might be used in the event such as 'please start' and 'enjoy your meal' but which do not have the same function because the Italian phrase has no significance or field of reference in English. Semantically, however, the phrase can be perfectly translated as 'good appetite' (ibid.).

Since it is the translator's version that we ultimately read, translators are responsible for carrying the message over. In the meantime, they have to serve the target culture's linguistic and cultural norms and assist comprehension with footnotes for example. Greenstein (1990: 87, cited in Abdul-Raof 2001: 13) claims that translation is an aid to reading the source text but does not substitute it. Thus, the translated text cannot be the same as the original, hence the response that the target text will have on its audience cannot be the same or equivalent to that of the source text on its audience. Alexieva (1993: 103) therefore suggests that the term equivalence be retained but should be taken to mean 'optimum degree of
Hatim and Mason (1990: 8) also warn translators against equivalence. They see equivalence as an unachievable goal because the concept of two texts that belong to two different language and culture system as dynamically or formally equivalent does not exist (Abdul-Raof 2001: 5). And like Alexieva, they opt, instead, for the closest possible approximation to the source text. Realizing that total equivalence and perfect translations is a chimera, theorists such as Newmark (1991) and House (1981) have repeatedly confirmed that an approximation is what translators should look forward to because of the differences of the socio-cultural norms that two different languages hold.

Theorists who claim that a translation can only be recognized as such if equivalence is achieved have for the most part concentrated on developing typologies of equivalence rather than investigating the essential nature of equivalence (Kenny 1998: 77). The concept of equivalence has been discussed in various dichotomous ways such as ‘formal vs. dynamic’ (Nida); ‘semantic vs. communicative translation’ (Newmark); ‘semantic vs. functional equivalence’ (Bell); ‘observational vs. participative positioning’ (Pym). Likewise, and following Koller (1989) equivalence is established on the basis of referential or denotative equivalence, connotative equivalence, text normative equivalence, pragmatic equivalence and formal equivalence (cf. Kenny 1998: 77). Baker (1992) relates equivalence to the degree of similarity between the target text and source text information flow and to the cohesive roles that source text and target text devices play in source and target texts and calls this affair textual equivalence (cf. Kenny 1998: 77). Indeed, the general view on equivalence in translation studies has come to refer to the relation between texts in two different languages rather than between the languages themselves, a step which ‘liberated translation studies from debates on interlingual translatability’ (ibid.:
that Neubert and Shreve (1992: 143, cited in Abdul-Raof 2001: 6) discuss the reconstruction of the source text's textuality to produce a target text textuality as a way of achieving equivalence between source and target texts.

To understand the problem of equivalence, theorists have suggested a number of solutions based mainly on linguistic accounts. Catford (1965), for example, using scale and category grammar, defines equivalence on formal, grammatical bases in which the aim is to transfer the grammatical structures of the source text into equivalent ones in the target text. Nida (1964) suggests that formal equivalence is not always enough and a more dynamic view of equivalence would yield dynamic or functional equivalence for translation especially when dealing with sensitive texts. He also suggests that cultural transposition can be called upon whenever dynamic equivalence cannot help. For example, the phrase 'lamb of God' would be rendered into 'Seal of God' for the Eskimos because the Lamb does not symbolise innocence in their culture (Nida 1964: 228). This solution however, presents translators with the dilemma of finding a cultural equivalent for the concept of the Lord being a shepherd. Similarly, Roman 16:16 'greet one another with a holy kiss', was translated as 'give one another a hearty handshake all around' for a conservative community (ibid.). However, the translation does not fully represent the message of Roman 16:16 (ibid.).

According to Halverson (1997: 212) the use of the concept of equivalence may vary in scope or focus as Hartmann and Strok (1972, cited in Halverson 1997: 212) clearly say,

Texts in different languages may be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partially equivalent), in respect of different levels of presentation (equivalent in respect of context, of semantics, of grammar, of lexis, etc.)
and at different ranks (word-for-word, phrase-for-phrase, sentence-for-sentence).

Kade (1968) writing on lexical equivalence categorizes equivalence relationships in terms of the degree of correspondence between the source and target lexical units. He identifies four types of equivalence: total equivalence (one-to-one correspondence), facultative equivalence (one-to-many correspondence), approximative equivalence (one-to-part-of-one correspondence) and null equivalence (one-to-none correspondence) (Halverson 1997: 213; Kenny 1998: 78). Filipec (1971) and Reiss (1976, 1989) emphasized text-level relationships (Halverson 1997: 213). Koller (1979) differentiated between formal similarity between language systems and equivalence relations between real texts and utterances (Kenny 1998: 78). Koller also discussed the dual nature of the concept of equivalence as a normative, theoretical one and as a descriptive, empirical one (Halverson 1997: 213). Abdul-Raof (2001: 8) rightly provides a list of the many different types of equivalence which represent the different aspects of the equivalence relationship that the various approaches have led to:

**Linguistic (textual material)**
Nida 1964; Catford 1965

**Cultural**
Larson 1984; Newmark 1982

**Stylistic**
Popovic 1976; Bell 1991

**Semantic (content)**
Kade 1968; Nord 1991

**Structural (textuality)**
Filipec 1971; Reiss 1971; Wills 1982;
Koller 1972; Neubert 1985;
Hatim and Mason 1990;
Neubert and Shreve 1992
According to Newmark (1981: 38) 'opinion swung between literal and free, faithful and beautiful, exact and natural translation, depending on whether the bias was to be in favour of the author or the reader, the source or the target language’. He thus categorizes translation on whether the emphasis is on the source language or the target one, as follows (1988: 45):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Language Emphasis</th>
<th>Target Language Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word-for-word translation</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal translation</td>
<td>Free translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful translation</td>
<td>Idiomatic translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic translation</td>
<td>Communicative translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a communicative translation translators must attempt to produce an effect on target language readers that is as close as possible to that obtained on source language readers (Newmark 1981: 39). In a semantic translation, on the other hand, translators must attempt to render ‘as closely as the semantic and syntactic structure of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original’ (ibid.). In other words, and according to Bell (1991: 7), ‘the translator has the option of...
focusing on finding formal equivalents which preserve the context-free semantic sense of the text at the expense of its context-sensitive communicative value, or finding functional equivalents which preserve the context-sensitive communicative value of the text at the expense of its context-free semantic sense'. For example, A fox is not taken twice in the same snare translated into Arabic can be as follows:

Formal Equivalent: لَ يًوَقَعُ الثُّلُبُ فِي النَّحْرِ مَرَّتَينَ

Functional Equivalent: لا يلدغ المؤمن من جحر مرتين

Putnam (1975, cited in Halverson 1997: 224) claims in an interesting way that if the term ‘water’, for example, is H2O in one culture and XYZ in another but they both play and refer to the same role of nourishing plants and animals, etc., then we may have two different groups of scientists claiming two different statements but both are correct; one group may say that H2O and XYZ are the same liquid since they both have the same function, the other group may rightly too say that they are different liquids because they do not have the same micro structure. If we apply this to the translation into Arabic of A fox is not taken twice in the same snare we will find that both translations are correct and are, at the mean time, equivalents of the original. Nonetheless, on the micro-structure, not every word has an equivalent and the structure of the sentence itself in Arabic is different from that in English. While the first translation is a correct equivalent on the word and sentence levels, the second uses a translation that is current in the target language community. The problem arises from the quest as to what is considered a translation, at the first place, for peoples of different backgrounds. In an ideal situation, translation ‘is the very precise transferring of information from one language, SL, into another, TL, the TL keeping exactly the same meaning as expressed in the SL text and the same connotations of words, interpreting the message exactly as the author meant it to be
interpreted, and conveying to its audience everything that the original message
conveyed to its audience’ (Sanchez 1999: 301). The task of finding the best
equivalents, therefore, is a daunting one and, in the main, relies heavily on the
individual competence and understanding of the translator and the norms of the
receiving culture. Expressions such as it is raining cats and dogs; let the cat out of the
bag; to flog a dead horse; جنّت على نفسها برقص and many others may well
cause problems in translation because words that go together in one language can be
meaningless in another. For languages that are both culturally and linguistically
incongruous, the problem of translation equivalence is even trickier (see section 5.2).

Nida and Taber (1969) argue that there are two different types of equivalence,
namely formal equivalence (formal correspondence) and dynamic equivalence. On
the one hand, formal correspondence focuses on both form and content, a source
oriented type of translation equivalence. To measure dynamic equivalence, however,
Nida and Taber (1969: 23), say ‘we can only rightly compare the equivalence of
response, rather than the degree of agreement between the original source and the
later receptors’. Formal correspondence consists of a target language item which
represents the closest equivalent of a source language word or phrase. Nida and
Taber (1969: 5) make it clear that there are not always formal equivalents between
language pairs because there is no such thing as ‘a perfect match between languages’.
Therefore, ‘the extent to which the forms must be changed in order to preserve the
meaning will depend upon the linguistic and cultural distance between languages’
(ibid.: 5). Looking at translation in terms of the receptors, they favour dynamic
equivalence and declare that ‘we cannot presume that the source was writing for this
“unknown audience” or that the monolingual receptors in the second language have
enough background to understand the setting of the original communication’ (Nida
and Taber 1969: 23). The use of formal equivalents might at times have serious implications in the target text since the translation will not be easily understood by the target audience (as in the example of The Lamb of God above) (Fawcett 1997). In comparison with dynamic equivalence, Nida and Taber (1969: 201) assert that ‘Typically formal correspondence distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and hence distorts the message, so as to cause the receptor to misunderstand or to labour unduly hard’. Dynamic equivalence, on the other hand, is measured ‘in terms of the total impact the message has on the one who receives it’ (Nida and Taber 1969: 22) and is defined as a translation in which the target language wording will trigger the same impact on the target culture audience as the original wording did on its audience. Despite adopting a linguistic approach to translation, Nida (1964) and Nida and Taber (1969), as a result of dealing with sensitive texts are more interested in the message than form of the text.

Catford (1965) also had a preference for a linguistic-based approach to translation. His main contribution is the introduction of types and shifts of translation. He proposes very broad types of translation in terms of three criteria:

1. The extent of translation; full translation vs. partial translation.

2. The grammatical rank at which translation equivalence is established; rank-bound translation vs. unbounded translation.

3. The levels of language involved in translation; total translation vs. restricted translation.

The second type of translation is where the concept of equivalence is at play. In a rank-bound translation each source language word or morpheme has an equivalent while in an unbound translation equivalence is not restricted to a
particular rank hence equivalence may be found on a sentence, clause or any other rank(s). Catford (1965), however, notes that different languages have different ranks in which case formal correspondence can only exist between languages that have the same ranks and only if these ranks have the same configurations in both languages (Leonardi 2000). He distinguishes textual equivalence from formal correspondence. The former is ‘any target language text or portion of text which is observed on a particular occasion to be the equivalent of a given source language text or portion of text’ and the latter is ‘any target language category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the same place in the economy of the target language as the given source language category occupies in the source language’ (Catford 1965: 27). As for translation shifts, Catford (1965: 73) argues that there are two main types of translation shifts: level shifts in which the source language item at a particular level has a target language equivalent at a different level, and category shifts which he divides into four types: structure shifts, class shifts, unit shifts, intra-system shifts. Abdul-Raof (2001: 10-11) illustrates these shifts in translation from Arabic into English by giving the following examples from the translation of the Qur’an into English:

1. Structure shifts (involve a grammatical change between the structure of the source text and that of the target text):

\[
\text{الذين لا يؤمنون بالآخرة مثل السوء (للذين لا يؤمنون بالآخرة مثل السوء)}
\]

[The attribute of evil applies to all who do not believe in the life to come. Q 16:60]
the translator had to change the word order of subject noun phrase (the underlined words) that comes last in the sentence in Arabic to the opening of the sentence in English in order to produce a stylistic effect.

2. Class shifts (occurs when a source language item that belongs to a certain grammatical class is translated into a target language item of a different class):

(كان أكثرهم مشركين)

[Most of them worshipped others besides God. Q 30:42]

in this example the translator changed the underlined single source language word into a combination of words because the source language item does not have a one-word equivalent in the target language due to the absence of the concept itself in the receiving culture. The source language noun becomes a verb + a complement in the target language.

3. Unit shifts (where a single source language item is replaced with a phrase in the target language because there exists in it no one-word equivalent):

(والفَمْ قُدْرَتُهُ مَنْازِلُ حَتَّى عَادَى كُلَّ أَفْلَحِيْنَ الْقَدِيمِ)

[And the Moon, We have measured for her mansions (to traverse) till she returns like the old (and withered) lower part of a date-stalk. Q 36:39]

4. Intra-system shifts (when a source language singular becomes plural and vice versa):

(وَمِنَ أَصْنَافِهَا وأَوْلَادِهَا وَأَشْعَارِهَا)

[... and out of their (rough) wool, and their soft, fury wool and their hair... Q 16:80]
in this example the underlined source language words are in the plural form yet in a singular one in translation. This is due to the obligations of the target language linguistic system.

However, Catford's linguistic approach to translation comes under criticism from Snell-Hornby (1988: 20), Bassnett (1991: 6) and others for being too narrow and reducing the translation process to a linguistic exercise since there are also other factors, such as textual, cultural and situational aspects, which should be taken into consideration when translating. For Snell-Hornby (1988) the concept of equivalence in translation is an illusion. In other words, she does not believe that linguistics is the only discipline which enables people to carry out a translation since translating involves different cultures and different situations at the same time and they do not always match in two different language sets. She also claims that Catford’s definition is a circular one that leads nowhere (1995: 19). Also criticizing Catford’s linguistic theory of translation, Abdul-Raof (2001: 5) argues that Catford’s definition ‘cannot be validated for languages like Arabic and European languages which are both linguistically and culturally incongruous’.

Baker (1992) introduces four types of equivalence at different levels; equivalence that can appear at word level and above word level when translating from one language into another, grammatical equivalence, textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence. She argues that when analyzing a text the first thing that translators look at is the word. Baker (1992: 11) elaborates in her discussion on the word word and explains that it can have different meanings in different languages and can be regarded as a more complex unit or morpheme, which in turn means that translators should pay attention to a number of factors when considering a word, such as numbers, gender and tense. At the grammar level, Baker (ibid.: 12) notes that
grammatical rules differ from one language to another which often poses dilemmas for translators as they try to find a direct correspondent in the target language system. This situation often results in remarkable changes in the way information is carried across and in many cases persuades translators either to add or remove information when transferring into the target text due to the absence of particular grammatical devices from the target language itself of which number, tense, voice, person and gender. When translating between Arabic and English number, gender and person may pose difficulty. While English has only two number distinctions 'singular' and 'plural', Arabic has an extra one, the 'dual'. Thus, when translating from English into Arabic, for example, translators must verify whether the original's plurality is dual or plural. For example, a simple word such as 'presidents' could be either the plural 
\[
\text{مديرين}
\]
or the dual 
\[
\text{مديرین}
\]
(for more illustration see section 5.2). Gender presents an even more problematic situation. Consider the following:

She is beautiful (girl)

It is beautiful (flower)

When translating the above into Arabic, both sentences will be rendered as 
\[
\text{إليها جميلة}
\]
In this regard, El-Sheikh (quoted in Shunnaq 1998: 37) has the following to say,

Compared to English, gender plays an extremely important part in the grammar of Arabic. It combines with number to form intricate concord systems which might link together, or set apart the various elements of the larger linguistic units such as the phrase or the clause.

In addition, in some cases in English a noun of common gender is used to refer to two nouns each indicating a different sex as in, child (boy/ girl), parent (father/ mother). Arabic, however, does not have the concept of neuter. It lists two genders, 'masculine' and 'feminine' so for example, the word 'cousin' in English will have
eight designations in Arabic (اَبْنٍ عَمِّ، بَنَتٍ عَمِّ، اَبْنٍ عَمِّ، اَبْنَ خَالٍ، بَنَتٍ خَالِ، اَبْنَ خَالِ، اَبْنَ خَالِ، اَبْنَ خَالِ). In which case, to translate (ابن عم), for example, into English, with the aim of specifying the sex, it will be (the son of the father’s brother).

Besides the words and the grammar, the texture of a text is a very important feature in translation as it facilitates the comprehension and analysis of the source text which in turn assists translators in their attempts to produce cohesive and coherent texts for target culture audiences in a specific context. The decision of the translator to retain the cohesion and coherence of the source text is dependent on three factors, the target audience, the purpose of the translation and the text type. It goes without saying that translation involves far more than the replacement of unrelated words or sentences because they are only parts of a text. The cohesive devices give sentences and words meaning and retain the consistency of a text. The pragmatics of a text is the last in Baker’s (1992) list. Translators need to make all the implicit messages of the source text explicit in order to be able to carry the message into the target text.

Also in favour of a functional and pragmatic equivalence in translation is House (1977). She argues that the source text and target text should match one another in function. She takes her discussion further to suggest that it is possible to characterize the function of a text by determining the situational dimensions of the source text (House 1998: 199). She argues that every text is in itself placed within a particular situation which has to be correctly identified and taken into consideration by the translator (ibid.). According to her, ‘The basic requirement for equivalence of original and translation...is that the translation should have a function...which is equivalent to that of the original. The translation should also employ equivalent pragmatic means for achieving that function’ (House 1998: 199). Once the function
of the original is achieved, after analysing it according to a 'set of situational dimensions' that result in a 'textual profile', it is then taken to be a 'norm against which the translation is measured' (House 1998: 199). Hence the translation can be evaluated; the degree to which the original and translation match in their textual profile and function is the degree to which the translation is judged adequate in quality (ibid.). In other words, for the translation to be adequate in quality, the textual profile and function of the translation should match the profile and function of the original. In order to evaluate the match between the original and translation, House makes a distinction between dimensional and non-dimensional mismatches. 'Dimensional mismatches are pragmatic errors that have to do with language users and language use; non-dimensional mismatches are mismatches in the denotative meanings of original and translation elements and breaches of the target language system at various levels' (House 1998: 199). Thus, a judgement on the quality of a translation will inevitably consist of a list of both types of errors and the function of the translation.

Based on empirical work with the functional-pragmatic model for translation quality assessment which House develops on the basis of contrastive discourse analysis between German and English (cf. House 1998), she makes a distinction between two basic types of translation, overt and covert translation. 'An overt translation is required whenever the source text is heavily dependant on the source culture and has independent status within it; a covert translation is required when neither condition holds, i.e. when the source text is not source culture specific' (ibid.: 199). According to her (ibid.), functional equivalence is only possible in covert translation. For example, a tool manual is unlikely to exhibit any features specific to either the source or target cultures. Hence a covert translation is the likely outcome.
Our case study is addressed to the Arab audience in whom the text is deemed to provoke a response. The English translation Love in the Kingdom of Oil is addressed to another audience that is expected to have a different reaction since the issues addressed in the novel do not concern the English readers at a first degree. This will be an instance of overt translation in which functional equivalence cannot be maintained because the aim of the original text (to provoke a response) for its audience is different than that of the translation (to offer an insight into a foreign culture’s culture) to its new audience hence it is intended that the source text and the target text function differently. In addition, in order to be able to evaluate a translation it is essential to know why, how and what translational options and strategies translators choose in formulating their decision path in the process of translation (House 1998: 200). However, while translation quality assessment is product oriented, it is important to first study why an original gets translated, what strategies the translator chooses and what norms he/ she follows in order to know how the product of the translation process is supposed to function in the target culture.

The criticism that the linguistically oriented approach to translation and its focus on equivalence receives arises from the absence of a precise definition of what the concept stands for and the belief that the too many types of translation equivalence are a de facto problem (Halverson 1997: 214). Opponents of the linguistic approach to translation have chosen instead to focus on the features of the target culture that would affect the translation process and/ or products (ibid.). According to Halverson (1997: 215) they are ‘more interested in differences than in sameness, and in the motivations underlying textual “manipulation”’. Toury (1995: 24) says,
...the position and function of translations (as entities) and of translating (as a kind of activity) in a prospective target culture, the form a translation would have (and hence the relationships which would tie it to its original), and the strategies resorted to during its generation do not constitute a series of unconnected facts. Having accepted this as a point of departure, we found interdependencies emerging as an obvious focus of interest, the main intention being to uncover the regularities which mark the relationships assumed to obtain between function, product and process.

In other words, the power of the target culture features that act as steering factors in translating and translation become the primary object of study, while the relations that bind the translation to its original should be secondary at best (Halverson 1997: 215). The regularities which Toury refers to above are, in other words, the norms that regulate an action or behaviour. Gentzler (1993: 4) argues that analysing translations on the basis of equivalence and non-equivalence or any other judgemental criteria implies ‘notions of substantialism that limit other possibilities of translation practice, marginalize unorthodox translation, and impinge upon real intercultural exchange’. Newman (1994: 4694, cited in Kenny 1998: 79) describes translation equivalence as ‘a commonsense term for describing the ideal relationship that a reader would expect to exist between an original and its translation’. Toury (1980; 1995) has a similar view. He argues that equivalence between a source text and its target text is a given not an assumption, hence ‘the question to be asked in the actual study of translations (especially in the comparative analysis of TT and ST) is not whether the two texts are equivalent (from a certain aspect), but what type and degree of translation equivalence they reveal’ (1980: 47). This approach ‘makes appeal to a historical, relative notion of equivalence’ (Kenny 1998: 80). ‘Rather than being a single relationship, denoting a recurring type of invariant, it comes to refer to any relation which is found to have characterized translation under a specified set of
circumstances' (Toury 1995: 61). Thus, the norms which determine the particular concept of equivalence that was prevalent at a particular time of history or those which determine translations from specific cultures at a certain time of history, for instance, constitute a valid object of enquiry.

At any particular time of history translators are expected to establish and/ or follow norms that best suit a particular text in a particular situation guided by their experience, their ideology and the demands and constraints of their cultures and/ or patrons. Source texts that are expected to comply with these norms will be chosen for translation; hence their translations will be accepted in the receiving culture and appeal to their new audience. This brings up the question what demands translators should meet, and how.

Toury (2000: 199) argues that, ‘in its socio-cultural dimension, translation can be described as subject to constraints of several types and varying degree’. These constraints lie far beyond the source text. The strategies that translators choose when translating or selecting foreign texts for translation depend heavily on the type of text in hand and the audience intended. Therefore, the value of any translation can only be assessed against purpose, strategies and type of audience. According to Toury (ibid.: 199), sociologists and psychologists regard norms as ‘the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community- as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate- into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations, specifying what is prescribed and forbidden as well as what is tolerated and permitted in a certain behavioural dimension’. Therefore, when the situation allows a set of different kinds of behaviour for the translator to choose from but he/ she decides, non-randomly, to select specific ones, one could assume the existence of norms (ibid.). According to these norms,
instances of behaviour are evaluated. The re-occurrence of norms in similar situations indicates that they are more demands and constraints than just norms. Alas, 'non-compliance with a norm in a particular instance does not invalidate the norms' (Hermans 1991: 162, cited in Toury 2000: 200). However, deviating from a norm is always costly.

4.2.1 Adequacy and Equivalence

Like equivalence, the evaluative term adequacy is often used to decide whether a translation is correct within a normative approach to translation. A normative approach to translation formulates ways, means and methods as demands that translators should meet and, according to which, judge translations. It formulates a definition of a norm for translation. The two terms (equivalence and adequacy), however, 'have been described in ways too vague and general and cannot therefore be applied to the evaluation of concrete translations' as both formulations 'presuppose that it is possible to compare the unity of form and content of a text' (Komissarov 1993: 65-66). Adequacy is also often equated with 'good translation' (ibid.: 70) and used as a synonym for equivalence albeit all attempts to reach a clear understanding of both terms (Reiss 1983: 301). Some scholars have attempted to make a distinction between equivalence and adequacy. When translating, translators often make decisions. Their decisions are determined by the purpose of the translations. Accordingly, adequacy is the relation between the purpose of the translation in hand and the means by which the translation is achieved. In other words, 'adequacy is simply appropriateness' and 'is thereby process-oriented' (ibid.). That is to say, 'if equivalence answers the question whether the target text corresponds to the source text, adequacy answers the question whether a given translation, as a process, meets the requirements of given communicative conditions'
(Shveitser 1993: 51). For Reiss (1983: 302) adequacy is ‘the choice of linguistic signs in relation to the purpose of translation (though the purpose of the translation may not be that of the source text)’, a situation that may be argued to apply to all culture-bound texts. The difference between the source and target text purpose will obviously affect equivalence between the target text and its source one since equivalence is the relation between the source text and its target one.

An adequate translation is thought to be a translation that is made on a level necessary and sufficient to render the content of the source text unchanged while in the meantime observes the norms of the target language and its culture (Komissarov 1993: 66). Equivalence, on the other hand, is ‘the relation between linguistic signs in two different systems, and text equivalence is the relation of equivalence of linguistic signs in a text in two different linguistic communities, each having its own socio-cultural context’ (ibid.). Thus, an adequate translation is also an equivalent one but with different degrees of identity between the meanings of the original and translation. A translation is judged non-equivalent if it fails to render the contents of the original. For Katharina Reiss and Hans J. Vermeer (1984) equivalence includes relationships not only between separate units but also between whole texts (cf. Shveitser 1993: 48). For them, equivalence on the level of units does not necessarily imply equivalence on the level of texts and vice-versa (ibid.). In addition, the equivalence of texts goes beyond their linguistic manifestation into the cultural dimension (Shveitser 1993: 48). Adequacy for Reiss and Vermeer (1984) refers to the correspondence of linguistic units in the source text with linguistic units in the target text (ibid.: 48). Thus, adequacy is related to translation as a process, while equivalence is related to the relationship between the target and source text that have similar communicative functions in two different cultures (Reiss 1983: 301). As a
result of the disagreement on what equivalence or adequacy actually mean and what makes a translation equivalent and/or adequate, the degree of acceptability that a translation exhibits will be judged differently by people who come from different backgrounds and who identify different purposes for the evaluation of target texts (Komissarov 1993: 66).

4.3 Scholarly and Practical Quality Assessment

Theorists of translation agree that translation is the rendering of the same ideas from the source language into the target language. They also agree that the translator is both a text receiver and a text producer who should first read and comprehend the source language text then convey it equivalently into the target language text. In addition, translators are obliged to convey the ideas of the source language text into the target language text giving utmost care to the linguistic and cultural norms of the target language as well as its naturalness. The natural relation that binds a translation to its source text is the basis of what is referred to as the equivalence relation (House 1996: 24). Accordingly, the translator is expected to produce a target language text which should be 'equivalent, creative and genuine and has the source language cultural flavour' (Shunnaq 1998: 33). The important question that might spring up, however, would be 'is it possible to produce a translation that could meet these standards?'

The act of translation is a very old one, almost as old as language itself, that its use, study and application have invited, and continue to do so, various entries. Translation, at its very beginnings, was mainly a way of facilitating communication as the different groups of people came into contact within the course of history. As time went by translation retained its very purpose yet acquired in addition a host of
others, a situation which inevitably resulted in creating a study of translation in conjunction with all factors deemed to have an effect on the role of translation. In addition, as translation came to be understood as an action that takes place not between two languages but between two cultural settings, a need to examine what effects cultures have on translation evolved which further complicated the quest into what makes a good translation. Translation scholars have tried to achieve this goal by developing models for the evaluation of translations. They hoped to achieve this goal by building models based scientific theories of translation and by producing a systematic procedure for evaluation (Lauscher 2000: 149). The degree to which a target language text is equivalent to a source language is argued by some scholars to be at the core of evaluating translations. House (1996: 31-32) says, ‘Equivalence I take to be the fundamental criterion of translation quality’ for which she states that ‘an adequate translation text is a pragmatically and semantically equivalent one’. She finds that a translation text must have ‘a function equivalent to that of its source’ as a first requirement for equivalence. Although this may be perfectly applicable to technical texts or for machine translations, the equivalence approach to evaluating translation appears to be problematic when it comes to literary translation. Similarly, according to Reiss (1971, cited in Lauscher 2000: 151) a translation is deemed good only if it achieves optimum equivalence that takes place if ‘considering the linguistic and situational context, the linguistic and stylistic level and the intention of the author, target text and target text units have the same “value” as the text unit in the source language’. Reiss’s model, like House’s cannot be applicable in cases of creative language uses such as metaphors for example or when the translation is intended to address a different audience in the target culture. In addition, van Dijk and Kintsch (1983, cited in Lauscher 2000: 151) argue that the comprehension of a
text is influenced by the situation in which the text is read, the purpose for reading it, the knowledge and expectations of the reader, and so on. In other words, the comprehension of a text is influenced by other elements that lie outside the text itself such as the cultural, social and political, elements. Having said that, the function assigned to a text is a combination between what stems from the text itself and what is attributed to it by the readers in specific contexts. Sequeiros (1998: 1) lists three problems with this approach based on Gutt (1991). According to him, judgements based on equivalence can only be made in relation to a specific text and situation because what may seem as an equivalent translation in one context may fail to be so in another (ibid.). Another problem with this approach is related to the value of equivalence. According to Sequeiros (1998: 2), it is essential to know the ranking or hierarchy of the features to be compared if we want to make evaluative comparisons between different translations. However, he argues that this ranking is outside equivalence as such and precedes any equivalence comparisons (ibid.). Therefore he finds that what actually produces the evaluation is not the equivalence procedure but the value attached to the rankings. Hence, Sequeiros (1998: 2) suggests that something other than equivalence is required to explain evaluation judgements. A third problem which Sequeiros (1998) associates with equivalence approaches with regard to evaluating translation is the ‘criterion for the composition of these hierarchies’. In other words, ‘the importance and ranking of features depend on the purpose of the translation’ (ibid.: 2). However, the problem with this is that ‘the purposes themselves are hierarchically ordered as well and their ordering has to be done prior to equivalence evaluation’ which ‘suggests that something other than equivalence is required to explain evaluation judgements’ (ibid.).
In order to solve the problems associated with equivalence in evaluating translation, Gutt (1991, cited in Sequeiros 1998: 2) argues that there arises a need to shift the approach to translation in two ways; a shift in the domain of translation so concentration be on the communicative competence that underlies translation rather than on being merely on products (translations) or processes (translating), and a shift from descriptive concerns as in the classification of equivalence features to the understanding and explanation of the complexities involved in communication. Based on a theory that explains these communicative phenomena, evaluations can then be carried out (ibid.). Gutt (1991, cited in Sequeiros 1998: 3) argues for the existence of several types of translation:

A. by description (e.g. technical translation)

B. by resemblance (e.g. literary translation)

B.1. interpretive (e.g. narrative translation)

B.1.1. direct (e.g. literal translation)

B.1.2. indirect (e.g. freer translation)

B.2. non-interpretive (e.g. aspects of poetry translation)

For the purpose of literal translation, the focus is on translation by resemblance and in particular the direct and indirect translation. A direct translation is a translation that assumes to 'achieve complete interpretive resemblance' between the source language and target language texts, while indirect translation assumes to achieve 'less than complete interpretive resemblance between the two texts' where interpretive resemblance is defined as 'the relationship between two propositions (or more generally two stimuli) in terms of the logical and contextual assumptions they share' (ibid.: 3). Indeed, the greater the number they share, the greater the interpretive resemblance between them. Reiss (1983: 301-3) also offers four types of
translation, as they exist in practice, namely, interlinear version, literal translation, philological translation and communicative translation. In an interlinear translation the translator chooses the appropriate words in the target language to reproduce a source text word-for-word. This kind of translation aims at word equivalence and not text equivalence because texts are made up of more than just words. In a literal translation, however, the translator aims to achieve lexical and grammatical equivalence hence chooses the most appropriate words and grammatical structure in the receptor language on the level of a sentence. However, like interlinear, this type of translation does not achieve text equivalence because texts are not made of separate sentences. Moving the reader to the author and original text, the translator chooses the appropriate words, grammatical structure and stylistic level in the receptor language as to enable the reader to recognize the linguistic and thought structures of the original but through the target language text. In the communication type of translation, however, the translator avoids foreignness in the choice of words and sentence structure producing, therefore, translations that serve the target language syntactically, semantically and pragmatically. Having explained the four types, Reiss (1983: 302) argues that only in the case of communicative translation ‘does appropriateness, the adequacy of the choice of linguistic signs for building up the receptor language text, aim to produce equivalence on the level of the entire text’.

Due to the nature of translation as a decision process, translators must make up a hierarchy of demands on equivalence and decide which one(s) to follow (House 1996: 26). According to Sequeiros (1998: 3), most literary translations are found within a continuum that looks as follows:

```
|-----------------------------|  +
| Indirect translation       |
```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
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It is also often the case that a given text has more than one translation. However, not all of them are appropriate in a given context. House (1998: 199) makes it clear that a target text must have a function that is equivalent to that of the original as a basic requirement for equivalence between original and translation. She defines the function of a text, which she sees as ‘something going beyond the notion of mere “use of language”’, as ‘the application or use which the text has in the particular context of a situation’ (House 1996: 32-36). In order to establish the function of a text, translators must characterize its ‘textual profile’ which results from ‘a systematic linguistic-pragmatic analysis of the text in its context of situation’ (ibid.: 36). The ‘context of situation’ refers to ‘the immediate environment of a text’ as opposed to the ‘context of culture’ which refers to the broader ‘cultural background’ which both must be taken into account in order to interpret meaning (House 1996: 37). This leads to one of the main sources of the problem of acceptability in translation, namely, the expectations raised by the translation in the audience in question (Sequeiros 1998: 4). The expectations raised by a translation play an important part as to whether the translation is successful or not hence degree of acceptability. A mismatch between what a translation provide and what the audience expects may well cause communication difficulties thus low acceptability judgements. Since the expectations of a lay person are not necessarily the same as those of a an editor, a scholar or a well informed reader, exploring the relevance of a translation for the intended audience and investigating the expectations it will raise in them will provide the necessary clues for translators in making decisions. Acceptability judgements will therefore depend on the degree of adequacy and equivalence between the source and target texts at the levels chosen to match the expectations of the intended audience. The second translation of A fox is not taken
twice in the same snare into Arabic (see example above), for example, may be
debemed to be less than faithful and still be relevant and acceptable. Also, consider
the following example from our case study in which the translator rightly conveyed
the meaning without being faithful to the original’s words:

- أصبحت أم الهول هي أبو الهول، تغيرت الميم إلى ياء

- The lady Sphinx became the Sphinx, the soft smooth skin became hairy ....

According to Neubert (1985: 123, cited in El-Shiyab 1999: 207) a text is not
only ‘a neutral vessel filled with information’. One of the main characteristics of
texts, especially literary texts, is that they are expressive. According to Newmark
(1988: 39) the expressive function of the text originates in the mind of the author, the
producer of the utterance. By comparison, translators express in their texts the way
they understand the text influenced by the way they view the world and how they
feel and/ or react towards a specific subject in the text. In addition, literary texts,
besides being means of delivering information or sole pleasure, sometimes perform
as a way of provoking readers.

Focusing on literary translations, Van den Broeck (1985, cited in Lauscher
2000: 155) offers a model for evaluation which aims to establish the degree to which
the target and source texts can be related to each other along ‘functionally relevant
features’. In this model, he proposes the concept of adequate translation and argues
that, to evaluate a translation, the critic must first establish a hypothetical
reconstruction of the textual relations and functions of the source text (adequate
translation) then compares that with the provided target text on the basis of the
results of contrastive stylistics and linguistics describing the mandatory and
oppositional shifts in the target text (ibid.: 155-156). Since the comparison here
takes place between two translations, then it implies that there can always be more than one best-translation of a source text. However, any judgement reached here will be according to the norms of the person doing the comparison. In addition, Lauscher (2000: 156) states that the problem with this model is that it does not define the concept of function and does not explain how to determine the functional elements of a source text.

For Reiss (1983) who argues that target texts which aim to have functions other than equivalence and which address a different target audience are no longer translations but texts on their own rights, function is determined for each translation by the sponsor of the translation and perhaps the translator too in accordance with the role intended for the translation in the target system. For D'Hulst (1996, cited in Lauscher 2000: 157), a translation is ‘an independent text functioning, by definition, in the target culture’. In other words, if the target text fulfils the function it has been intended for, it will be considered a good one (ibid.).

The above models, however, do not consider the question who is evaluating a translation, which has an impact on how the target text will be judged. Translations can be evaluated by clients, target addressees, translators and outside observers like translation researchers which will inevitably result in different judgements. The above models also neglect actual translation processes and strategies which, therefore, makes them open to consideration and not applicable to the different types of texts. The strategies of translation involve the basic tasks of choosing a foreign text for translation, identifying its intended target audience and deciding how to translate it. These tasks are determined by various factors that are cultural, political, and economic. Hence, the strategies that translators consider in order to develop a method for translating can be divided as leading to two paths: target culture oriented
and source culture oriented. In a target culture oriented approach, a translation project may conform to the values and norms currently dominant in the target culture and appropriate the foreign text ‘to support domestic canons, publishing trends, political alignments’ and diminish any reference to the foreignness of the text (Venuti 1998b: 240). In a source culture oriented one, a translation may aim to resist the dominant and highlight the marginal instead by introducing foreign texts and voices that are excluded and marginalized by the domestic canons. This approach is ‘motivated by an impulse to preserve linguistic and cultural differences by deviating from prevailing domestic values’ (ibid.). However, if these strategies and processes and what informs them are not considered, comparing source and target texts will only highlight the differences but will not help in identifying whether they are just errors or premeditated inaccuracies. In addition, not taking them into consideration will make attributing the responsibility for the differences observed impossible. In the case of published translations, target texts are not the product of translator’s decisions only but also those of all persons involved.

It must be mentioned also that the type of differences observed when comparing two texts relies, first and foremost, on the objective of the comparison. The aim of our case study is to illustrate how the constraints and demands of the master discourse of translating foreign cultures into English in accordance with the translators’ and/ or publishers’ ideology, as members of the translating culture, inform the translators’ and publishers’ choices and direct the overall product of translation so much so that it confirms the domestic identity of that foreign culture. Because our aim is not to judge whether it is a good or bad translation, only examples of errors that justify our aim are included. The decisions that translators make when translating depend on their belief about what appeals to their audience
and what will ensure the success of their translation. Gutt (1991: 112), rightly says, ‘whatever decision the translator reaches is based on his intuitions or belief about what is relevant to his audience’ (cited in House 1996: 118). The decisions and choices that translators make depend not just on what the translator’s background, linguistic and cultural competence or ideology informs him/her but also on the socio-political relations between the cultures involved and the ideological constraints and demands of the translation patrons and market, the translation audience and, most important of all, reasons for the translation. The norms which govern the way we interpret and judge translations and which also inform translators’ decisions in the process of translating also decide what aspects of an original text must be rendered in a translation and in what way in order to maximise its chances of success in a given socio-cultural context and guarantee its acceptability by the intended audience.

The above terms and their definitions cannot be easily applied to the evaluation of actual translations. In addition, some translators regard the formulation of norms for them to follow a threat to their creativity as well as freedom (cf. Komissarov 1993: 67). These attempts are thus often protested and rejected because the very possibility and necessity of a theoretical analysis of translation is unacceptable (ibid.). The situation worsens when the norms for translating foreign cultures, for a sustained period of time, oblige translators to select certain foreign voices and texts for translation and work within a predefined framework.

Translation is the product of history. It arose in response to specific social, historical and cultural demands. It rightly follows that any culture or language community has, at different stages of its history, defined specific views on the goal and function of its translation movement establishing therefore demands for
translators to meet and criteria for the right way to translate. Indeed the different periods of history have been dominated by different demands; norms that reflect the goals of translation at a given time. Such an attitude often hinders the evaluation of translations because other factors such as ideology predefine the establishment of norms. Deviations from the demands of equivalence at word level, for example, in our case study prove to be connected with other determinants of translation, often culture related. In some cases deviations are inescapable because the two language and culture systems differ deeply. The translation of titles of work of art such as novels, plays, movies, etc., is an example. Sometimes titles are changed out of the desire to clarify an allusion that would hinder understanding as in the following examples from translations of film titles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Titles in Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill</td>
<td>رحلة حب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a love journey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleepy Hallow</td>
<td>أسطورة الفارس الغامض</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the legend of a mysterious knight)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Brockovich</td>
<td>تحدي امرأة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the challenge of a woman)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our case, however, the title of the novel الحب في زمن النفط is translated as ‘Love in the Kingdom of Oil’ although it should have been simply translated into ‘Love at the Time (age) of Oil’. The deviation from the demand for equivalence here was pragmatically motivated by the desire to make the title more attractive and
interesting, hence more suitable for the receiving Western audience familiar with the One Thousand and One Nights and who knows the original author, El-Saadawi, in the frame of Arab women, sensuality and oppression.

Hence, any attempt to translate with a specific purpose in mind related to the translation’s intended function in accordance with the characteristics of the receiving audience, influences the relationship of equivalence between source and target text. Adequacy on the other hand is judged on whether a translation corresponds to the norms that primarily modify it as a result and which are established according to the goals of the translation undertaken, the characteristics of the target audience and the fact that it is introduced to a different culture. Hence, adequacy and equivalence are relative notions because ‘any communicative situation is always embedded in a certain culture at a certain moment in history, and that any interaction in it is therefore likely to take place under some kinds of constraints’ (Retsker 1993: 18). Thus, a translation that is judged equivalent or adequate at one time may not be judged as such at another.

The natural mismatches that exist between the source and target language obviously result in an unavoidable non-equivalence between the source text and the target one. These mismatches include syntactic, pragmatic, semantic, textual, phonic and cultural mismatches. The problem, however, arises when non-equivalence occurs as a result of the imposition of the translator’s ideology in order to steer the target text towards a specific goal, personal or otherwise.

The contradiction between any traditional concept of equivalence and adequacy and the actual conduct of translation can, therefore, be answered by postulating that ‘it is norms that determine the type and extent of equivalence...
manifested by actual translations' (Toury 2000: 204). Studying norms, therefore, will inform us about how the functional relationship between the source and target texts that equivalence postulates is realized. This can be carried out in one translator’s work, in one text, or a school of translators and a corpus, in a specified period of history, or for any other justifiable selection (ibid.). However, it must be mentioned that the role of norms in translation and in the realization of equivalence depends heavily on the position of translation itself as an activity and product in the culture in question.

4.4 Translation as a Norm-Governed Activity

Translation, as an activity that involves two cultures and two languages and a process of decision making inevitably involves two different sets of norms. Norms are produced by members of a socio-political and cultural entity, thus are, by default, partial and biased. They may be regarded as ‘social regulation mechanisms which make certain choices and decisions by the translator more likely than others’ (Hermans 1998: 156). According to Toury (2000: 205), each society would have three types of competing norms: the dominant ones which direct behaviour, of which translational behaviour, thus are mainstream; the leftovers from previous norms; and the seeds of new ones. For the mainstream ones, he argues that there is nothing inherited which makes them mainstream, they are so only because they happen to function as such throughout a period of time (ibid.: 206).

As mentioned above, translation behaviour, like any other behaviour, in any society tends to have certain regularities or norms. According to Hermans (1998: 156), the norms consist of two parts: 'a directive aspect which exerts pressure on members of a community to behave in certain ways, and a “content”, which is an
intersubjective notion of correctness, i.e. a notion of what is proper or correct in particular situations'. The notions which represent correctness can in turn serve as examples of good practice (ibid.). Due to the natural course of history, cultural systems, as highly complex entities, tend to have a wide range of competing, conflicting and at sometimes even overlapping norms. However, the existence of a large number and a variety of norms that can occur separately or joined does not hinder the fact that they exist. If any thing, it means that different situations have different requirements that create and enforce different regularities.

Since the times of Cicero and Horace, translation theory has been normative; telling people how to translate (Robinson 1998: 161). There have been, however, many attempts to break away from the normative approach. One of the successful attempts has been the polysystem approach, developed in the early 1970s by Itamar Even-Zohar, which studies the socio-ideological systems governing the production and interpretation of texts in the source and target language and which insists that the target system naturally attempts to fit foreign texts into its dominant norms (ibid.: 162). The impetus for the notion of norms in translation came from the polysystem approach. Prior to this stage, 'studying translation often consisted of evaluative comparison of source and target texts, in isolation from both the source and target contexts of literary production' (Baker 1998b: 163). The polysystem approach advocated understanding the way texts function collectively, i.e. the relationship not between individual source and target texts but between target texts themselves, from a historical and social stand (ibid.). The concept of norms in translation is primarily about what translation behaviour consists of rather than what it should consist of. Rather than attempting to evaluate translations, the focus in the notion of norms is on
‘investigating the evaluative yardstick that is used in making statements about translation in a given sociocultural context’ (Baker 1998b: 163).

Norms are the options and decisions that translators tend to favour on a regular basis in a given period of time. For example, when translating, translators either focus on the source text and its norms or on the target text and its norms. If the translator chooses to focus on the source text, then he/she will be subjected to the source language and cultural norms in which case the translator would be after an adequate translation. According to Even-Zohar (1975: 43, cited in Toury 2000: 210), ‘an adequate translation is a translation which realizes in the target language the textual relationships of a source text with no breach of its own [basic] linguistic system’. Observing the norms of the source, however, will inevitably result in clashes with those of the target text especially those norms that are not linguistic ones. On the other hand, if the translator decides to observe the target text’s linguistic and cultural norms, then this well inevitably result in a departure from the source text but may well guarantee the acceptability of the source text in the target culture. In other words, adherence to the source norms determines the adequacy of a translation, while subscription to the target text’s linguistic and cultural norms determines its acceptability (Toury 2000: 200). It must be mentioned, however, that shifts from the source text are not exclusive to acceptability-oriented translations since even the most adequate translations will necessarily involve shifts from the original (ibid.). Hence, the non-random decision to favour specific norms over others, the decision to purposely shift from the original or to follow set out rules and guidelines be they linguistic or cultural demands is what makes translation a norm governed activity. In addition, norms also govern the addition, omission, re-locating and any other changes, combined or separate, that a text undergo. Although this applies very much
to cases of literary translation, non-literary translations can also be norm-governed. The degree to which the different norms represent the constraints of the target culture also differs.

Toury (2000: 202) identifies two groups of norms applicable to translation, namely preliminary and operational norms. According to him, preliminary norms have two interconnected sets of considerations related to the existence and actual nature of a definite translation policy, and the directness of translation (ibid.). He identifies translation policy as ‘those factors that govern the choice of text types; or even of individual texts, to be imported through translation into a particular culture/language at a particular point in time’ (ibid.). Such a policy, of course, exists when the choices are purposefully non-random. The directness of translation is to whether a language other than the source language is allowed to mediate in translation and what specifications should this language hold if it is allowed. Operational norms, however, inform the decisions that are made during the act of translation itself (Toury 2000: 200). Operational norms consist of two types: matricial and textual-linguistic norms. Matricial norms govern ‘the very existence of target-language material intended as a substitute for the corresponding source-language material’ and the way they are distributed in the target text, while textual-linguistic norms govern the selection of material to formulate the target text in, or replace the original textual and linguistic material with’ (ibid.: 202-3).

It would suffice thus to say that, as a norm governed activity, ‘what a translator is introducing into the target culture ... is a version of the original work, cut to the measure of a pre-existing model’ (Toury 2000: 203).
Other scholars have also discussed the issue of norms and distinguished different types of it: norms vs. conventions, constitutive vs. regulatory names, professional norms vs. expectancy norms (Baker 1998b: 164-5). While norms are binding, conventions only express preferences. Constitutive norms concern what is accepted as a translation and what is not. Regulatory norms concern choices at the lower level, i.e. the kind of equivalence to be achieved (ibid.). For Chesterman (1993, cited in Baker 1998b: 165), professional norms are the result of competent professional behaviour and govern the accepted strategies of the translation process. He subdivides professional norms into three major types: accountability norms which are ‘ethical and call for professional standards of integrity and thoroughness’; communication norms which are ‘social and emphasize the role of the translator as a communication expert’; relation norms which are ‘linguistic and require the translator to establish and maintain an appropriate relation between source and target texts on the basis of his/her understanding of the intentions of the original writer/commissioner, the projected readership and the purpose of the translation’ (Baker 1998b: 165). Expectancy norms regard what the receivers of the translation expect of a translation to be and what a native text in the target language should be like (ibid.). The translator is therefore expected to conform to the expectancy norms which will ultimately oblige him/her to conform to the professional norms.

Non-normative translational behaviour is also always a possibility. However, it will raise questions such as who does a culture allow to deviate from the mainstream norms and demands to introduce changes and under what circumstances are these changes expected to occur and/or be accepted (Toury 2000: 206). What are often observed are not the norms themselves but the actual products of a norm-governed instance of behaviour which is translation in our case. Toury (ibid.: 207)
therefore offers two major sources for the reconstruction of translational norms: textual (the translated texts themselves) and extratextual (such as prescriptive theories of translation, the activity of a translator or a group of translators, statements made by translators, editors, publishers or any other active persons). Texts are the direct product of a norm-regulated translation act hence represent norms very well. In terms of the extratextual sources, they provide a proof to the presence of norms. In addition, because they emanate from interested parties, ‘they are likely to lean toward propaganda and persuasion’ and ‘on occasion, a deliberate desire to mislead and deceive may also be involved’ (ibid.).

Hermans (1995: 217, cited in Baker 1998b: 165) declares that the concept of norms has effectively replaced equivalence becoming the operative term in translation studies. In addition, and more importantly, the primary subject of analysis becomes not the individual text on the basis of equivalence but how this text, or even better a group of texts, reflect the norms reigning at a given time of history for translation between two given cultures.

4.5 Conclusion

Through its history translation has acquired different forms. The acquisition system is a dynamic one. For example, when sound was added to silent movies a new generation of film translation, dubbing and subtitling for the television and the big screen was born. The different types of translation and different approaches to it came as a result of the process of social development on the macro-level of mankind as a whole and the micro-level of every single socio-cultural group of people. In other words, translation not only evolved historically but it is what makes history itself. This dynamicity was also accompanied by needs that formulated the norms for
undertaking this activity. The norms come as the answers to three questions that are related to both the original which belongs to a given historical and social context, and to the new social, cultural and linguistic target: (i) What does this text express or contain? (ii) Who is it meant for? (iii) For what purpose is it translated? The result is different approaches to translation, hence different types of it and different ways of evaluation. However, exclusive reliance on one approach or another does not serve translation, methodologically and factually, simply because no single approach can satisfactorily explain the complex nature of translation as a specific social, cultural and creative activity. In addition, due to this state of affair, there should be no difference between translation quality assessment and translation as a process or product since any study of the process of translation postulates at the same time suggestions for the assessment of the quality of a translation product.

For a long time translation equivalence has been a measure for good or bad translations. However, translation is also a window that cultures open on each other. Thus it goes far beyond the domain of language and equivalency yet acknowledges the central part that language in translation plays. In other words, the social, historical and cultural context in which translation operates must correlate with language in order to make the language clearer. Therefore, the imposition of norms for translating and evaluating translations on translators especially when dealing with foreign cultures can be damaging to the cultural, ethnic and historical image of cultures that we do not know but have to live with. This makes the window a non-transparent one, rather one that has been calculatingly cut and polished.

Critical Discourse Analysis (van Dijk 1993, 1998; Fairclough 1995; Wodak and Ludwig 1999), which is concerned with analyzing written, as well as spoken, texts to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias,
assists in examining how the constraints and disciplinary demands of a master discourse of representation affect the translation traffic between unequal cultures. Approached from this perspective, alongside the characterization of what translation involves, Chapter Five aims to examine how the translation traffic between the Arab/Islamic world and the West is shaped by the ideologies of a master discourse of representation.
Chapter Five

5 The Discourse of Translating Culturally

5.1 Introduction

To translate is ‘to express in one form what has been written or previously expressed in another’, says Valero-Garces (1995: 556). As discussed in the previous chapter, translation as such constitutes an activity that it is associated with interpreting and explaining meaning, which subsequently adds a paralinguistic dimension to the understanding of foreign cultures and attaches the translator to a degree of political preferences. We have also shown that translators deal with the concept of language not in isolation, but in accordance with other manifestations of human activity, i.e. as a polysystem (Even-Zohar 1987). In other words, they deal with ‘language’ as part of the human complex system that is known as ‘culture’.

According to Toury (1980: 15) translation is ‘the communication of verbal messages across a cultural-linguistic border’ which means that no word has a meaning in isolation, and any cultural product has a context, and the context is the result of external factors. Accordingly, translators deal with linguistic materials that reflect a culture which is itself determined by the political and economic factors that underlie the texts’ and the translators’ cultural backgrounds as discussed in Chapter Three and Chapter Four. Translators are thus expected to intervene and manage texts in order to produce comprehensible texts linguistically and culturally. In view of that, the strategies that the translators choose when translating culture reflect, in the
translated text, the cultural background and motive of the translator and/or publisher. Translators are readers who experience conscious or unconscious reactions to different cultures according to their cultural background and the way they view others vis-à-vis themselves, to previous ideas and images, and to the objectives of their translation projects. Often, certain norms of the translating constituencies, which have already existing systems of representation, (re) production and consumption of the other vis-à-vis the self and its constituencies, govern the strategies of production and circulation of texts in translation. Such norms explain the purpose and effects of translation as a project along side the role of the translator, working within a particular socio-cultural context, as an intercultural mediator between two, most often, competing discourses. Following such strategies in translating interculturally ultimately produces a master discourse through which the Other is received, accepted and/or refused then reproduced. Along these lines, translators select and construct discourses aimed for particular receivers, hence, assisting in the construction and/or deconstruction of old and/or new identities.

Such processes and effects are most visible in intercultural translations taking place between politically, economically and developmentally unequal societies. This relation thus reveals the need to analyse the multifaceted practices inherent in the process of intercultural translation within the boundaries of critical discourse analysis and translation studies. Focusing the attention of this research on the translation of culture and culture of translating cultures in order to assess the role of translation in the globalization of cultures, this chapter tries to explore how this activity is performed in accordance with a master discourse that is rising in a rapidly globalizing world as the powerful and factual, leading unsurprisingly to resistance from the Other. The chapter begins by differentiating between two types of foreign-
text-management, namely intrinsic and extrinsic management, in order to differentiate between intervention for the sole purpose of comprehension and readability, and intervention for reasons beyond the comprehension and readability of a target text that induced this research. The first case is illustrated by examples of some of the basic differences between Arabic and English where the translator will have to perform intrinsic management. The discussion of Critical Discourse Analysis further in the chapter is coupled with extrinsic management in revealing what norms or restrictions are actually at work when translating, hence on what basis to evaluate a text.

5.2 The Discourse of Translation

Most literature on translation suggests certain well-established principles for translators to apply. However, when translating more than one model or principle is possible and each is appropriate. Indeed, the very same principles can lead to different translation procedures and products depending on what strategy or strategies the translator chooses. Such translator decisions are also called translator strategies. In other words, according to the principles of equivalence, the source language and target language texts should be equivalent to some degree but the non-compatible textual features of the two language systems would not allow a direct device-for-device replacement, in which case, the translator would opt for a strategy that will serve the target text without necessarily applying certain principles. Yet, as simple and achievable as this objective may seem, its implementation, in most cases, involves dilemmas of various types.

Many translation theorists stress that translators often sacrifice certain aspects of the source text on both the content and form level in order to achieve equivalence,
which, as we have shown earlier, has for long been a notion that dominated the theory and practice of translation (Fraser 1996). Translators have always been expected to produce translations that transplant the informational and emotive effects of the source texts into the target ones. However, each language is a unique communication system which invites Shunnaq (1998: 33) to say, ‘producing an equivalent translation is an unattainable task and…any attempt aiming at providing an adequate functional equivalence may be deemed to be a failure’. Translation between languages like Arabic and English are specifically problematic.

Intervention in a text on the part of the translator is inevitable due to the mismatches between the source language and target language. This intervention is referred to as managing; a term which was introduced by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, cited in Farghal 1993: 257) who view it as inherently related to argumentation where situation managing means to steer the text in a way that serves the text producer’s goals as opposed to monitoring of the situation where a reasonably detached relation to the text is maintained. Farghal (1993: 258), however, distinguishes between intrinsic and extrinsic managing. According to him, intrinsic managing takes place when the translator alters the source text due to the differences between the two language and cultural systems. Some of the differences encountered while translating between Arabic and English are related to syntax; number and gender; relative pronouns; text type; emotiveness; lexical non-equivalence; cultural expressions and synonymy. In these cases intervention is inescapable and translators are expected to perform intrinsic managing in order to produce comprehensible texts. In addendum to our discussion of equivalence in the previous chapter, this section highlights some of the basic, yet problematic, differences between English and Arabic that if not rightly handled can result in misleading and incoherent translations.
Producing acceptable Arabic into English translations poses problems of what is loosely termed ‘style’ which are problems arising from features of the source text other than grammar and individual lexical items. Sometimes there are segments of the source text which could be omitted or replaced without affecting the message. For example, the connector ‘wa’ is often repeated in Arabic sentences that for an English reader it would appear unnecessary and if translated as ‘and’ each time it appears in the sentence it will produce weak sentences in English. In Arabic ‘wa’ has an essential function that is performed largely by punctuation marks in English. However, the Arabic ‘wa’ does not always mean ‘and’. To better understand this, consider the following examples from the translation of into English:

- There was also the typewriter. It was an electric one. There was also a new, oil- powered typewriter. It wrote in all languages.

In the above example all the Arabic ‘wa’ were either omitted or replaced with punctuation in English without changing the meaning. Now consider the following:

- There is no precedent for a woman going out and not returning. A man can go and not return for seven years, but only if he stays away longer than that does the wife have the right to free herself from him.

In the above sentence, the first two Arabic ‘wa’ are translated as ‘and’ while the third one becomes ‘but’. Now consider the following example:
If ‘wa’ is translated as ‘and’, the sentence in English will read as follows:

- **And ALLAH I do not know what happened.**

For the English reader this above sentence resulted in nonsense. An appropriate translation would be:

- **I swear I do not know what happened.**

Arabic and English have different constructions. A comparison of an Arabic text and its translation into English would show that the Arabic text undergoes changes to the structure of nearly all sentences in order to be readable in English. That is because the main Arabic word order is V.S.O, where as the English is S.V.O. The Arabic verbal sentences have the basic word order of verb-subject-object-adverbial. To illustrate, consider the following example from the translation of الحب في زمن النفط:

- Woman goes on leave and does not return. (A)

- Goes woman on leave and does not return. (B)

In the Arabic sentence the verb comes before the subject. If translated as such in English as in the sentence in (B) where the verb comes before the subject, the sentence will look odd. Arabic also favours linking through co-ordination and usually forwards the main clause rather than the sub-ordinate clause as the following example shows:
- Because Julie had felt unhappy after she had failed the tests, she thought she had better stay away from her friends.

- لأن جولي شعرت بالتعاسة لأنها فشلت في الاختبارات عزمت أن تبقى بعيدة عن صديقاتها.

Although the above Arabic translation conveyed the grammatical structure of the English sentence, the Arabic sentence is deprived of its naturalness. Another difference between Arabic and English on the syntactic level is the relation between the noun and its modifiers. In Arabic adjectives come after nouns but precede them in English as the following example shows:

- صديقات جولي سيئات.

- Julie’s friends are bad.

Another problem which translators face when translating between Arabic and English is the issue of gender and number (discussed in chapter 4). In the above example, ‘friends’ denotes male as well as female friends. Arabic however has أصدقاء for female friends and أصدقاء for male friends. In addition, ‘friends’ could be dual or plural in English whereas in Arabic it corresponds to four nouns, صديقتين، صديقان، صديقتان، صديقان.

Because Arabic is a language which has three number distinctions (singular, dual, plural) and one which distinguishes between two genders (masculine, feminine), it has far more relative pronouns than in English and are used more often. Arabic has الذى، التي، اللذان، اللذين، اللذين، اللائي اللائي and more as they correspond to each gender and number there is in Arabic. All these Arabic relative pronouns correspond to the English ‘who’. In addition, in Arabic, unlike in English, the relative pronoun is omitted when the antecedent is indefinite. The following examples illustrate.
- Those are the two men *who* robbed the bank.

- Those are the two girls *who* robbed the bank.

- This is the man *who* robbed the bank.

- I met a man robbed a bank (literally translated from Arabic where the relative pronoun is omitted. The appropriate translation in English should be ‘I met a man *who* robbed a bank’).

As the previous chapter indicates, complete equivalence in translation is a far fetched task, indeed almost impossible. In addition, when translating between two languages like Arabic and English which have two different cultural settings translators will very often come across lexical terms that do not have an equivalent in Arabic or which cannot be fully translated into English due to the absence of the concept they refer to. For example, تَمْيَز, طَهَارَة, جِنَابة, استِخْلاَرة, الإِسْرَاءُ وَ المُعَارِجَةُ are terms in Arabic that no exact lexical equivalent in English can replace because the concepts they refer to do not exist in the Western English-speaking culture. However, the
The literal translation of this sentence is ‘His Layla this time was a Bedouin girl’. ‘Layla’ in this sentence is not just a name. It is a cultural allusion to Layla, the heroine of the love story ‘The crazy of Layla’ from the Arabian folklore. ‘Layla’ was the love of ‘Qays’, the platonic lover who went crazy in the 7th century. So ‘Layla’ in the above sentence is not actually a name but a reference to one’s love or date. The above sentence therefore could be translated as ‘His date (love, girl) this time was a Bedouin girl’. The cultural allusion to ‘Layla’ could be replaced with ‘Juliet’ as in ‘Romeo and Juliet’ whose love story represents a folkloric status in the Western culture similar to that of Qays and Layla. Having said that, the above sentence could be translated as, ‘His Juliet this time was a Bedouin girl’. However, ‘Juliet’ and ‘Bedouin’ do not match. If the translator decides to retain the original cultural allusion and reference of the original in the translation, he/she must explain in a footnote.

This is specially the case when translating texts full of proverbs, euphemisms, historical incidents, legendary figures, etc. that are culture specific. Euphemisms are expressions or devices that are used in cases which require some sensitivity or ‘in ordinary circumstances as a substitute for a TABOO word’ (Nida and Taber 1969: 200). Arabic for example uses phrases like which are used to say politely that someone died. The Arab culture is also full of references rooted in the Islamic teachings and conventions. Therefore an expression such as (literally means, if ALLAH wills, He will extinguish your
sins by this illness), which is said to an ill person when visiting him or her, derived from the prophets teachings, can be rendered faithfully through complete faithfulness to the source language but with the assistance of an explanation. Similarly, proverbial expressions pose problems due to the fact that they are products of the culture and heritage of the given community. A proverb such as جنة على نفسها براشجنت على نفسها براش literally translated as ‘Braqish brought it all to herself’ will sound meaningless to an English reader unless it is accompanied by the story underlying the proverb.

Arabic is a prosperous language rich with words and expressions. Accordingly, one of the problems that translators often encounter when translating between English and Arabic is that of synonymy. Some words in English could have a number of equivalents in Arabic which presents the translator with the dilemma of distinguishing the degree of similarity between the items in question and deciding which is best. For example, ‘oppression’ in English could be إضطهاد, فهر. Similarly, the word لجنة for example could be ‘committee’ or ‘commission’ in English. So translating a sentence like ‘The committees of the United Nation’s commission on human rights gathered in a conference last month’ would be problematic.

The issue of synonyms could be associated with text types. Any text is a functional piece of language which has a role in a specific context unlike words and sentences that appear individually. According to Hatim (1984, cited in Shunnaq 1998: 38) the context of a text is crucial in determining its structure which in turn determines the kind of texture devices used to make the text operational. According to the pragmatic and communicative layers of the context, Hatim (1984) classifies texts into three types: expository, argumentative, and instructive (ibid.). Accordingly, the function of a word will depend on the type of text it appears in. The word عنبر for
example could be ‘ambergris’ in the context of perfumes, ‘cachalot’ in a text about sea creatures, ‘a warehouse, store’ or ‘unit’ in a context about sections.

Intervention in a text on behalf of the translator is inevitable and necessary in order to produce natural and readable target texts. Failure to manage a text intrinsically, therefore, would produce scribbled texts. Extrinsic managing, however, takes place when the alterations are related to the obligations of the translator’s ideology to steer the target text towards a specific goal (Farghal 1993: 258). This intervention manifests itself in different ways combined or separated; through choosing to add or delete a piece of information, to re-locate a sentence or paragraph, opting for an excessive use of emotive vocabulary or to favour lexical equivalents over others (Examples in Chapters Six and Seven illustrate). Extrinsic managing is the product of the culture of translation.

The search for equivalence in translation led translators and theorists of translation to focus on either form or content ignoring the paralinguistic constituents in a given text. However, the realization that texts cannot be regarded as products of languages only rather of a unique bond between both language and culture introduced culture into translation in somehow a different way. Culture in translation was first handled in relation to translating cultural specific items as part of achieving equivalence. Nida (1964), Catford (1965), Nida & Taber (1969), Newmark (1981) and others discussed the issue of translating cultural specific items under different labels and proposed models to tackle the problem. Nida (1964), for example, suggests using words in the target language that have similar effects on the target readers, or else, use footnotes. For Newmark (1981: 70), translating culture covers proper names, institutional and cultural terms. He suggests that proper names belong to the encyclopaedia and not the dictionary. They have no meaning or
connotations and are therefore untranslatable and not to be translated at all unless they have connotations in certain contexts. Names of firms, newspapers, journals, periodicals, etc. are to be transcribed. Institutional terms according to Newmark (1981: 73) are three types: obsolete, international and national institutional terms. Obsolete institutional terms, he argues, should be transcribed, as they are token words that give colour and flavour of a period, and if they were translated they would sound ridiculous. International institutional terms, on the other hand, have official translations. For national institutional terms, political, financial, administrative, and social terms, he lists fourteen translation procedures ranging from transcription, deletion to adding a footnote or glossary. In dealing with non-institutional cultural terms, Newmark (1981: 83) posits that the translator has more freedom than in dealing with institutional ones. They are translated or given a cultural equivalent especially in fiction. However, he suggests transcription coupled with discreet explanation within the text is the ‘best’ translation procedure for terms peculiar to a foreign culture especially with the growing interest in other countries and increased communication. According to him, this is the most appropriate sign of respect for foreign cultures because if the term becomes common, it can be adopted in the target language. The choice to leave proper names and some other culture-specific items may not satisfy all translation products. On the other hand, choosing equivalents as a way of facilitating communication may diminish their symbolic validity. Such is the case with the translation of the characters’ names and nicknames. For Catford (1965) cultural untranslatability occurs due to the absence of a relevant situational feature of the source language text in the target language one which means that the context is what will guide the reader to select the appropriate situational feature. This however
leaves the term open to different interpretations depending on the reader’s different cultural contexts.

Bassnett (1991: 34) aptly says, ‘In so far as language is the primary modelling system within a culture, cultural untranslatability must be de facto implied in any process of translation’. Recently, however, culture in translation attracted a different, albeit not new, theme. Since translating has naturally come to involve the transportation of one language and its culture from one social group into another, culture now is seen to have a role and effect on translation. The focus has shifted from untranslatability to the cultural, political and economic ramifications of translation or in other words, the culture of translation. This intrinsic and intertwined relationship between language and culture exerts violence on the process of translation because as Eco (cited in Dellinger 1995: 7) has remarked, ‘differences in the ideological makeup of...any society in terms of ethical, religious, and psychological points of view as well as tastes, values, etc., inevitably lead to some sort of...gap, especially under those circumstances where one culture comes in contact with the other’. Unquestionably, as pointed out before, translation is one of those vital means through which intercultural contact and the swing between cultures have been made possible.

However, whenever translation takes place between cultures that have historically come into contact and do not see eye to eye, the activity of decoding itself will also depend on awareness of key conventions that are often historically defined. Having said that, the translators’ ideology (what distinguishes a social group of people from another) becomes the keyhole through which the other is seen through the eyes of the self, hence produces translations that are tailored for the target reader and which exclude whatever does not fit within its image of that Other.
At this juncture translators and/ publishers practice extrinsic management as part of the reigning culture of translation.

Looking at translation from an ideological angle makes it no longer an innocent or neutral activity as ideology, whether on the individual or institutional level, finds its way into it as a process and product. In which case the translator often resorts to a master discourse of representation through which other cultures are represented and through which the translator opts for a string of oblique strategies and tactics to evade confrontation especially if those cultures challenge the accepted norms of the translating culture. Venuti (1996: 196) regards such strategies and tactics of decoding as the violence that translation brings to foreign texts and cultures. In this respect he writes:

The violence of translation resides in its very purpose and activity: the reconstruction of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs, and representations that pre-exist in the target language, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulation, and reception of texts. ...Whatever difference the translation conveys is now imprinted by the target-language culture, assimilated to its positions of intelligibility, its canons and taboos, its codes and ideologies.

Asad (cf. Dingwaney 1995: 4) locates this violence in a specific exercise of power-colonial power, specifically the power of the West. The aim of translation as such becomes 'to bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar; and this always risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign text, often in highly self-conscious projects, where translation serves an imperialist appropriation of foreign cultures for domestic agendas, cultural, economic, political' (Venuti 1996: 196). This shift in the characterization of translation is fed, in part, by work on
Orientalism, anthropology, colonial, post-colonial and cultural studies. ‘Translation in all its forms is frequently the site of a variety of power plays between actors involved’ (Fawcett 1995: 177). Some of these power plays are deliberate manipulative actions that have economic, political or cultural desires be it to cut costs, to control behaviour or legitimize cultural supremacy and hegemony (ibid.). Thus, the relationship between the production of knowledge in one culture, its transmission, relocation and reinterpretation in the target one, alongside the master discourse constituents that underline these processes determine the value and respect given by one society to the cultural products of another.

The expression of power in translation is defined by some as ‘the decision to whether or not to translate something’ (Fawcett 1995: 181). Toury (1980, cited in Fawcett 1995: 181) feels that ‘the study of such decisions will allow us to winkle out patterns of translation policy in specific historical and socio-cultural settings’.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides grounds for such studies. ‘It has an overtly political agenda, which serves to set [it] off... from other kinds of discourse analysis... It aims to provide accounts of the production, internal structure, and overall organization of texts’ (Dellinger 1995: 2). CDA treats language as a type of social practice, among many, used for representation and signification. Ideology also is involved with CDA. ‘The defined and encircled sets of statements that make up a discourse are themselves expressive of and organized by a specific ideology’ (ibid.). In other words, a language can never appear by itself- it always appears as the representative of a specific system of linguistic terms and norms, which themselves fulfil discursive and ideological systems.
5.3 Critical Discourse Analysis

According to Van Dijk (cited in Sheyholislami 2001: 1), CDA ‘is a field that is concerned with studying and analysing written and spoken texts to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias’. Along similar lines, Fairclough (1992: 135) defines CDA as,

Discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony.

In other words, CDA aims at making clear the unclear links between discourse production, social structures and social practices. Robert Kaplan (1990, cited in Dellinger 1995: 1) writes, ‘the text, whether written or oral, is a multidimensional structure…any text is layered, like a sheet of thick plywood consisting of many thin sheets lying at different angles to each other’. The basic elements of any text are its grammar, morphology, phonology and semantics. However, says Kaplan (ibid.), ‘the understanding of grammar and lexicon does not constitute the understanding of text’. He adds, ‘rhetoric intent, coherence and the world view that author and receptor bring to the text are essential’. Kaplan’s words assert that meaning cannot be derived solely from the text. In fact, meaning lies outside the text itself; that is in the interface between the author’s indications and the degree to which they are encoded in the discourse produced, and the receiver’s own signs and ability to decode his/ her
intention, the author's encoded intention in addition to the capability to web one's own intention with that of the author.

5.3.1 Development of CDA

Understanding meaning as such, CDA re-introduced the study of language as an interdisciplinary tool to be used by concerned persons from various backgrounds. Most significantly, investigating cross-cultural translation projects in this rapidly globalizing world can vehemently benefit from CDA. In the late 1970s, a group of linguists and literary theorists at the University of East Anglia developed Critical Linguistics (CL) founding their approach on Halliday's Systematic Functional Linguistics (Sheyholislami 2001). Critical Linguistics practitioners 'aimed at isolating ideology in discourse and showing how ideology and ideological processes are manifested as systems of linguistic characteristics and processes' (ibid.: 1).

According to Fowler (1979: 185-189, cited in Sheyholislami 2001: 2) CL, like sociolinguistics, asserts that 'there are strong and pervasive connections between linguistic structure and social structure'. Since the 70s, CL has been developed and broadened taking into consideration the role of audiences and their interpretations, and moving beyond the textual analysis to the intertextual one. However, these developments have not resulted in the creation of a single theoretical framework, rather, what is today known as CDA. According to Bell and Garret (1998: 7), 'CDA is best viewed as a shared perspective encompassing a range of approaches rather than as just one school' (cited in Sheyholislami 2001: 2).

Van Dijk is one of the most quoted and referenced CDA practitioners. He applies his discourse analysis (a socio-cognitive model in which he defines social cognition as 'the system of mental representation and processes of group members') to media texts and what distinguishes his work from others is his call for a thorough
analysis not only of the textual and structural level of media discourse but also for analysis and explanations at the production and reception or comprehension level (Van Dijk 1995: 18).

Van Dijk (1995: 17) perceives discourse analysis as ideology analysis because, according to him, ‘ideologies are typically, though not exclusively, expressed and reproduced in discourse and communication, including non-verbal semiotic messages such as pictures, photographs and movies’. Hence, when analysing a text in translation as such, we are in fact analysing the ideology of the author and that of the translator, editor and publisher. He adds, ‘ideologies...are the overall, abstract mental systems that organize...socially shared attitudes’ (1995: 18). They ‘indirectly influence the personal cognition of group members’ in their act of comprehension of discourse among other actions and reactions (ibid.: 19). These then control how people act, speak or write, and how they understand the social practices of others. According to Van Dijk, mental representations ‘are often articulated along “us” versus “them” dimensions, in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms’ (1995: 22). He believes that in order to make such ideological dichotomy (us/ them) in discourse transparent, discourse must be analysed in the following way (ibid. 1998: 61-63):

a. Examining the context of the discourse: historical, political or social background.

b. Analysing groups, power relations and conflicts involved.

c. Identifying positive and negative opinions about ‘us’ versus ‘them’.

d. Making explicit the presupposed and the implied.
e. Examining all formal structure: lexical choice and syntactic structure, in a way that helps to (de)emphasize polarized group opinions.

Besides the socio-cognitive model of CDA which Van Dijk follows, discourse sociolinguistics is another direction of CDA which Ruth Wodak, from the Vienna School of Discourse Analysis, adopts. According to Wodak (1996: 3), Discourse Sociolinguistics:

is a sociolinguistics which not only is explicitly dedicated to the study of the text in context, but also accords both factors equal importance. It is an approach capable of identifying and describing the underlying mechanisms that contribute to those disorders in discourse which are embedded in a particular context—whether they be in the structure and function of the media, or in institutions such as a hospital or a school—and inevitably affect communication.

Wodak carried out research on a variety of social issues in various settings. Her results (cf. Sheyholislami 2001) showed that the context of the discourse under discussion had significant effects on its utterances, structure and function. Thus, focusing on the historical context of the discourse in question is essential for the process of explanation and interpretation.

According to Wodak and Ludwig (1999: 12), ‘language manifests social processes and interaction…and constitutes those processes as well’. Viewing language as such means that, (i) ‘discourse always involves power and ideologies as no interaction exists where power relations do not prevail and where values and norms do not have a relevant role’ (ibid.), (ii) ‘discourse is always historical, that is, it is connected synchronically and diachronically with other communicative events which are happening at the same time or which have happened before’ (ibid.), and (iii) that readers and listeners might have different interpretations of the same
communicative event depending on their background, knowledge and social position (ibid.: 13).

Having said that, Wodak and Ludwig (1999: 13) declare that 'the right interpretation does not exist...interpretations can be more or less plausible or adequate, but they cannot be true'. Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) speculate that CDA contributes to achieving the best interpretations. They argue that, 'the past two decades or so have been a period of profound economic and social transformations on a global scale' (ibid.: 30). They believe that these changes are due to actions by humans although they have been perceived as the results of nature. According to them, these recent economic and social changes 'are to a significant degree...transformations in the language and discourse' (ibid.: 4). Hence, CDA can explain the effect they have on discourse creating awareness of 'what is, how it has come to be, and what it might become' (Chuliaraki & Fairclough 1999: 4). This approach of CDA focuses its analysis on three elements; text, discourse practice (the process of production and consumption), and socio-cultural practice (the social and cultural structures that produce the communicative event) (Fairclough 1995: 57).

a) Text:

The first element in Fairclough's framework is text. Analysing a text involves analysing it linguistically in terms of its vocabulary, grammar, semantics, phonetics and cohesion (ibid.). According to Fairclough (1995: 58) any sentence in a text can be analysed in terms of:

- Specific representations of certain social practices or particular ideologies
- Particular constructions of writer and/ or reader identities
• Assembly of the relationship between the writer and reader.

b) Discourse practice:

According to Fairclough (1995: 58), discourse practice has two dimensions: institutional process (e.g. editorial, distributional, publishing procedures) and discourse processes (e.g. changes the text go through in the process of translation; decoding and re-encoding). In addition, like there is linguistic analysis at the text level, there is linguistic analysis at the discourse practice one that Fairclough (1995: 61) calls intertextual analysis. According to him, intertextual analysis is interpretative while linguistic analysis is descriptive. He (1992: 84-85) defines intertextuality as, ‘the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth’, and identifies two types of it:

• Manifest intertextuality: the diverse formation of texts by which other texts are explicitly referred to within a text through the use of explicit signs (e.g. exclamation marks) that indicate the occurrence of similar texts elsewhere.

• Constitutive intertextuality: it refers to the structure of discourse principles that go into the new text’s production.

c) Socio-cultural practice:

According to Fairclough (1995: 62), three important elements must be taken into consideration for the analysis of a communicative event: economic (e.g. the nature of the market producing translation), political (e.g. power relations between
the target text and source text cultures), and cultural (e.g. ideology of the cultures involved in the translating process). He also asserts that analysis should not take place at all levels but only if it is relevant.

1) Economy of translation: according to Fairclough (1995: 40), 'the economics of an institution is an important determinant of its practices and its texts'. Like any profit making institution, the translation body has products to market and these products, like all sorts of products, are open to the effects of the commercial industry. These effects play a vital role in deciding what is to be selected for translation and in what way should it be published. Besides, the sponsors of the translation projects have an essential influence on these projects.

2) The politics of translation: translation works ideologically and is in the service of the powerful. It contributes to reproducing social relations of domination and exploitation; it has the power of manufacturing consent. Fairclough and Chuliaraki (1999: 24) argue that, 'hegemony is relations of domination based upon consent rather than coercion, involving the naturalization of practices and their social relations as well as relations between practices, as matters of common sense- hence the concept of hegemony emphasizes the importance of ideology in achieving and maintaining relations of domination'.

3) The culture and economics of translation: production and consumption of texts in translation are two fundamental dimensions of the practice and its institutions. The production of texts for translation involves collecting, selecting, translating and editing while consumption on the other hand is how readers read, comprehend and relate the translated pieces. Selecting a text for translation is the most fundamental dimension of all. Hundreds of texts are produced every year in Arabic for instance,
yet only very few find their way to translation into foreign languages specifically English. In other words, a procedure for selecting texts for translation is always present. In some cases this procedure is not based on the literary value of the source texts, rather on the motives of the institutions and/ persons that sponsor the translation project. ‘Translation in many countries is shaped and influenced by economic and political decisions’ (Fawcett 1995: 181). Meaning, texts are selected as to whether they serve the interests of the decision makers. Hence the world represented through translation is not necessarily the real one, but a biased one. One that is prejudiced and twisted. In fact, the very act of selecting source texts for translation involves choosing specific source voices with the exclusion of others.

Van Dijk (1993) argues that recipients are, to a point, active and independent information users, but they often interpret texts in accordance with their background knowledge and the information they already know. What translation brings us about other cultures and people seems to be the only source of information since it is impractical to visit every group of people in this fast expanding world to know their culture. Translation is one of the means through which other cultures are made known. ‘Translating is travelling, taking a trip to a foreign country’ (Boujea 1988, cited in Cronin 1995: 362). Nonetheless, any medium selected must have used translation at one point or another to gather the information required. Having said that, it must be mentioned that seeing translation as such makes analysing translation as a practice and product essential in realizing what impact translation, especially intercultural translation as such, has on receivers and what role it plays in the presentation of foreign cultures and people. Accordingly, any analysis of a translation must be accompanied by an analysis of the processes of text selection, production and consumption. An ideal case study would be to conduct a reception
study (to examine the interpretations of a group of readers who read the same piece of translation) but since this task requires a wide band of time and cooperative volunteers, focus is on how this selective practice, of choosing material for translation and the way it is translated, affects the information presented giving way to specific interpretations to spring up.

5.4 The Master Discourse of Translation

Ever since the focus in translation shifted from form/content to the more broad fact that any text produced in a specific language is embedded in a specific culture, translating became naturally understood as implying transporting foreign cultural elements and intentions, associated with the language translated, to a different receiving culture and language. By the same token, the translator's role and involvement in the process of translation exceeded searching for equivalence, which for long amused translators and translation theorists. Today their role often, if not always, espouses the identity and needs of the target culture. Hence, translation would also imply that the transporting bodies in the receiving culture lay specific ingredients and descriptions for the transported materials before they are carried over. These ingredients and descriptions produce established systems for the selection, representation, production and consumption of foreignness producing, ultimately, a master discourse through which translation is practiced. Consequently, more than often, such master discourses of representation result in generalization creating stereotypes and labels that stamp cultures and individuals of those cultures perpetually. As we have pointed out earlier, the representational norms of the Arabs/Islam in the West, which adhere to a master discourse of orientalist representations, have for long stamped the approximately 1200 million Muslims (Arabs/non-Arabs) of the world by expressions such as the following derived from TV programs and
news titles (BBC documentary 2001; Startribune 2003; Mother Jones 1993; TIME 1979):

The Koran and the Kalashnikov

Muslim rage

The Vatican's dark marriage to Islam

The Crescent of Crisis

5.4.1 Representation and the Master Discourse of Translation

Acknowledging that any text produced in a specific language is in fact a product of two, rather than one, fundamental components, language and culture, makes the process of translation involved in making other cultures comprehensible entail varying degrees of violence and problems of all kinds and levels. This is especially the case when the culture being translated is one that is known as the Other. Culture here, as pointed out in Chapter Three, refers to the beliefs and value systems that unite a social group of people in how they view themselves vis-à-vis others and how they interpret events around them; the totality of knowledge and attitudes that a social group of people utilize to be recognized as a society different from others.

These characteristics are often represented, by use of language, in the cultural products of these social groups of which is literature and the written text. However, often the background and value systems of the producers and receivers of texts, of which translators, editors and publishers, remain in tact even when dealing with cultural products from other social groups especially those that were/ are historically in conflict. The West and East for example came into contact many times throughout history. The struggle for power and influence stamps the relation
between these two cultures even as these two cultures today seem to be politically and economically independent. The use of language in this sense as Paul Simpson observes (cited in Abdulla 1999: 2),

"Cannot be regarded as neutral, value free or exempt from at least 'angle of telling'; rather it is shaped by a mosaic of cultural assumptions, political beliefs, and institutional practices-in other words ideology."

Ideology here is the culture that differentiates one social group of people from the other yet not simply the deeply rooted and unconscious beliefs and value systems that a group of people embrace, rather, like Terry Eagleton puts it (cited in Abdulla 1999: 2),

"those modes of feeling, valuing, perceiving and believing which have some kind of relation to the maintenance and reproduction of social power."

In other words, ideology does not only refer to the self-satisfied, clichéd representations of the other, nor is it only the imposition of politics on works of art which intervene in any objective or critical analysis (cf. Abdulla 1999). Rather, and in its wider conception, ideology is the collection of assumptions and propositions that a group of people hold about themselves, others and the fundamentals of the world as a whole, i.e. a lens through which they see, interpret and evaluate the world including them. Within this manifesto linguistic meaning is seen as inseparable from ideology. For example, as the war in Palestine, Afghanistan, Iraq and other parts of the world goes on, many news reports choose to favour words such as 'terrorists', 'guerrilla fighters' over others like 'freedom fighters' which is not a case of difference in point of views as much as a conscious ideological categorization of events which explains the realities that inspire the way we perceive the world around us. The same is true of the choice between 'Intifada' and 'uprising', 'shot dead' and
‘died’. In translation, such insights provide better ways of discussing, critiquing and analysing a translation. In order to examine the interference of different factors in the interpretation, production and circulation of texts from one socio-cultural context into another, critical discourse analysis, which investigates the injection of ideologies in discourse production and circulation whether to challenge or to confirm existing stereotypes and clichés between the cultures in study, provides concrete grounds. More specifically, Dellinger (1995: 2) says, ‘socially situated speakers produce texts and writers’. He adds, ‘the relations of participants in producing texts are not always equal, likewise, meanings come about as a result of social processes, which are never arbitrary, since in most interactions users of language bring with them different dispositions toward language which are closely related to social positioning’. Indeed, the adoption of a particular ideological structure by the translator is a matter of choice and not chance. However, the decisions made by translators, editors and publishers in the process of translating and representing foreign cultures are not final. They could be persuaded socially or economically to follow other procedures in order to serve other interests. This relationship between ideology and interests implies that the powerful most often can change ideologies in order to justify certain attitudes. Meaning, the coding and decoding of the self, the other and the self vis-à-vis the other will have a tendency to be formalized and normalized in accordance with the interests of the powerful. Under these conditions individuals, of which translators, will act out of their will in order to meet the demands of the institutions they belong to. In other words, a master discourse of translation that serves the demands and interests of the translating culture and through which translators should work is the obvious outcome and is very unlikely to be challenged. Thus, the Other, its culture and people will be represented through the eyes of the translators, editors
and publishers according to the interests of the producers of the master discourse in which that Other in contrast to the self is considered different. Translation from Arabic has been for a long time following strategies that persistently confirm in the mind of the Western reader the image of the Arab/Islamic culture as different, radically Other (cf. Jacquemond 1997). Within the us/them dichotomy the dominant culture constructs a ‘formal’ which is a style that is accepted implicitly by members of that culture and which is recognized as ‘the’ style (Dellinger 1995). For example, a British citizen as a member of a society that recognizes itself as peace loving and antiterrorist unconsciously perceives Palestinian freedom fighters as suicide bombers.

Hence, through adhering to the conditions and limitations of the master discourse of translation and since one’s formal is seldom recognized as such, the cultures that are being translated become no more than a reflection of those cultures’ images in the mind of the individuals who provide the master discourse that serves their interests. In fact, the lexical items and forms, for instance, in the translated text on the part of the translator become, in most cases, a matter of conscious choices and not chance. Indeed, these choices structure the perceptions of the receptors of the translations so that texts will not only be simply referred to as translations but reporters of facts. The English translation of El-Saadawi’s utopian novel Love in the Kingdom of Oil on its back cover declares that ‘In this rich novel El-Saadawi dares anew to confront major issues and questions surrounding a woman’s role and position in a repressive, patriarchal order’ which presents the book more as a book of facts than a novel.

Cross-cultural contact usually results from the interaction between the people of different cultures. Historically, many cultures have come together for several
reasons, but in most cases the cultures involved were politically and economically unequal. In the case of the intercultural contacts between the East and the West, the East, seen by the West as the Other, was often represented through the eyes of the Western orientalists as the exotic and mysterious other yet accompanied by bloodshed, oppression, backwardness, etc (Hanafi 1998; Sengupta 1995). These orientalist representations and stereotypes of the colonial period are still reproduced and preserved today albeit by different agents (Jacquemond 1997). Film makers (e.g. True Lies, Three Kings, and Father of the Bride 2), journalists, politicians, archaeologists, etc. replace the travel writers. What is particularly interesting, however, is that some individuals from the Orient are excluded from the us/ them classification and are regarded agents of the orientalist representations of the Orient. Those accepted individuals are acknowledged as such so long as they do not dispute the Western master discourse of representing the East. Their acceptance depends so much on how they espouse the existing norms of representation be it through translation or other means. Commenting on the case of Tagore, the Bengali poet, Simon (1997: 472) says, ‘Tagore surely won the 1913 Nobel Prize on the basis of his work which was available in English. ...Tagore’s reputation and immense popularity in the West were not due primarily to an intellectual appreciation of his work but to an emotional association between the East and mysticism. Tagore actualized Western fantasies of the East as a place where “saints and prophets” brought deliverance to ordinary people’.

In translation, in our case from Arabic into English, texts are selected and organized in a way that reflects the ideologies behind the accepted norms of representation and translating, which are no different from those adopted by the orientalists of the colonial period (see the case of El-Saadawi’s the Hidden Face of
Eve below). In this vein, Niranjana (cited in Dingwaney 1995: 11) defines translation as 'a significant technology of colonial domination'. In addition, the master discourse of translation and its norms that handle and represent the Other extend to reach the Other itself. In the French book market, for example, translation, per annum, makes up some 15 to 20% of publications of which translations from Arabic represent only 1% (Jacquemond 1997). This is because, as Jacquemond (1997) argues, Arab producers are compelled to revise their products in relation to the orientalist representations, and to adhere to the values of the French culture.

Thus, translation, which is one of the primary means through which texts from what is known as the 'Third' or 'non-Western' world are made available to the 'Western' and global community, entails varying degrees of violence. Venuti (1995; 1996; 1998), Lefevere (1990), Fawcett (1995) and many others locate the violence that the process of translation brings to translating non-Western cultures in a specific exercise of power that attaches the West to its non-Western objects. Translation here is looked at in terms of power relations, identity forming and construction of cultures. This results in the creation of an image that satisfies and serves the interests of the West in its objects of study within the master discourse of translation creating stereotypes about the specific cultures (Sengupta 1995). Stereotypes are often seen as disintegrating and restraining yet as tools for the powerful to legitimise its control of the weak as it justifies its battles for hegemony (Bhabha 1994; Lefevere 1990). For example, representing and stereotyping the Islamic world as a zone that harbours terrorism justified, to some extent, the United States’ war on Iraq and Afghanistan and reintroduced the United States and its, mostly Western, allies as the moderate and civilized.
The representation of Others as such constructs classifications such as us/ them, East/ West, fundamental/ moderate, superior/ inferior, violent/ peaceful, etc. Excluding Other cultures according to such categories from what is called ‘world culture’ is accompanied, on the other hand, by an inclusion of members of the Other who occupy the ‘no-man’s-land’ between the two cultures; they belong to one society (East) but assume the culture of another (West). Accordingly, certain voices, views and texts are selected by the publishing industry; reviewers and critics in response to what they believe readers look forward to read. Indeed, and in terms of translating from Arabic into English, translation has followed specific strategies of representation within an already established framework. There seems to be a blockade in the way of Arabic culture except for texts that echo the usual clichés about the Arabs and Islam (Said 1995: 99). The Arab world is rich with innovative writers, male and female alike, yet despite the large number of writers only few are chosen for translation. Works by the 1988 Nobel Prize winner Naguib Mahfouz are translated over and over again giving, in a way, little chances for the new voices to find their way to translation. What is particularly interesting, however, is that most of what appeared to be new editions of Mahfouz’s work in English especially the Cairo Trilogy were either ‘indifferent’ or ‘poor’ translations which means the aim was to ‘capitalize’ on his fame ‘but not at the cost of a retranslation’ (Said 1995: 97). On the other hand, Jacquemond (1997) presents another dimension of Mahfouz in the West. A precise analysis of the translation and reception of Mahfouz in France and elsewhere shows that his success in the West is attributed to the creation of money worth work that is exotic yet familiar to the Western receptor, so much so that novels written after 1967 are never chosen for translation (Jacquemond 1997). In addition, not everything in the work chosen for translation is destined to be translated, and/ or
translated forwardly, for several reasons that are not only economic but involve an exercise of power (Fawcett 1995: 183). Nawal El-Saadawi is an Egyptian writer who comes second to Naguib Mahfouz in translation. Her celebration in the West is derived less from her criticism of the Western foreign affairs, than from her accounts on female circumcision (cf. al-MuHsin 2000). The English translation of her book The Hidden Face of Eve rearranged the chapters of the book bringing those that dealt with sexuality forward, omitted paragraphs and even added a new chapter which has led her to rewrite the introduction to the second edition of the English version of the book and reconsider her topics in later works.

Taking these accounts into consideration and applying critical discourse analysis to translation helps in understanding how translation is affected by the ideologies of the ‘translating culture’ and how the ‘translated culture’ is consequently shaped according to the constraints and demands of the master discourse of representation and cultural translation.

5.4.2 The Discourse of Cultural Translation

Translation has been going on for nearly 5000 years. Yet it is in demand today more than ever as the world market expands and the trend towards globalization assumes greater endeavours. Such trends gather momentum to bridge the gap between cultures to facilitate communication. For this very purpose, translation has been seen as one of the tools that could masquerade as innocent activities. Nonetheless, the move towards erasing cultural boundaries has been restricted by other more dynamic attempts. A true globalization of cultures has not been achieved. Instead, and as a result of several factors, of which the unequal power and trade relations, the cultural boundaries are further emphasized. St-Pierre (1997: 423) succinctly remarks, ‘the “space” of translation is one in which
interaction with other cultures takes place, or in certain cases does not take place'. Within this traffic, English continues to play a vital role in international communication and remains the most translated-into/ from language.

The critical position of English in cross-cultural communications specifically between the West and the Arab/ Islamic world, as the impact of the Arab World on world affairs grows, highly affects the role of the translator between these two cultures. The relation between the Arab/ Islamic world and the West has been prickly for the last two decades of the twentieth century and continues to be so especially after the events of September, 11, 2001. Within this context, cultural translation witnessed an unprecedented use of stereotypes and clichés about the Arabs and Islam. Specific strategies of representation which fit within a previously constructed framework of representation for that part of the world influence translators, editors and publishers’ strategies and decisions not only with regard to how to translate but, more hazardously, what to translate.

As a cross-cultural communication act, translation by default gives a huge number of domestic and foreign audiences the chance to view foreign and domestic cultures, respectively, across language boundaries. Translators, thus, assume the role of cultural mediators. Bochner (1981, cited in Katan 1999: 12) was first to introduce the term cultural mediator. The idea of the translator as a mediating agent, however, is not new. Steiner (1975) (cf. Katan 1999) described the translator as a bilingual mediating agent between monolingual communication participants in two different language communities. Steiner’s focus is almost on linguistic mediation. However, a wider consideration of the concept of cultural mediation is current.
A cultural mediator is a person who facilitates communication, understanding, and action between persons or groups who differ with respect to language and culture. The role of the mediator is performed by interpreting the expressions, intentions, perceptions, and expectations of each cultural group to the other, that is, by establishing and balancing the communication between them. In order to serve as a link in this sense, the mediator must be able to participate to some extent in both cultures. Thus a mediator must be to a certain extent bicultural.

(Taft 1981, cited in Katan 1999: 12)

The cultural mediator according to Taft (1981, cited in Katan 1999: 13) is 'someone who may never be called to communicate the exact translation of words, rather communicate the ideas in terms that are meaningful to the members of the target audience'. In a similar vein, Hatim and Mason (1990) use the term mediation. They identify two kinds of mediation. They assume that, (1) translators mediate between cultures, including ideology, with a view to overcoming differences between the two cultures, and (2) translators are privileged readers of the source texts; they read to reproduce and decode to re-encode. However, Bassnett (1993: 99) argues that giving the translator the absolute credibility to communicate and re-encode a text in another language highlights issues of power and manipulation.

The mapmaker, the translator and the travel writer are not innocent producers of text. The works they create are part of a process of manipulation that shapes and conditions our attitudes to other cultures while purporting to be something else.

Issues of culture, representation and manipulation in translation are relatively new. In fact, since the 1976 historic meeting at Leuven in Belgium, Translation Studies has come a long way welcoming approaches from other disciplines. The relationship between culture and translation, in particular, has been given importance that from
the 1980s onward, as previously mentioned, the focus on culture in translation studies shifted from cultural untranslatability to the role of culture in translation. This shift has been instigated by work on Orientalism, post-colonial writings and cultural studies which led some writers on translation to re-define translation. Bassnett and Trivedi (1999: 2) argue that,

"translation does not happen in a vacuum, but in a continuum; it is not an isolated act, it is part of an ongoing process of intercultural transfer. Moreover, translation is a highly manipulative activity that involves all kinds of stages in the process of transfer across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Translation is not an innocent, transparent activity but is highly charged with signification at every stage."

Since cultures, as sets of beliefs and values, are embedded in languages, they represent, by extension, ideologies. Accordingly, if translation does not merely take place between two languages but rather between two cultures, it is inevitable that it also transfers implied ideologies. By the same token, the ideology of the translator is what shapes the way other cultures are represented. Considering translation in terms of identity forming and representation of the Other promoted some writers on translation to associate it with manipulation; subversion and appropriation, what Venuti (1998a) refers to as the ‘scandals of translation’. Translation as such predetermines the target reader perceptions of the foreign culture. In this regard, Venuti (1994: 201-2) defines translation as,

"an inevitable domestication, wherein the foreign text is inscribed with linguistic and cultural values that are intelligible to specific domestic constituencies. This process of inscription operates at every stage in the production, circulation, and reception of the translation. It is initiated by the very choice of a foreign text to translate, always an exclusion of other foreign texts and literatures, which answers to particular domestic interests."
It continues most forcefully in the development of a translation strategy that rewrites the foreign text in domestic dialects and discourses, always a choice of certain domestic values to the exclusion of others.

Translation as such turns out to be an instrument used to shape domestic attitudes towards foreign countries/ethnic groups/races/nationalities either to respect them and attach value to them or to show hatred, dislike and disrespect for the cultural differences (Venuti 1994: 202). Hence, translation ultimately 'figures in geopolitical relations by establishing the cultural grounds of diplomacy, reinforcing alliances, antagonisms, and hegemonies between nations' (ibid.). According to Venuti (1995; 1996) the very purpose and activity of translation represent violence. He argues that translation exerts two types of violence on foreign texts (ibid. 1996: 197); one inherent in the translation process of gain and loss, and another that results from the selection, production and reception of foreign texts. He divides the second type of violence into two subtypes; domestication wherein the linguistic and cultural values of the foreign text are replaced with ones that are intelligible to the target (domestic) reader (bringing the author home, and foreignization where the original's peculiarities are reserved (sending the reader abroad). However, these two subtypes overlap because although the foreign text is inscribed with foreign values that remain foreign in translation, they may be reserved only because they conform to domestic values and norms previously constructed for that foreign culture. Such decisions deprive source texts producers of their voices and deprive original texts of their value by adding naturalizing and normalizing effects to them. Niranjana (1992: 3) claims that 'translation reinforces hegemonic versions of the colonized'. According to Venuti (1997: 210) English language translation has been dominated by domesticating theories and practices since the 17th century. 'It dominated the theory and practice of English language translation in every genre' (ibid.: 211). However,
as Venuti (1997) argues, domestication and foreignization are not viewed as bad or inaccurate translation strategies. It would also suffice to mention that translation can be described as violent only if the damage it brings to foreign texts is deliberate and unnecessary. Types of violence that are due to the natural differences between the two languages (as section 5.2 above illustrates) are essential and unavoidable.

Translators, editors and publishers assume the role of selecting texts for translation and choosing the best strategies to be adopted and developed in the process of translation. It thus goes without saying that the decision of whether to adopt domestication or foreignization in selecting, reviewing and translating texts is governed by cultural, political and economic elements that constitute the translators, editors and publishers' ideology and the master discourse of translation. As mentioned above, ideology is defined as,

The set of beliefs and values which inform an individual's or institution's view of the world and assist their interpretation of events, facts, etc.

Mason (1994: 25)

Ideology, thus, refers to 'ideas, values, conceptions and assumptions, whether cultural or political, related to power and authority of persons or institutions in a specific society' (Abdullah 1999: 2). John Haynes (cited in Abdullah 1999: 2) notes that ideology implies 'the wider conception of life and values which seem natural to the speaker or writer'. Indeed, language use is shaped by ideology. One good example of this is the translation of the Arabian Nights by Richard Francis Burton in 1885. Byron Farwell wrote the following about Burton's translation, which is considered an encyclopaedia of the Arab/ Islamic world (cited in Carbonell 1996: 80),
The great charm of Burton’s translation, viewed as literature, lies in the veil of romance and exoticism he cast over the entire work. He tried hard to retain the flavour of oriental quaintness and naïveté of the medieval Arab by writing ‘as the Arab would have written in English’. The result is a work containing thousands of words and phrases of great beauty, and to the Western ear, originality.

Burton tried to frame, through translation, an image of the Arabs and of Arab culture, literature and even language that he wished to transfer. Whether intentionally or not, he viewed the Orient as an Other as seen by the Self (Carbonell 1996). Apart from Burton’s Arabs, the Arab world and Islam in general are expressed and represented according to an established framework. It all begins with the selection of foreign texts for translation. Foreign texts are often chosen according to their subjects; only texts that appeal to the receiving culture are selected for translation. These foreign texts are then often translated (rewritten) in a way to fit within styles available in the domestic culture and its literary tradition. These styles are fixed stereotypes for foreign cultures. They exclude values and elements that do not serve domestic interests. So ‘even when the decision is made that a specific text is to be translated, the power play is still only just beginning’ (Fawcett 1995: 183). Robyns (1990, cited in Fawcett 1995: 183) for example, gives an account of the ideological norms of translation in the translation, at a given period, of American noir novels into French. Robyns argues that political comments were omitted for ideological reasons while plot, character and setting were reduced by omission to make the translation conform to a model of what the roman noir was perceived to be in France at that time (ibid.). Such a calculated choice of foreign texts and strategies in translation creates a domestic representation and a domestic subject intelligible to the domestic culture (cf. Venuti 1998a). Kuhiwczak (1990, cited in Fawcett 1995: 188) gives another
account of this. He says, in the first translation of Milan Kundera's novel *The Joke*, the chronological order of events and chapters was rearranged. Likewise, El-Saadawi's second edition of *The Hidden Face of Eve* deleted a whole paragraph that explores the contradictory position of Western women, and replaced a chapter by another from an earlier work by the author (Amireh 2000).

Given these constraints and asymmetrical relationships of power between the translating and translated cultures, cultural translation that takes place in a predictable, even predetermined direction within an already specified framework results in alien cultural forms or concepts or indigenous practices that are translated via a process of formalization (assimilation to culturally familiar forms or concepts or practices) whereby they are striped of their foreignness (Dingwaney 1995: 4-5). Given the premise that translation primarily means transporting the product of one culture into another, cultural translation between the Arab/Islamic world and the West is a case to consider. Historically the Arab world and Islam have been imprinted by stereotypes that reinforce the colonial and orientalist images, which see that other as the uncivilized barbarian which needs Western aid and intervention to lift it from its foxholes and pick up the pieces (Faiq 2003; Sengupta 1995). Arabs are not alone, Latin Americans as well as Africans, Indians, Eastern Europeans and Vietnamese are of the various cultures consciously grouped together under 'Third' or 'non-Western' World.

Cultural translation is not only about how cultures get translated, rather, what and who gets translated. 'It has to do with the selection of certain voices, views and texts, by the publishing industry (presumably in response to what it believes readers will read) and by reviewers and critics' (Dingwaney 1995: 5). These selections are then represented as accepted canons of other cultures’ texts and/ or authors (*ibid.*).
Of course, decision is based on the degree of those selections compliance with the receiving audiences’ tastes. In the case of the Arab/ Islamic one in translation, most representations of that culture are rooted in ‘the Western obsession with fixed texts generated from master discourses’ (Faiq 2003: 43). As a result of the unequal power relations, the Western master discourse is not to be negotiated during the selection, production and circulation processes. Thus, as Asad (1985, cited in Dingwaney 1995: 4) argues, the institutional constraints, disciplinary demands and the expectations of the audiences for whom these translations are intended affect the translations undertaken. In a letter written in 1857 by Edward Fitzgerald who translated the Rubayyiat of Omar Khayyam to E.B.Cowell, Fitzgerald writes (cited in Abdulla 1999: 10),

It is an amusement for me to take what liberties I like with these Persians, who (as I think) are not Poets enough to frighten one from such excursions and who really do want a little art to shape them.

Fitzgerald devoted more than a quarter of a century of his life and career (ending by his death) to alternations, changes and revisions which Lefevere (1992, cited in Abdulla 1990: 11) doubts he would have devoted had he been translating from a superior culture, such as Greek or Latin.

Fitzgerald would never have taken the same liberties with classical Greek or Roman authors, not only because they represented a superior culture but also because there were many experts around who could check this translation.

Translators’ ethnocentricity and the master discourse of representing the Other through which translators, publishers and editors work produces translations that are tailored for target culture readers and which screen out all that does not fit that
perception. During the 19th century and until World War II, Britain was a force that wielded enormous cultural and political power over much of the world. After WWII, colonialism was coming to an end and the United States, unshaken by the war, became the most powerful, hence, influential, politically, economically and culturally. Much has changed in the relation between the West and its Others, yet the perception of that Other remains the same. The Arab/ Islamic world, in particular, receives enormous attention from the Western one due to its strategic location and the ongoing Arab/ Israeli war (some attribute this attention to Samuel Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations' (cf. Tonnesson 1994)). Yet in translation it remains either marginalized or accepted within a pre-tailored framework. The current perception of the Arab world is primarily the product of 'those texts which have been selected for translation' (Thomas 1998: 104). The power and ability of the West to construct a canon that favours certain writers and texts over others does not only define what Western readers should read or what counts in terms of representations of the Third in the First world, but extends to affect how Third World writers themselves write for translation. Thomas (1998: 104) writes,

it is interesting to consider Naguib Mahfouz – the only Arab writer to have been given the full Western approval through his winning of the Nobel Prize. He worked as a censor throughout the Nasser and Sadat eras, eras not noted for liberal attitudes to the arts or critical awareness. He also appeared on Israeli television on a number of occasions supporting a pro-western position. Despite what one may think of the literary merits of his work...the fact remains that nearly all of his work has been translated, which compares very favourably with translations of other Arab writers who have been much more critical of the West...

Whether they write for translation or in translation, some writers from the Arab world may well be chosen not so much for their innovative products or socio-
political critique as for their compliance with a master discourse of representing Arabs, in particular Arab women and Islam (cf. Dallal 1998).

5.5 Conclusion

Domestic identities of foreign cultures can be confirmed or changed through a random selection of texts that represent variable ideologies. In his argument about the identity-forming power of translation, Venuti (1998a) regards this process a threat to the cultural and political institutions because it reveals their unbalanced and unfounded basis. The phenomenon of cultural globalization, for example, which is often praised by cultural and political figures, is supposedly an intercultural act that aims to introduce cultures to each other through translation amongst other means. Yet it is sceptical in many ways because the elements that serve as its basis are usually based on stereotypical representations.

Critical discourse analysis offers guidelines for the analysis of the ideologies that govern the production and circulation of a discourse. In order to be aware of the role intercultural translation plays in the representation of foreign cultures and people for the purpose of the globalization of cultures, it is essential to analyze translation as a process and product. Translators are expected to intervene in texts due to the non-equivalency between source and target languages. However, managing texts for purposes other than clarification and producing readable texts is what is called into investigation. The application of critical discourse analysis approaches can make explicit the implicit constraints, norms and disciplinary demands through which translators, editors and publishers work when selecting and re-presenting foreign texts and voices.
For translation to bridge the gap between cultures and facilitate fruitful cultural dialogues, it needs to adopt non-stereotypical or clichéd representations. The argument here is not a plea for attractive as opposed to unattractive representations and translations. Rather, it is a demand that cross-cultural translation be fair in its selection of texts and metaphor to represent reality not stereotypes. In order to capture this, Chapter Five reconsiders Lefevere’s conceptual (the culture of translation) and textual (translation of culture) grids for approaching translation culturally.
Chapter Six

6 Analysing Translation

6.1 Introduction

Translation may be regarded as a response to a problem of communication usually between two language-bound cultural entities. The act itself is a multi-dimensional and multi-layered process involving in one consensual domain problem solving and decision-making.

The decision to include certain voices for translation but exclude others is, so often, not innocent. Instead, it often functions to contain selective voices within a predefined space. Discursive, ideological and institutional structures pre-empt discourses by the Other and determine what they should write or say and whether they will be heard. Third World writers, from the Middle East in our case, who critique their home cultures, especially issues related to Arab women, Islam, democracy, are welcomed for translation in the West as their words seem merely to confirm what their Western audience already know. Marilyn Booth, an American translator, succinctly says ‘publishers in the West refused to translate outstanding novels by female Arab writers because they see the Arab/ Muslim woman only within the frame of the veil, extremism and seclusion’ (my translation, quoted in Al-‘araby 2003: 39). In addition, writers are expected to adhere to a Western style of narration. When the critic of the Middle Eastern oil based societies Munif published the English translation of his Cities of Salt, critics ignored and denigrated his writings. Dallal (1998: 8) quotes a John Updike remark about Munif’s Cities of Salt:
'it is unfortunate...that Mr Munif...appears to be...insufficiently Westernized to produce a narrative that feels much like what we call a novel'. Thus writers find themselves positioned as what Mary E. John (cited in Amireh & Majaj 2000: 1) call, 'native informants from elsewhere'.

Although non-Western writers had begun to be granted more space within the Western context, this gesture of inclusion did not challenge the already defined landscape that continued to assign to non-Western writers their pre-given locations. For example, the growing interest in Third World women's narratives in the Western market tends to focus primarily, though not exclusively, on gender oppression (cf. Amireh & Majaj 2000; Saliba & Kattan 2000). In addition, the processes of translation- editing, publishing and marketing- that had brought Third World women's texts into First World markets play a major role and have a great impact on how such texts were selected, received and read. 'Much of what “First World” readers know of these writers is conditioned by the “metropolitan mediations” that first brought them public attention, as well as by the interpretative frameworks that lent them “currency” within the global market’ (Saliba & Kattan 2000: 88).

Analysing the processes set in place when texts and voices travel to other contexts, that is analysing texts and culture in translation, provides to us an understanding of the construction of non-Western writers and their texts in Western contexts as both mediators and mediated.

6.2 Analyzing Text and Culture in Translation

The translation traffic between the Western and non-Western world is situated at a historical moment of increasing globalization. The movement of capital, populations, and cultural products across national borders is accelerated. For the
most part, this has been a movement from the powerful to the less powerful one. However, it is not all unidirectional. While Hollywood productions dominate the entertainment market across the globe, Mexican soap operas, Indian movies, and postcolonial literature (African, Middle Eastern, Far Eastern) and other cultures' artefacts also do travel. Nonetheless, the balance in power relations governing First World-Third World relations governs this cultural flow. In practice, it decides what is to be selected for consumption, translation, marketing, reviewing, teaching, etc., hence, jeopardizes the ongoing demand for the globalization of cultures.

The politics of inclusion and exclusion extend to reach all cultural products including Third World texts which, in the process of travelling across national and cultural boundaries, are reproduced and reshaped to fit local agendas. In order to examine these texts within their old and new contexts, it is essential that we first acknowledge that texts do not travel by accident. Unless originally written in English, they must be selected then translated; they must be published and distributed; and they must be brought to the attention of readers through circles of decisive mechanisms such as reviewing and inclusion in educational courses. Market weight plays a significant role in such processes. Decisions about selecting texts for translation or educational purposes, editing, publishing and circulation are all made with economic factors in mind besides the political and cultural ones. Thus, for literature from the non-Western world, the Arab/Islamic world for instance, decisions are made in relation to marketing strategies, current political affairs, and considerations of audience appeal to foreground certain texts and voices and edge others. Marketing decisions depend heavily on the ideological and political agendas of the translating culture. Thus, these three factors are important elements that must be taken into consideration when analysing the production and reproduction of
literary texts as they decide which texts are chosen for translation, the way they are translated, reviewed, edited, published and marketed. In fact, these three elements are essential for the analysis of any communicative event (Fairclough 1995: 62).

As it is today translation is often associated with acts of discrimination, inclusion, exclusion and stereotyping, that it has become synonymous with domination, appropriation and misrepresentation of cultures. The nature of the translating market, the Western one in our case, has been dominated by selective strategies. As we have already cited, Venuti (1996: 196) demonstrates how over the last three centuries Anglo-American translation theory and practice have had normalizing and naturalizing effects through what he calls domestication and foreignization. The ultimate aim of such strategies, as discussed earlier, has been to hold back source voices and texts that do not fit within the local image of the foreign culture, but advance those which represent foreign and alien cultures in terms of what is familiar and unchallenging to the dominant culture. The decision often depends on a publisher’s assessment of marketability. In addition, issues that come into play during the process of translation itself such as decisions to reshape a text are addressed with a target audience and sales figures in mind. Reporting on a personal experience of translating contemporary Arabic literature (the work of the Syrian writer Abd al-Salam al-Ujaili) into English, Peter Clark (1997: 109) writes:

I proposed to my British publisher a volume of Ujaili’s short stories. The editor said, ‘there are three things wrong with the idea. He’s male. He’s old and he writes short stories. Can you find a young female novelist?’ Well, I looked into women’s literature and did translate a novel by a woman writer even though she was and is in her eighties.
Al-Ujaili at the time was a doctor in his seventies who had written poetry, criticism, novels and short stories (Clark 1997: 109). Many of his short stories which Clarks finds 'outstanding' and 'well worth putting into English' are 'located in the Euphrates valley and depict the tensions of individuals coping with politicisation and the omnipotent state' (ibid.). According to Fairclough (1995: 40), 'the economics of an institution is an important determinant of its practices'. This can be illustrated through the example of *Nisanit*, a political novel that depicts Arab-Israeli and intra-Arab conflicts originally written in English by the Jordanian author Fadia Faqir. Amireh and Majaj (2000: 5) give an account of the changes that the American King Penguin edition made to the novel. According to them, the cover of the American edition reflects none of the political themes of the original. Instead, the cover feeds audience ideas about Arab women through presenting the image of a woman covered in black and positioned against a stretch of geometric tile. The cover of course draws at the familiar veiled Arab women whose body, and sometimes face, are unseen and who are treated within an already marked out space. ‘The cover has no relation with the theme of the actual novel in which women and men live under political, social, and economic pressures that are not reducible to a one-dimensional Islamic or patriarchal oppression’ (Amireh & Majaj 2000: 5).

We have argued in Chapter Five that the translation establishment, like any profit making institution, sponsors products for marketing and that akin to all types of products, they need to be promoted. Thus, the nature of the market producing translation is what decides what is to be translated, who and how. For instance, in the case of Fadia Faqir's novel *Nisanit*, featuring the image of a veiled woman feeds audience expectations and ideas about Arab women as it bears a curious familiarity with the Western 'exotic veiled Arab women' (cf. Amireh & Majaj 2000). Thus, the
ideology of the culture producing a translation decides what marketing decisions it makes- one that is eye catching, attracts readers and ensures sales, but that does not necessarily reflect the actual theme of the text. As a result, certain Third World voices choose to write specifically for translation. For example, Arab critics and readers accuse the Egyptian writer Nawal El-Saadawi, ‘whose celebrity in the West served to de-legitimise her from her Egyptian and Arab readers’, of writing for a Western audience not for them (ibid.: 7). The very welcomed reception of El-Saadawi and her writings is seen as a proof that she writes and says what the West wants to hear: ‘it would be difficult to overstate the degree to which Saadawi’s views are misrepresented to English-speaking audiences. Yet this process does not work in one direction only and builds on a complex dialectic; the nature of Saadawi’s writing has radically changed in response to the pressures and appeal of the Western marketplace’ (Dallal 1998: 8). Although she is an outspoken critic of the West, El-Saadawi’s critique of her culture, specifically her accounts of circumcision, and discussions of women and the Arab world come hand in hand with the already existing stereotypes about Arab culture, Arab women and Islam in the West. In addition, her non-political writings are seen as the window that grants Western readers a glimpse into the lives of Arab women and culture- as lifting the veil and revealing the mysterious world of Arab women. The back cover of her Love in the Kingdom of Oil inscribes San Francisco Chronicle’s declaration that ‘More than any other woman, El-Saadawi has come to embody the trials of Arab feminism’. It also promises readers that El-Saadawi’s ‘rich novel...dares anew to confront major issues and questions surrounding a woman’s role and position in a repressive, patriarchal order’. Meanwhile, Love in the Kingdom of Oil tells the story of a woman who leaves work and a husband to search for a Goddess but never returns. Instead, she
ends up in a place where oil is the food and air of its inhabitants and she accidentally marries another man. The story does not, at any point, give readers what San Francisco Chronicle promises them. In addition, the cover illustration of the same novel, which is the same in the original and translation, does not reflect the argument of the story, rather features the image of a sad-looking and miserable but unveiled woman centred between two pictures- one of a man dressed as an Arab, specifically the Arabian Gulf costume, and the other of a mosque. Again, like Faqir’s *Nisanit*, the cover draws at the position of the Arab woman in a male dominant Islamic society who is treated within a predefined space marked out by religion and men although, contrary to Faqir’s, the Arab woman on El-Saadawi’s cover is, according to her feminist views, a modern woman liberated of the veil. The mosque, referring to Islam, is not mentioned anywhere in the novel.

Indeed, such marketing decisions are not arbitrary. Carbonell (1996) argues that regardless of the increase in the number of works translated from Arabic into European languages, there is an inescapable underlying tendency to select a particular work for translation according to its outlandish character or appealing subject matter. Translation per se introduces a cultural Other as the familiar and recognizable to serve domestic agendas (cultural, economic, political) of foreign cultures (Venuti 1996: 196). The tools used in translating or choosing what to translate from the Arab/ Islamic world are still within the same old rules which Venuti (1998a/b) refers to as domestication of the foreign and which Burton maintained in his translation of the *Arabian Nights*, which is regarded a reference to the Arab/ Islamic world, in 1885. Often, as Marilyn Booth’s statement indicates, voices and texts that are in line with the basis myths about Arabs and Islam propagated and maintained by Western media in which Islam and the Arabs are
repeatedly identified in negative and hostile terms are constantly selected. This attitude towards Arabs and Islam is not recent. For the West, 'Islam has replaced communism that once haunted the West and the enemy Muhammad has replaced the enemy Marx' (BBC documentary, January, 23, 2001).

Historically, the perception of the Arab/ Islamic world has been regulated primarily by stereotypes that are a collection of ideas and images preserved in the collective memory of the translating culture and which regulate and generate most representations and translations (cf. Said 1997; Faiq 2003). Indeed, the anti-Arab/ Islam trend has been portrayed in many Hollywood movies such as Aladdin and its theme song which identified his birthplace as a place ‘where the camels roam...where they cut off your ear if they do not like your face’ (Khouri 1997), Father of the Bride 2 in which a Middle Eastern unshaved villain by the name of Mr. Habib, portrayed as evil and greedy, extorts thousands of dollars from naive families and verbally abuses his wife, Operation Condor in which the evil characters are greedy Arab buffoons shown following the film’s stars as they search for a treasure and try to attack them but instead they fall from the windows, trip over each other and engage in a series of unsuccessful acts. The movie G. I. Jane contains an end sequence in which the star proves she is worthy of being a navy seal by killing a horde of Arabs. Other movies which include True Lies, Escaping LA, Iron Eagle II, Die Hard III, and Three Kings to name but a few, maintain the same idea. The knowledge that readers and viewers, of which translators, receive about the Arab/ Islamic world through the various spheres of the media contributes to their perception of that part of the world. Recently, a well known BBC presenter wrote ‘deeply offensive, unscrupulous and factually incorrect opinions...set[ing] up the dichotomy of “us” versus Arabs in the title of his dreadful piece “We Owe Arabs
Nothing?? describing Muslims and Arabs as 'suicide bombers, limb amputators and women oppressors' (Dowd 2004: 11). In her comments, Helen Dowd argued that besides presenting information based on fictional and nonfactual data, if the presenter's views 'influence one person...they fortify in the mind...the horrendous views that Arabs are “bad”'. This case shows as Venuti (1998a: 73) rightly states that 'when...projects reflect the interests of a specific cultural constituency the resulting image of the foreign culture may still achieve national dominance, accepted by many readers in the domestic culture whatever their social position may be'. Indeed, the decision of the translators, editors and publishers as members of a culture that sees Arabs and Islam as such, be it in choosing what to translate or adopting a translation strategy, is vehemently affected by their acquired culture. As a consequence, the outcome of such translation projects does not benefit cultural globalization, rather, merely confirms the already existing representations of Arabs and Islam. In other words, and as Said (1978: 5-6) succinctly puts it, 'the Orient is created or orientalized, made to coincide with European ideas about the orient'.

Islam and the Arabs are seen by some as a threat to the Anglo-American bloc economically, politically and culturally (cf. Mohamad 2002; Amireh 1996). Therefore, they are re-created through stereotypes that serve the Western interests (cf. Said 1997). The Arab/ Islamic world has been the focus of interest of many powers due to its strategic location, in the middle between East (China, Japan and North Korea) and West and in the heart of the Arab/ Israeli war, and its natural resources. It holds the world's largest oil reserves besides natural gas. Thus, the stability of the area is very peculiar to the security of the rest of the world. A cut off in oil supplies or a rise in prices will lead to an economic disaster just as the one that happened in 1975 or that which was about to happen before the 1991 Gulf War. For these very
reasons, the West is keen to maintain its authority and control on that part of the world. In 1993, the financial editor of the Chicago Tribune proposed that ‘the USA should become a mercenary state using its monopoly power in the security market to maintain its control over the world economic system, selling protection to other wealthy powers who would pay a war premium’ (quoted in El-Saadawi 1997: 24).

In this context and concerning the relationship between the Arabs/Islam and the West (Europe and North America) economically and politically, much has changed but the nature of the stereotypes that regulate the discursive strategies in western discourses, including translation, and shape the West’s knowledge of that part of the world has changed little. Rather, the stereotypes have primarily become powerful means that demolish the rich diversity of the peoples and cultures of the Arab and Islamic world and trade it with terrorism and fundamentalism. Such stereotypes justify the West’s interference in that part of the world; to save the people from themselves and their neighbours. In addition, it facilitates the West’s military presence in the area, which before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was strongly rejected by the Arab and Muslim population. As a result, the West maintains control over the Arab/Islamic world not only culturally but also economically and politically in accordance with its interests so long as it maintains the terrorism/barbarism perception of the Arab/Islamic world in the West. In the last two decades of the 20th century and even more significant the first years of the new century (particularly after the events of September 11, 2001 in the USA), ‘there has been an unprecedented use and abuse of stereotypes about the Arabs and Islam often with damaging consequences’ (Faiq 2003: 52) to the extent that ‘speaking Arabic or even reading an Arabic document in public is likely to draw unwelcome attention. And of course, the media have run far too many “experts” and “commentators” on terrorism,
Islam, and the Arabs whose endlessly repetitious and reductive line is so hostile and so misrepresents our history, society and cultures...’ (Said 2002).

Within this context, Carbonell (1996: 89) poses a very fundamental question: to what extent, since quite a lot of Western representations of exotic entities are merely fictions of the Western mind imposed on actual peoples, are these peoples allowed to construct a selfhood devoid of Western assumptions and mythologies? There have been many sincere attempts by Western intellectuals and journalists to see and introduce the Arabs and Islam beyond the keyhole and to challenge the stereotypical portrayals of the master discourse of translation from Arabic into English, but they are usually swollen up by the overwhelmingly dominant master discourses of representation. Translation within the frames provided by the dominant master discourse of translation from Arabic into English creates an image of the original, particularly for those who have no access to the reality of that original, that can undoubtedly be different from the truth, insofar as the translator can manipulate reality because he/she is under the pressure of a series of constraints typical of the culture to which he/she belongs (Alvarez & Vidal 1996: 5). In fact, the politics (power relations between the translating and translated cultures), economics (the nature of the market producing translation) and culture (ideology of the cultures involved in the translating process) of any institution are correlated that makes it essential to be aware of the ideology that administrates a translation (ibid.: 6).

In effect, the aforementioned constituents and norms of the translating culture determine what and who to be selected from other cultures for translation. They also decide what strategies to adopt throughout the encoding and decoding processes. As mentioned earlier, this selective attitude towards foreign voices and texts promoted many writers to write wittingly for translation such as Nawal El-Saadawi, Hanan al-
Shaykh, Salim Barakat. Dallal (1998: 8) argues that 'a large number of novels are written in Arabic, the target audience for which is primarily Western'. 'Novels which are translated are often imagined to reconfirm accepted notions about two dominant subjects: Arab women and the Islamic resurgence or what is called “Islamic fundamentalism”' (Dallal 1998: 8). Translation from Arabic has followed representational strategies within an established framework. 'Novels are chosen least often for their innovative technique; when this is of interest, it must take forms recognizable in the West. In most cases, interest lies in the content' (ibid.). Within this framework whatever links the Arab/Islamic world to violence, bloodshed, civil wars, backwardness, poverty of the majority and luxury of the elite, ignorance, drought, hunger, violation of human rights, torture, imprisonment and discrimination against women, women's sexuality, social oppression, political dictatorship, severe penal codes, traditionalism and the persecution of intellectuals, writers and artists, etc., is a point of attraction apart from few exceptions that do not affect mainstream trends. And recently one more theme has been added; terrorism. Sabah Zwein (2001) in her review of the Arabic version of Nawal El-Saadawi’s latest novel Love in the Kingdom of Oil remarks: 'Love in the Kingdom of Oil follows none of the pre-existing conventions for novels: it is not a contemporary French-style novel...nor is it an American-style novel... It is not even an Arabic-style novel... Al-Saadawi’s narrative lacks structure and strategy, a particularly surprising omission since she has claimed to present the “issues”'. In terms of the content, according to Zwein, the novel combines outdated, false and unjustified 'fragmented ideas'. Nonetheless, the novel was published in English only a few months after the publication of the Arabic version.
A better understanding of the constituents that constitute a master discourse of representation within which translators, editors and publishers operate might lead to making translation a true process of intercultural understanding for a fair globalization of cultures rather than being a technology of domination reinforcing the already existing images and representations in a culture about its others leading undesirably to accusations and counter accusations of misrepresentation. To achieve such a goal, translation between Western and non-Western cultures needs to review what André Lefevere (1999) calls the ‘conceptual and textual grids’, precisely the ‘culture of translating’ and ‘translation of cultures’, from which I think most master discourses of representation generate. The two overlapping grids are the outcome of the collective reservoirs of beliefs, ideas and images. The textual grid is a type of accepted and acceptable texts, language and structure that decide whether a certain text will be accepted or rejected by a certain culture (Lefevere 1999: 76). The conceptual grid on the other hand deals with the ideological aspects. To illustrate his conceptual and textual grids, Lefevere (ibid.: 77) gives the following example: when Kellogg’s attempted to market their Corn Flakes for the emerging middle class Indians, it failed. The product took off only when it was remarketed and reintroduced as ‘Basmati Flakes’. He argues that a successful communication is one that is the product of a virtual mutual agreement between the writer of a text and the reader, to play their assigned parts in connection with the markers that the writer is supposed to put for the reader that s/he will recognize. Accordingly, the presence of conceptual and textual grids in any given culture means that it is prescribed to translate, for example, using a specific language and structure. The translator, acting as a writer, will think in correspondence to the dominant conceptual and textual grids, consciously or unconsciously, as s/he decides what texts and voices must be
translated and how they should be translated and represented, in order to meet his/her reader’s expectations. Such grids are constructed historically and brought into being by certain elements (ibid.) such as ideology, power relations between the decoded and encoding cultures, and marketability. The grids may last for a certain span of time to be changed or even abandoned constituting as such a master discourse or a norm.

In the case of translation, especially when translating from non-Western to Western cultures, bearing in mind the power relations between the two cultures, the grids may entail a degree of violence. Translating from Arabic, for example, with specific traditions for the production, reception and circulation of texts, as discussed above, has meant taking liberties, being invisible, and sometimes violent, to shift the texts into mainstream world culture and literature (see A Sample Analysis below). World culture and literature refers to the Western textual and conceptual grids of production. World culture can accommodate foreign signs and concepts, so long as neither conflicts radically with systems of profit (Asad 1995: 331). Profit, of course, depends on whether products feed audience expectations. Updike’s reaction to the translation of Munif’s Cities of Salt, for example, stems from this one-sided ideology, which suggests that the West expects others to adapt to its norms in order to be welcomed as members of world culture and literature.

The asymmetrical relationships of power between the translating and translated cultures compel translators as well as editors and publishers, whether consciously or unconsciously, to apply the contextual and conceptual grids of the translating cultures. Hence, they introduce the alien cultures as familiar stripped of their foreignness on the level of language, structure even content. The outcome may, therefore, undermine readers’ assumptions and judgment regarding both the original
and translation. It may also, and most importantly, pre-define readers conclusions, derived from the translation, regarding the original culture because the translated texts often construct foreign cultures in terms of the two grids; the conceptual and textual. According to Lefevere (1999: 77) translations of non-Western cultures particularly by Western ones are made in terms of Western categories in order to enable the West to understand these cultures and hence come to terms with them.

Indeed, the conceptual and textual grids play a major role not only in how foreign cultures are translated, but most importantly what and who gets translated. They are very much associated with the inclusion of certain writers, voices, ideas, texts, etc., and the exclusion of others by publishers and patrons who instruct the translations. ‘Here a specific cultural constituency controls the representation of foreign literatures for other constituencies in the domestic culture, privileging certain domestic values to the exclusion of others and establishing a canon of foreign texts that is necessarily partial because it serves certain domestic interests’ (Venuti 1998a: 71). Hence, the calculated choice of foreign texts and the development of translation strategies according to the existing conceptual and textual grids consolidate the domestic canons for foreign literatures, and confirm the domestic identity of the foreign culture instead of creating a readership that is more open to linguistic and cultural differences. Edward Fowler (1992, cited in Venuti 1998a: 71-72) gives an account of modern Japanese fiction into English and states that during the 1950s and 1960s American publishers issued many translations of Japanese novels and story collections. However, Venuti (1998a: 72) declares that their choices were very selective and focused on few writers hence ‘established a canon of Japanese fiction in English, which was not only unrepresentative, but based on a well-defined stereotype that has determined reader expectations for nearly forty years’. In
addition, the identity that this canon established ‘travelled beyond English since English translations of Japanese fiction were routinely translated into other European languages during the same period’ (ibid.). The decision to choose certain writers but exclude others, argues Fowler (cited in Venuti 1998a: 72), was made by university professors in association with trade publishers. According to him, Japan was represented as an ‘exoticized, aestheticized and quintessentially foreign land quite antithetical to its pre-war image of a bellicose and imminently threatening power’ (cited in Venuti 1998a: 72). ‘The English language canon of Japanese fiction functioned as a domestic cultural support for American diplomatic relations with Japan, which were also designed to contain Soviet expansionism in the East, at a time when Japan was being transformed from a mortal enemy during the Pacific War to an indispensable ally during the Cold War’ (Venuti 1998a: 73). Indeed, the calculated selections and choices infused by the conceptual and textual framework provided, through translation, the exact image that the United States desperately needed.

The 1980s and 1990s, however, witnessed a considerable opening up by Western cultures and societies onto non-Western peoples, cultures and literature. Nonetheless, of all major languages and despite a Nobel Prize in Literature, Arabic, the official language of 22 countries and approximately 400 million people of which millions living in the West remains the least translated-from language even if compared to Classical, Greek and Latin (cf. Venuti 1995). Edward Said (1995: 97) aptly remarks on such a situation,

For all the major world literatures, Arabic remains relatively unknown and unread in the West, for reasons that are unique, even remarkable, at a time when tastes here for the non-European are more developed than ever
before and, even more compelling, contemporary Arabic literature is at a particularly interesting juncture.

In addition, and perhaps more importantly, even though there are institutional programs developed to improve cross-cultural exchange between the West and the Arab/Islamic world, they continue to be dominated by institutions and individuals whose formative experiences have been shaped by the history between the Arabs/Islam and the West. In translation, Arabic literary texts and voices remain rarely chosen for their innovativeness, rather to the degree of harmony with the master discourse of translating and representing Arabs, Arab culture and Islam. Only texts produced by ‘acculturated’ authors that are the closest to the Western aesthetics and values are translated (Jacquemond 1997). For example, Muwaylihi’s *Hadiith ‘isa bnu Hisham* is not translated into French but Tawfik al-Hakim’s *Maze of Justice: Diary of a country prosecutor* and Taha Hussein’s *The Steam of Days* are (Jacquemond 1997). In other words, writers who span the two cultures (Arab/Islamic and Western) and whose works combine between the Western ideals and values, on the one hand, and the description of Arab culture and Islam as naïve yet sophisticated, on the other hand, find their way into translation. Naguib Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize novel, for example, was given the full Western seal in 1988 for it provides to the Western reader an exoticising and a naturalizing reception, which conforms to the Western culture of translating Others: ‘solidly realistic novels, which conform to the western canons of the novel and which give the reader his money’s worth, in that they give him an overall vision of the “customs of the country”’ (Jacquemond 1997: 157; Thomas 1998: 104-5). On the whole, the Western conceptual and textual grids which establish the framework for the culture of translating and the translation of non-Western cultures ultimately lead to
manipulations of the target culture through the processes of choosing a material for translation and translating, thus, regulating and/or satisfying and agreeing with the expected response of and/or sought from the receivers of the translation. This form of manipulation infused by the conceptual and textual grids exerts violence on foreign cultures. The result deprives source text producers of their voices, on the one hand, and creates a huge gap between the reception of the same literary work in its original culture and the culture of translation. Nawal El-Saadawi's (an Egyptian feminist and female writer) writings, for example, are more familiar in the West than in her local Arab society. Some of her books are translated more than three times and the translations are often consumed as a transparent window into the Arab culture and society, and Islam. Consequently, a domestic cultural identity for the foreign culture is formed (Venuti 1998a: 67). The culture of translation and the translation of culture from the Arab/Islamic world 'has largely been positioned through the selection of translation material that the prevailing view of Arab culture- as a mixture of the quaint, the barbarously primitive and the comfortably dependant-is to a large degree a product of those texts which have been selected for translation' (Thomas 1998: 104-5). Hence, it confirms the prevailing idea that the Arab/Islamic culture is not only dead but that its present cultural product is worthless unless it stems from natives who have adapted the Western forms and values and thus confirm, from within the Arab/Islamic culture itself, the clear dichotomy between tradition and modernity, backwardness and progress, etc. (Jacquemond 1997).

Critical Discourse Analysis combined with the perception of the master discourse of representation, and the conceptual and textual grids provide grounds for analyzing text and culture in translation in order to achieve an understanding of the processes that shape the in-between space. To illustrate, this thesis handles both
the translation of culture and the culture of translation. Examples are derived from El-Saadawi's novel *Love in the Kingdom of Oil*. This particular work by El-Saadawi was purposefully chosen to serve the hypothesis that she writes for translation. El-Saadawi is the most translated Arab writer today after Naguib Mahfouz (Dallal 1998: 8). Mainstream print media review her books, some of which are taught at university levels in the West (see Chapter Seven). El-Saadawi herself, though a medical doctor, was a visiting professor at Duke University Centre for International Studies. In the Arab world she is marginalized and some of her books are banned. Contrary to her status in the West and despite what one may think of the literary merits of her work, the majority of Arab intellectual circles do not consider El-Saadawi a representative of the Arabs and their culture (Bahgat 2001). In addition, some of her comments and views have alienated her from her Arab audience (Bahgat 2001; Lloyd-Davies 2001).

The aim of choosing El-Saadawi is to show how translation can form a particular cultural identity and maintain it through the calculated selection and manipulation of texts written by the native and which fit within a space that comes already formulated as a master discourse, on the basis that the space in-between need not come in a straightjacket. The Arab/ Islamic world is rich with male and female writers who come from different backgrounds and represent different ideologies. Nonetheless, in the case of female Arab writers 'the same women tend to be published: Assia Djebar for Algeria, Fatima Mernissi for Morocco, Nawal El-Saadawi for Egypt' (Lazreg 2000: 36) although there is a host of other innovative female writers of distinct orientations such as Layla Fosyran, Huda Barakaat, Salwa Safy, May Mansy, Hayfa BiTaar, Rawiya AbaDHa, Suha Bishaarah, Rimaa Sibaay Haqqy, to name but a few.
6.3 A Framework for Approaching Translation Culturally

Sharon Hamilton-Wieler (1988, cited in Synder 1996: 145) argues that removing an element from a text (i.e., writer, reader, content, meaning, intertextuality) affects its overall function since these elements are in a continuous rather than a static relationship with each other. In translation, the foreign text’s functionality and success in the domestic culture rely heavily on the acceptability of the foreign writer and the translator (as both a reader and writer), editor and publisher ability to give readers what they expect in terms of content and context (meaning and intertextuality). For translators, editors and publishers, the framework within which they decode and re-encode a foreign text and its culture is provided by the norms of a master discourse of representation in translation. From this it necessarily follows that when they are involved with foreign cultures, the stereotypes, which constitute reservoirs of images and ideas about the foreign culture preserved in their collective memory as members of a social group, provide grounds for their understanding of foreign texts and voices. In the case of translating from non-Western into Western cultures, the translators, editors and publishers’ culture and knowledge contribute to their choices and decisions, and to their ability to fairly translate the Other.

Since translating involves the transporting of languages from one cultural setting into another within an already marked out target constituency that ultimately yields a master discourse through which identity for other cultures is marked and within which translation is carried out, it is the aim of this thesis to examine how and what demands of the master discourse of representation affect cross cultural translation projects between Western and non-Western languages specifically Arabic and English within the context of globalization. Based on insights from Lefevere’s conceptual and textual grids, critical discourse analysis approaches, and the concept
of a master discourse of representation, in view of the political and economic history between the Arab/ Islamic world and the West, our framework for approaching translation culturally in terms of choices will be as follows:

1. Cultural context

2. Language
   a. Omission
   b. Replacement
   c. Addition

3. Structure
   a. Omission/ reordering of paragraphs, sentences, information
   b. Omission/ reordering of chapters

4. Reference
   a. Perceptual
   b. Linguistic

The production and reception of texts in translation is determined by the shared knowledge of the translating culture and how it sees and/ or wishes to see itself vis-à-vis others. As members of a socio-cultural group, translators as well as editors and publishers often work within spaces already marked out by their cultures for the foreign ones. As mentioned earlier, this state encouraged some writers, of which El-Saadawi, to write and/ or alter their works specifically for translation. This very purpose ultimately leaves little or no space for the translators, editors, reviewers to perform extrinsic managing or to intervene in the text deviously. As a result, the examples cited in Chapter Seven from Love in the Kingdom of Oil, the translation of El-Saadawi’s latest novel, are limited. Therefore, a sample analysis from the translation of Nawal El-Saadawi’s 1977 (literally, the naked
face of the Arab woman) translated as *The Hidden Face of Eve: Women in the Arab World* by S. Hetata in 1980, two years after the publication of the Arabic version, is included. The aim is to show, through a comparison between *The Hidden face of Eve* which marked the beginning of El-Saadawi’s international popularity and her latest novel *Love in the Kingdom of Oil*, how the culture of translation and the translation of culture can misrepresent a foreign voice, text and culture, and how they ultimately drive some writers to write for Western readers.

### 6.4 A Sample Analysis

*The Hidden Face of Eve* marked El-Saadawi’s ‘official’ crossover to the West and became one of the most influential books, often hailed as a classic (Amireh 2000: 219). It appeared in English just as the Iranian revolution of 1978-1979 was mounting. The replacement of the Shah by an Islamic government opposed to the United States policies posed a threat to the Western economic and political interests in the Middle East. This reading renewed Western interest in and hostility to Islam, hence influenced El-Saadawi’s introduction, image and reception in English.

Amireh (2000) gives an account of the differences between the Arabic, British and American editions. In the preface to her British edition (dated 1979) ElSaadawi relates the aim of her book to those of the Iranian revolution, which she does not mention in her Arabic edition. She devotes half of the introduction celebrating the revolution as an anti imperialist move continuous with her project as she believes that the liberation of women is not separate from their political, economic and national liberation. Her preface to the British edition indicates her awareness that she was addressing a different audience that has different expectations. However, contrary to her expectations, the preface and introduction annoyed some
reviewers that two reviewers writing for feminist journals in England and the United States expressed their disappointment with the introduction especially its celebration of the Iranian revolution, Islam and nationalism (Amireh 2000: 222). This response made El-Saadawi rethink how to readdress her book for the Western audience in the American edition. Knowing that her American audience would be even less tolerant of her condemnation and criticism of the American foreign policy, she omitted the celebration and defence of the Iranian revolution as well as her anti-imperialistic views from the American edition of the book, which was published in 1982 (ibid.). Instead, she focused on her argument about how religion is used by some political institutions in the Third World as an instrument of oppression. In another attempt to meet her audience’s expectations, El-Saadawi completely changes her views on clitoridectomy. In the British introduction she criticized those who pay the issue much attention and refer to it as a barbaric act, and ignore other serious problems that face women. This statement disappears from the American edition. In addition, she referred to the practice herself as barbaric perhaps in an attempt not to alienate herself from her Western readers. Thus, it is clear that El-Saadawi tries to control and frame how her Western readers will receive her. In the meantime, she is very well aware of how her criticisms of her own society are received in the West and tries to compromise between her values and those of her recipients to insure the selling of her books. The alterations take yet another lead as the book travels from Arabic into English.

The title of the book الموجه العاري للمرأة العربية was translated into The Hidden Face of Eve, which is a clear departure from the original. This title is anticipated to attract readers through a camouflaged reference to the veil. While the Arabic title (literally The naked face of the Arab woman) tries to reflect the aim of the book
which is to lie bare the truth about the lives of Arab women from a political point of view, the English title confirms readers’ assumptions and images of the Arab/Islamic world, rather than questions them, by using one of the most dominant metaphors about the Arabs, Arab women and Islam in the West. In addition, reference to the ‘Arab Woman’ in the title was replaced by ‘Eve’ hence reallocating the aim of the book ‘from historical to mythical’ in a rather borderless context allowing for the already existing images in the mind of English readers to predefine their judgment and the way they will conceive the book (Amireh 2000: 226). Alterations also reached the structure and content of the book. The book was written at a time when Egypt’s late president Sadat introduced his pro-capitalist policies of ‘openness’ that El-Saadawi opposed. Hence, she focused on criticizing capitalism in favour of socialism. However, two chapters in the original which are to the core of its aim were omitted ‘Women’s Work at Home’ and ‘Arab Woman and Socialism’ from the translation (ibid.: 224). In addition, a whole passage, which urges Arab women not to feel inferior to their Western counterparts and not think that Arab traditions and culture are more oppressive, was absent from the translation (ibid.: 225). Beside omissions, the translation added sections. Two chapters titled ‘The Grandfather with Bad Manners’ and ‘Circumcision of Girls’ were added (ibid.). The latter is often quoted and included in courses at university level in some American universities (ibid.). The translation also gives the first section of the book the title ‘The Mutilated Half’ which further emphasizes the theme of circumcision that the Arabic book mentions only in the author’s recitation of her childhood (ibid.). Besides additions and omissions, the translation rearranges the chapters of the book to meet its new aims. In the original, the sections that dealt with sexuality were placed at the end of the book while those dealing with the history of Arab women
were put first (Amireh 2000: 226). In the translation, however, those dealing with sexuality were brought forward, while the ones about history, which emphasize the fact that Arab women enjoyed better status in the past and that their present situation is not attributed to Islam indicating that true Islam empowers and dignifies women, were put last in the book (ibid.). ‘Her accounts of “clitoridectomy” are what is in demand; no one wants to hear her Islamic apologia, socialist commentary, or perspectives on Arab women that do not reconfirm Western stereotypes’ (Dallal 1998: 8). Her defence of Islam was dismissed by the reviewer explaining that ‘no culture as religion-dominated as Arabic culture can ever accomplish social or political equality for women’ (Amireh 2000: 227). Besides, a footnote in which she informs her readers that in a conference in the United States she criticized the stereotypical representation of Arab women in American movies was omitted from the British and American editions (ibid.: 225).

The Western culture of translating non-Western cultures, then, produced a book that is very different from the original. The rearrangement of the different chapters of the book, the omissions and additions, which fit within the framework through which the West sees its Others (the Arab/ Islamic world in our case) does violence, not only to the original text, but to its culture and identity and to the author herself. The reception of El-Saadawi that the translation granted her erases her political and anti-imperialistic identity and mentions her only in the context of circumcision and fundamentalist Islam as both a victim and native authority. Reflecting on this position, Saliba and Kattan (2000: 92) maintain that in a survey distributed to female students at five different universities to determine the ‘transnationalism’ of Arab women writers for which students were given the names of five authors ‘whose works are fairly well distributed in the West in English
translation as well as in Arabic’ of which El-Saadawi ‘whose writing has, in many ways, come to represent Arab women in the West’ (Saliba & Kattan 2000: 93), no one listed El-Saadawi as a nationalist and 93.9% said she was a feminist while only 1.1% identified her as a literary writer (especially that the Arab world has produced remarkable literary writers such as Naguib Mahfouz and Taha Hussein). However, this identity is supported by El-Saadawi herself by allowing her works to be used in this manner and giving the West what it seeks to hear and read. As an Arab feminist, El-Saadawi often disqualifies other Arab women’s feminism by pronouncing them Western hence inauthentic, which therefore grants her the authenticity that they may lack (Amireh 2000: 229). As a psychiatrist, El-Saadawi often speaks from the premise of an experienced rural Arab woman. She presents herself either as a rural Third World woman who achieved success in a male-dominant society and/or a lone feminist from the Arab world (ibid.). Combined with disqualifying other Arab women’s feminism, El-Saadawi offers herself to the West as the certified and true representative of Arab feminism, Arab culture, and Islam. She says, ‘I consider myself the voice of the silent majority in Egypt and the Arab world’ (cited in McMillan 1999). El-Saadawi continues to give the West what it wishes to know through her writings, novels, interviews and opinion although she is well aware that the West will use her critique of her culture against her to distance the Arab world from the Western one and reaffirm the ongoing stereotypes and representations of that part of the world. In an interview after a United Nations conference on women’s issues in Copenhagen in 1980, El-Saadawi criticized some Western attendees for focusing on Third-World women’s issues of sexuality and patriarchy to the exclusion of class and colonialism. This view was expressed by El-Saadawi before

The Western culture of translating non-Western cultures, inspired by the West’s relations of power with its Others, frames El-Saadawi’s voice and image in a way that fits Western agendas and assumptions: a West that is more interested in reading about women’s oppression, fundamentalist Islam and exotic Arabian Nights’ like narration. El-Saadawi herself encourages this representation. Her latest 134 pages novel *Love in the Kingdom of Oil*, which will be analyzed in the following chapter for the purpose of this thesis, confirms just that. In this novel, El-Saadawi does not refer to any of her political and anti-imperialistic views. She refers to oil and authority but focuses solely on an ambiguous relationship between men and women supposedly in the Arab and Muslim society. ‘Many critics of the literary world see this most recent work of hers as a testimony to their claim that El-Saadawi is being published and translated abroad while more worthy candidates are only known locally’ (cf. Woffenden 2001). *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* is about a woman who takes leave from work to start off a long journey digging and searching for traces of the ancient goddesses, specifically Hathor and Sekhmet. The author describes the woman’s journey in search of the goddesses’ remains in the desert telling her thoughts and adventures and the stories of the women she meets. In the Kingdom of Oil, where the female heroine finally reappears and inhabits, women are abused and no woman has dared before to disobey the orders of a man. In this Kingdom she faces more men in her life. She left her boss at work and her husband to become the wife of another. The novel is ‘marked by interrupted dialogues, changing narratives, dry descriptive accounts, scanty details and much ambiguity’ (Zwein 2001). In addition, it ‘lacks structure and strategy’ and ‘paragraphs are
speckled with bits and pieces of colourless and tasteless dialogue that presents no new ideas and does not support a storyline’ (ibid.). The novel which is burdened by ‘intermittent and voiceless dialogue’ scattered throughout, is also ‘very awkward and tentative and jumps from one theme into another’ (Zwein 2001; Woffenden 2001). The novel is full of ambiguity; the vacation, the oil, the man she marries, the women carrying barrels of oil, the ambiguous time and places. It does not relate these different themes, which leaves the end obscure and lacking.

*Love in the Kingdom of Oil* in its back cover promises to ‘confront major issues and questions surrounding a woman’s role and position in a repressive, patriarchal order’. However, there is no such confrontation of major issues and questions relating to the role and position of women. On the contrary, much of the questions that the novel poses, especially with regard to the war between the sexes, are outdated and have been more effectively handled by El-Saadawi herself in earlier work. The overwhelming presence of oil which is not justified could have been more effective had the author focused on the power of the oil economy and its impact on romantic relationships, especially women, as the title suggests. This hail of criticism makes one wonder what makes this novel worthy of translation and how the quality of translation can be assessed.

*Love in the Kingdom of Oil*, which was published in 2001 and translated by Basil Hatim and Malcolm Williams, is the translation of الحب في زمن النفط (literally Love in the time of oil) published by Saqi Books in London in 2000.

### 6.5 Conclusion

Intercultural translation has helped in bridging the gap between cultures and peoples, but at the same time it has formulated domestic identities for foreign
cultures, becoming therefore the site for cross-cultural prejudice. As far as translation from Arabic is concerned, there is a continuous interaction between Western representations of Arabic culture and the culture and politics of translation from Arabic. It tends to fit within two criteria: the dominant ideology and poetics of translation from Arabic, and the dominant stereotypical representations of the Arab/Islamic culture. The Western culture of translating from the Arab/Islamic world keeps reinforcing the same representations Orientalism has created through the calculated selection of texts and voices for translation and/ or inscribing in the structure of language itself (English and the Arabic of those who write for translation) the images of a violent and different, yet familiar and exotic orient. Translation as such confirms the stereotypical representations as the encyclopaedia to the orient and reasserts their status as the authorized mediators between the Arab/Islamic and Western cultures. The Arab and, by extension, Islamic worlds have undeniably been represented as the extremely hostile and barbaric, yet also the exotic and ally. The Western culture of translation from Arabic ultimately led to hostility not only to everything that is Arabic but also to Islam.

Today Islam is defined negatively as that with which the West is radically at odds, and this tension establishes a framework radically limiting knowledge of Islam. So long as this framework stands, Islam, as a vitally lived experience for Muslims, cannot be known.

Said (1997:163)

The ethics of translation, however, postulate that translation should signal the foreignness of the foreign text and create a readership that is more open to cultural differences (Venuti 1998a: 87). Translation should be a true process of intercultural understanding for a true globalization of cultures rather than a tool for reinforcing
existing representations and images of one culture about the other. This can be achieved through a cross-cultural assessment of the discourses underlying translation and translating between the Western and Arab/ Islamic world.

Taking off from this premise, the following chapter discusses the case of *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* by Nawal El-Saadawi foregrounding the translation traffic from Arabic into English and a biography of Nawal El-Saadawi.
Chapter Seven

7 The Case of Love in the Kingdom of Oil

7.1 Introduction

As the previous chapters have shown, translation from Arabic has for long been prisoner of the old/new strategies of domestication despite the enormous and unprecedented interest in the Arabs, their culture and Islam. The master discourse of translation and representation, which is the result of the conceptual and textual grids, subjugated Arab texts and voices to selective tools through which texts and voices recognized as conforming to the master discourse of writing about and representing Arabs, Arab culture and Islam find their way into translation. Their texts are altered and manipulated in translation in such a way to meet audiences' expectations and assumptions. We have also shown in the sample analysis provided how this situation has led many writers to write specifically for translation. In addition, it led to a situation where the proportion of books translated from Arabic is minute despite a Nobel Prize in literature. The discussion in the previous chapters also illustrates how the manipulated representations of one side about the other can be taken as part of the scheme of history, given that the two, different cultures, have clashed, and continue to do so.

As it reinforces in the translating culture the stereotypical representations of the translated one but in voices from within the latter, translation radically limits knowledge of the different voices and hinders the heterogeneity of the people and richness of the culture. Based on the information in the previous chapters and
foregrounding the translation traffic from Arabic, this chapter considers the case of El-Saadawi and the translation of her latest novel *Love in the Kingdom of Oil*.

### 7.2 Translation Traffic from Arabic

The manipulative representations that a culture circulates about another are not just the outcome of history but they are what makes history. The Arab culture and the Western one are two different cultures that have clashed many times, and continue to do so. Until the end of the first half of the last century the Europeans colonized most of the Arab world. Today, the Arab/Israeli war persists and the rest of the Arab world is under the custody of the United States. Within this context, the nature of the strategies adopted in Western discourses, of which translation, have changed a little. The state that the Arab world lives is reflected in poetry, novels and short stories and even non-fictional literature. However, as we have argued in the previous chapter, very little is translated from the Arab/Islamic world and more than often, what is written about that culture is far more than what is translated from it (cf. Jacquemond 1997).

The Arab world with its different nations embraces different ideologies, histories even religions. Nonetheless, the culture of translating (conceptual grid) and the translation of culture (textual grid) between Arabic and mainstream European languages are smothered. Within this context, translation traffic from Arabic is alarming because the outcome corresponds to a minuscule number of translations from Arabic, most of which further reinforce the dominant representations acquiring thus the status of facts (cf. Carbonell 1996). According to the UNESCO nearly 1% only of the global translation output is from Arabic, the official language of 22 countries and some 400 million speakers, and over 1200 million Muslims who also
use it for limited purposes. Statistics reported by Venuti (1995: 14) illustrate the number of Arabic works translated for the years 1982, 1983 and 1984. In 1982, 298 Arabic works were translated in the United States out of a total of 54198, 322 in 1983 out of 55618, and 536 in 1984 out of a total of 52405 translated foreign works. These figures are microscopic compared with translations of classical Greek and Latin works. Translations from these sources were 839, 1116 and 1035 for the three years respectively (ibid.). In 1987 the global translation output was approximately 65,000 volumes but only 479 were from Arabic (ibid. 1998a: 160).

Joseph Zeidan, a literary historian, lists 480 Arab women writing between 1880 and 1980 and some 150 women writers from the Arab world who gathered in 1995 in Cairo for the first Arab Women Book Fair, which exhibited more than 1500 titles (cf. Amireh 1996) which makes no sense why one, or few writers, should be quoted as the only source of information about that part of the world. What is more disturbing is that the translation attitude towards foreign cultures often has the power to,

(re)constitute and cheapen foreign texts, to trivialize and exclude foreign cultures, and thus potentially to figure in racial discrimination and ethnic violence, international political confrontations, terrorism, war.

Venuti (1996: 196)

What Venuti lists applies wholesale to the representation of the Arabs and Islam through translation (Islam always associated with Arabs although only 18 percent of Muslims are Arabs). Clark’s experience of translating Arabic literature into English (see Chapter Six) fits the network in which Arabs and Islam are fashioned.
As demonstrated in section 6.4 in the course of the example provided, it is obvious that the norms of translation from Arabic ultimately led to the creation of Arab writers who write in Arabic but for translation. In most cases, and as Dallal (1998) explains, the works of such Arab authors that find their way into the West through translation are taken by Western critics as evidence that the stereotypes and clichés used to represent/translate Arabs and Islam are in fact facts uttered by the natives. Jacquemond (1997: 157) aptly remarks,

The documents are all the better received since they confirm at the same time the otherness of the culture (backward, authoritarian...) and the representation French culture bestows on itself (modern, democratic...) – confirmation all the more gratifying since it stems from the other.

The back-cover of Hanan Al-Shaykh's *Women of Sand and Myrrh*, for example, declares that 'little is known of what life is like for contemporary Arab women living in the Middle East' and promises the reader that Al-Shaykh's novel will provide a glimpse behind this 'still-closed society' (Amireh 1996). In a similar vein, Jacquemond (1997) argues that Naguib Mahfouz was presented to the Western audience as the ethnographer of the ordinary people of Cairo although eight years before Mahfouz won the Nobel Prize in Literature, Edward Said was told 'Arabic is a controversial language' in an explanation by a New York publisher who refused the Arabic titles which included some of Mahfouz's work that Said suggested for translation,

Eight years before Naguib Mahfouz won the Noble Prize in Literature, a major New York commercial publisher known for his literal and unprovincial views asked me to suggest some Third World novels for translation and inclusion in a series he was planning. The list I gave him was headed by two or three of Mahfouz's works, none of which was then
in circulation in the United States. True, there were a few novels by the Egyptian master available in England, but these had never gained entry into the United States, and even in Europe were principally known only by a few students of Arabic. Several weeks after I submitted my list I inquired which novels had been chosen, only to be informed that the Mahfouz translations would not be undertaken. When I asked why, I was given an answer that haunted me ever since. ‘The problem’, I was told, ‘is that Arabic is a controversial language.’ (1995: 97)

Other writers, male as well as female, have benefited from the international interest in Mahfouz whose Nobel Prize must have made Arabic less controversial. Such writers, whose works portray only a thin slice of the society, are taken as representatives of all Arabs and Islam to reinforce what Lefevere (1996) called ‘the dominant poetics, the dominant ideology’ of the western culture of representing its other. Foreign organizations and publishers in the metropolitan centres often support these writers considering them ‘lone voices’, translate and celebrate them (cf. Amireh 1996; 2000) (consider the case of El-Saadawi below).

The long history between the West and the Arab/ Islamic world cannot be dismissed as irrelevant to the literary reception of Arab writers, specifically women, in the Western marketplace. The West’s interest in Arab women writers corresponds to its interest in and hostility to Islam, central to the colonialist project (Amireh 1996). The Western policies in the Arab/ Islamic world, precisely concerning the Arab/ Israeli war, in addition to the three Gulf Wars and the Iranian revolution, which resulted in the emergence of political Islamic groups opposed to the Western policies and the collaborating corrupted regimes, paved the way for the West to announce what it referred to as fundamentalist Islam as its post cold-war enemy (BBC documentary 2001). In addition, the relentless reiteration of issues such as the veil, the inheritance, the harem, excision, and polygamy under misinterpretations of
Islam represented Arab women as victims of a region and a religion that are exotic, yet violent. Within this context Arab women novelists are reframed in line with the dominant discourse to meet the expectations and assumptions of Western readers (consider the case of El-Saadawi’s *The Hidden Face of Eve*, Chapter Six).

Translation traffic from Arabic, thus, creates a set of characters and ideologies organized around the contrast between the West (Self) and East (Other) in which the exotic Orient is represented in a table of accessible information, and so, a typical cultural product of Western dominance (Aydin 1994). The ideology of cultural globalization today subjugates the Arab/ Islamic world to translation projects and strategies that are suppressive and which eventually result in perverted images. One reviewer, an American feminist, according to Amireh (1996; 2000: 227) was reminded after reading one of El-Saadawi’s books of where Western women ‘have all come from’. This subjugation ultimately feeds into bloody resistance from the Other. Within this tumult there seems to be ‘a blockade designed to interdict any attention to texts that do not reiterate the usual clichéd about Islam, violence, sensuality, and so forth’ (Said 1995: 9).

Drawing on Wodak and Ludwig’s postulation that discourse, which always involves power and ideologies where norms and values have a relevant role, is historical connected synchronically and diachronically with other events, the following part will examine how the constraints and demands of the master discourse of translation from Arabic affected the production and translation of *Love in the Kingdom of Oil*, and ultimately the reception of Nawal El-Saadawi in the West. From a Critical Discourse Analysis point of view and following models set by Van Dijk and Fairclough, the study will consider the cultural context (the historical and political background of the writer’s reception in the Arab world and the West), the
language, the structure and references (all three in terms of choices) of *Love in the Kingdom of Oil*.

### 7.3 Case Study

الحب في زمن النفط is the most recent of Nawal El-Saadawi’s (Nawaal al-Sa’daaawy) than 30 books, which have been translated into 20 languages. It was published by Saqi Books in London in 2000 and is sold for £8.90. Saqi Books also published *Memoirs of a Woman Doctor* in 1987, *Woman against Her Sex*, and *Two women in One* in 1985. In this 152-pages novel, the main players are a woman, a man, and oil. The novel is not about the politics of oil or the struggle for liberation or the effect of oil on romantic relations but merely about a married woman who takes leave from work to search for the goddesses’ remains but never comes back. In her community nobody else has ever dared to disobey the command of men, which was why the police commissioner investigating the case could not understand how a woman could simply walk away. There is an indication that the woman was seeking love and her lost dignity in her search for the goddesses but the author does not develop this theme into the novel or link it to the other events. The woman finally reappears in a village where oil is everywhere only to become the wife of another man and live the same life she escaped.

The mention of oil is everywhere in the novel but there fails to be a significant examination of how it relates to the goddesses’ theme. Even towards the end as the novel explores some of the qualities of the goddesses, it fails to link them with the surreal world the author describes where the black gold is part of the landscape. The theme of oil could have been used more effectively had she focused on explaining how the politics of oil left the region at the mercy of illiterate emirs.
and kings. The lack of effective links and descriptions leaves the whole scene rather like an unfinished jigsaw.

As mentioned before, *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* is the translation of *الحب في زمن النفط* undertaken by Basil Hatim and Malcolm Williams. It was published by Saqi Books in London in 2001 in 134 pages and sold for £7.95. Basil Hatim is Professor of Translation and Linguistics at Heriot-Watt University of Edinburgh, Scotland (currently Professor of English and Translation, American University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates). He has lectured widely on translation theory at universities throughout the UK, Europe and the Middle East, and published extensively on the applications of text linguistics to translation theory and practice. His publications include *Discourse and the Translator* (1990), *The Translator as Communicator* (1997) (both with Ian Mason) and *Communication Across Cultures* (1997). He also translated George Tarabishi’s 1988 *Woman Against Her Sex: A Critique of Nawal el-Saadawi*, which was published by Saqi Books. Malcolm Williams is a Principal Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Plymouth. His books include *Making Sense of Social Research* (2003), *Science and Social Science* (2000), *Knowing the Social World* (edited with Tim May, Open University 1998) and *Introduction to Philosophy of Social Research* (also with Tim May, 1996). His empirical research interests include housing need and UK internal migration.

Nawal El-Saadawi is not only a feminist and novelist but also a socialist and medical practitioner. We therefore find it would suffice to provide a biography of her, the positions she held and the duties that were assigned to her. We believe that a fair judgement of one’s character should not be opinionated but must emanate from a thorough awareness of his/ her autobiography. In addition, and specifically in our case, the reception of the writer is very much linked to her background. El-Saadawi
was born in 1931 in the small village of Kafr Tahla outside of Cairo, Egypt and grew up in a traditional Egyptian household. She has eight brothers and sisters. Her mother came from an upper-class family and was taken out of school at the age of seventeen to marry her father. She was a normal housewife who had a relatively happy married life but felt cut off her dreams of being a woman of importance by getting married that she cursed it a cemetery or prison for women, which later was the reason why El-Saadawi hated marriage and men (cf. El-Saadawi 1997). Her father was a civil servant at the Ministry of Education. Her parents sent all the nine children to school. In 1949 El-Saadawi entered the medical school at the University of Cairo, receiving her M.D. in 1955 at the age of twenty-four. Later she studied at Columbia University, New York, receiving her Master of Public Health degree in 1966. Her first marriage, which went on without her parents’ approval, to AHmad Hilmy, a medical-student and freedom fighter, ended in divorce. Her second husband was a wealthy traditionalist, whom Nawal El-Saadawi divorced when he did not accept her writing. In 1964 Nawal El-Saadawi married Shiriiif Yusif Hitaatah, a physician and novelist who graduated from the medical college with honours in 1946 and had since occupied various posts and functions ranging between working with the United Nations and teaching in universities. He has written on many subjects including travel, politics and health, but since 1968 he devoted himself to novels. He speaks English, Arabic and French fluently and has translated into English several of El-Saadawi’s books. El-Saadawi has a daughter, the poet and social commentator Muna Hilmy, from her first marriage, and a son, the filmmaker ‘aTif Hitaatah, from her third marriage.

After graduation, El-Saadawi worked as a physician at the university hospital and two years at the Rural Health Centre in TaHla. From 1958 to 1972 she was
Director General of Public Health Education in the Ministry of Health. Two years after she was appointed the Director General, she became the Secretary General of the Medical Association in Cairo. In the same year she founded the Health Education Association and was the Chief Editor of its magazine, *Health*, until 1974. In 1972 El-Saadawi was dismissed from her post in the ministry for publishing *المرأة والجنس* (woman and sex), which dealt with sex, religion, and the trauma of female clitoridectomy – all taboo subjects in the country. In 1971 she founded the Egyptian Women Writer’s Association and in 1974 she became a contributing author of the Supreme Council for Arts and Social Sciences for four years. From 1973 to 1976 she worked in researching women and neurosis in the Ain Shams University’s Faculty of Medicine. From 1973 to 1978 Nawal El-Saadawi was a writer at the High Institute of Literature and Science. She was also a researcher at Ain Shams University’s Faculty of Medicine in Cairo. In 1977 and until 1987, she founded and became the vice president of the African Association for Women on Research and Development in Dakar, Senegal. In 1979 she was the United Nation’s advisor for the Women’s Program in Africa (ECA) and the Middle East (ECWA). The position only lasted for one year because in 1980 the then president of Egypt Anwar Sadat imprisoned her for anti government activity charges and for her communist views. She was arrested and imprisoned for two months in Qanaatir Women’s Prison under Egyptian ‘alleged crimes against the State’. She was released in 1982, after Sadat’s assassination. Before she was taken home, she met the new president, Hosni Mubarak. In 1982 she established and became president of the Arab Women Solidarity Association (AWSA), which was banned in 1991 following the group’s criticism of the Gulf War (Bahgat 2001). In 1983 she co-founded the Arab Association for Human Rights. Three years later, in September 1986, she chaired and
organized 'The International Conference on the Challenges Facing Arab Women' in Cairo. In 1989 she founded Noon, a magazine of the Arab Women Solidarity Association and her husband was its assistant editor but the magazine only lasted until 1991. After receiving death threats in Egypt she fled with her husband to the United States where she taught at Duke University and Washington State University in Seattle. From 1993 until 1994 she was a visiting professor at Duke University Centre for International Studies. In 1996 she returned to Egypt. Since then, she has devoted her time to writing novels and essays on women, culture, politics, creativity and contemporary thought, and to her activities as a visiting scholar and international speaker on women and political issues. In 2000 she was a visiting professor at Florida State University.

El-Saadawi began writing over 50 years ago. She says, 'once I learned to read and write, I started writing stories for myself in which the protagonists were my mother, my father, and my eight brothers and sisters'. She continues, 'I also had a strong urge to express my moods through my writings, and to register the events I witnessed in a way that reflected my thinking and my views of them' (El-Saadawi 1997: 1). She started by writing poetry then short stories, novels and plays. She says, 'writing was a release for my anger. What angered me most was oppression: oppression of women and oppression of the poor' (ibid.). Her books have concentrated on women, oppression and sexuality which resulted in her dismissal from her post as Chief Editor of the Health journal and as Assistant General Secretary in the Medical Association in Egypt. After her release from prison, following Sadat’s assassination, she focused on issues of equality- of gender, nation and race. Upon her return to Egypt after a five-year voluntary exile to the West, she moved to issues of legal equality and sexual options for women.
Nawal El-Saadawi, as an active Third World Arab feminist, also worked with the United Nations for some years. She was a consultant on Women’s Programs in the UN-ECA in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia from 1978 until 1979 and was head of the Women’s Program of the UN Economic Commission for West Asia UN-ECWA in Beirut, Lebanon from 1978 until 1980. She is an often-interviewed figure (she was lately interviewed on BBC International, 2004), which further assists her accessibility to a wider English-speaking audience. She is also often the only Arab writer featured in anthologies not specializing in the Middle East: her essays appear in *Sisterhood Is Global: The International Women’s Movement Anthology* 1984 and the *Heinemann Book of African Women’s Writing* 1993; she is the only Arab writer male or female to be featured in the *Contemporary Authors Biography* 1990 (cf. El-Saadawi 1997; Amireh 2000). Her books are reviewed by mainstream print media that often recommend them for a general audience; her movements and affairs are constantly reported; and well-known writers review and acknowledge her on the pages of prestigious newspapers such as the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times (Amireh 2000: 219). El-Saadawi’s fiction is also popular at university level, mainly in the United States and Europe. Some of the universities in which El-Saadawi’s novels are taught include: The American University in Cairo; Duke University; The University of Washington in Seattle; Harvard University; Yale University; New York University; Columbia University; The University of California at Berkeley; The University of Illinois; Georgetown University; The University of Virginia; UCLA; Indiana University and others. She has lectured at Oxford and Cambridge, at the Sorbonne in Paris, at Bern University in Switzerland, and widely throughout the rest of Europe. El-Saadawi also received many awards including: Literary Award by the Supreme Council for Arts and Social Sciences,
Cairo, Egypt, 1974; Literary Award by the Franco-Arab Friendship Association, Paris, France, 1982; Arab Association of Australia Award, 1988; Literary Award of Gubran, 1988; First Degree Decoration of the Republic of Libya, 1989; Honorary Doctorate, University of York, United Kingdom, 1994.

1. Cultural Context

Until 2004 El-Saadawi had up to 30 of her works translated into many European languages as well as into Japanese, Indonesian, Persian and Turkish and they are still in print. The Western interest in El-Saadawi predates the recent attention to Arabic literature that was generated by Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize. The first of her books to be translated was *The Hidden Face of Eve: Women in the Arab World* which appeared in English in 1980. It is a non-fiction that appeared in Arabic in 1977 as *الوجه الكريسي للمرأة العربية.* Her 1979 novel *Woman at Point Zero* which appeared in Arabic in 1980 was translated into English as *Woman at Point Zero* and published in 1983. Today her books are translated promptly. For example, her novel *The Fall of the Imam* which was published in Arabic in 1987 appeared in English only a year later in 1988. Another novel, *حدهلا و إيليس* which appeared in Arabic in 1992, was published in English under the title *The Innocence of the Devil* only two years after its original was published. At times, both the English and Arabic editions appeared simultaneously as with her memoir *A Daughter of Isis: The Autobiography of Nawal El Saadawi* (1999). Her latest novel *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* was published only few months after the publication of *الحب في زمن النفط.* In addition, a major shift in the publishing houses that introduce her works took place. All the first editions of El-Saadawi’s books were first published in Cairo before shifting to Beirut after her books were confiscated for dealing with subjects considered taboo (cf. El-Saadawi 1997). In the English-speaking world, when El-Saadawi’s books were first
introduced in the 1980s, small and futuristic publishing houses such as Saqi Books and Zed Books in London and City Lights in San Francisco took the lead (Amireh 2000: 19). Today larger presses and even conventional academic ones such as the Women’s Press in London and the University of California Press have replaced the small publishing houses (ibid.) Her books of fiction and non-fiction, old and new, are available in foreign bookstores (online bookstores of different origins, specifically American and European, sell a wide range of El-Saadawi’s books) making her one of the most translated Arab writers. El-Saadawi is frequently considered a representative of the Arab world for the West. In the United States in particular she is ‘inscribed as both a celebrity and a representative Arab writer’ (Amireh 2000: 217). However, despite this overwhelming fame in the West, she is less known in the Arab world and warily welcomed. Her latest novel الحب في زمن النفط وسقوط الإمام were confiscated from the 43 Cairo International Book Fair which took place on the 24th of January 2004. Her marginal position in the Arab world is not only because regional governments censor her and ban some of her books, but also because some of her views and comments locally and abroad have alienated her from her society.

El-Saadawi has never been the only Arab or the only feminist to write about women’s oppression. Nonetheless, she is considered the only Arab woman to represent the Arab world out of the hundreds of women that Zeidan lists. Perhaps this is because as Amireh (2000: 231) observes, ‘unlike the more academic writings of radical feminists such as Fatima Mernissi and Khalida Said, hers (El-Saadawi’s) address readers with the confidence of a physician, the passion of an activist, the credibility of an eyewitness, and the pathos of an injured woman’. This made her highly sought worldwide as a genuine speaker on women’s issues and the Arab
world. She is listened to because of her credibility and accessibility. For these very reasons the West prefers her and not those other female authors. For a Western reader saturated with stereotypes about Arab culture, women and Islam, and who consumes El-Saadawi, her writings, fiction and non-fiction, are deemed facts as they are supported by the fact that she is a medical practitioner and an experienced Arab woman unlike other Arab female authors and/ or feminists who are solely writers, novelists or simply sympathetic activists who do not hold El-Saadawi’s credibility. Within that context, she ends up, to a large extent, rewritten according to First World textual and contextual grids about Third World people and cultures. *The Hidden Face of Eve*, for example, devotes more space to the issue of ‘female genital mutilation’ and uses a more dramatic title for this section than does the original Arabic version, but neglects El-Saadawi’s social criticism in a sense of ‘cultural superiority’ (Rodrick 2002). This situation has led El-Saadawi to tailor her writings in response to the pressures and appeal of the Western marketplace (cf. Dallal 1998).

El-Saadawi is an Egyptian writer who writes in Arabic unlike other Arab writers who write in foreign languages for foreign and bilingual Arab readers, but she primarily addresses a devoted Western audience through the translations of her work and the issues she discusses. Seemingly, she provides a window into Arab women’s situation for audiences without such first-hand experience to which she gives herself credit by assuming the right to speak on behalf of the silent (cf. McMillan 1999). Thus, whether intentionally or not, El-Saadawi’s writings reinforce Western stereotypes about Arab society. El-Saadawi’s entrance into the western marketplace coincided with two major international events: the United Nation’s ‘international decade of women’, which declared the period from 1975 to 1985 as the decade of women and focused the attention of the international women community
on the lives of Third World women, their experiences and sufferings, and the Iranian revolution (Amireh 2000: 220). These two incidents did not just pave the way for her to enter the western market but they also framed her image in the West. Clitoridectomy was the centre of the discussions at the UN-sponsored Copenhagen conference of 1980 (ibid.). The way this international event was covered by the media hailed El-Saadawi and linked her to clitoridectomy as she spoke of her accounts of excision and circumcision during the conference (ibid.). According to Amireh (2000), a New York Times article under the headline ‘Female Circumcision a Topic at UN Parley’ begins by reciting El-Saadawi’s own excision. It also coincided with the Iranian revolution of 1978-1979. This revolution renewed the West’s fear of Islam. The replacement of the Shah by an Islamic government that is opposed to the United States policies posed a threat to the West in terms of its economic and political interest in the Middle East. El-Saadawi’s The Hidden Face of Eve appeared in English just as this revolution was mounting. Thus, its reception was influenced by the West’s interest and/or hostility to Islam.

As previously said, in Egypt and the Arab world, however, El-Saadawi as a fiction and non-fiction writer is not given the credit she gets in the West. Neither is she considered a lone feminist. She is rather regarded a product of a specific historical moment that flagged her up. It was the non-fiction المرأة وال الجنس (woman and sex) 1971 (for which she was expelled from her post at the ministry of health) that brought El-Saadawi to the attention of Arab readers (cf. Dallal 1998; Amireh 2000) although by that time she had already published some fiction as well as non-fiction such as (a doctor’s memoir) 1958 (two women in one) 1968. Within the next six years she published four books: (the female is the origin) 1974 (death of the only man on earth)
1974 (man and sex) 1976 (women and psychological conflict) 1976. All these books were published before الوجه العاري للمرأة العربية (the naked face of the Arab woman) 1977. These books, which discuss sexuality, feminism and politics, appeared in the aftermath of the Arab/Egyptian defeat by Israel. Many writers of that period, of which El-Saadawi, focused their criticism on their society in an attempt to determine its ills and recover them, from their point of views, as they believed the shocking defeat and loss of land were as much the result of corrupt societies and governments as of the powerful Israeli military. In the introduction to the American edition of The Hidden Face of Eve El-Saadawi (1982: 2) writes: ‘During the past years a number of serious studies have been published, and have contributed to the unmasking of many social ills that require a radical cure if Arab society is to attain real freedom in all endeavour whether economic, political, human, or moral’ (cf. Amireh 2000). El-Saadawi was not writing in isolation but as part of a larger group that criticized Arab society. However, El-Saadawi spoke from a feminist point of view focusing on sexuality and gender. Unlike other feminists or advocates of women’s rights such as Qaasim Amiin, Huda Sha’raawy, Aminah al-Saadawi and others who expressed the interests of middle and upper class women, El-Saadawi focused on poor women highlighting their oppression and exploitation. El-Saadawi’s reception as a novelist in the Arab world is very critical. Following the publication of المرأة والجنس 1971 El-Saadawi’s polemical works became popular and widely read in the Arab world but her novels did not receive the same attention (cf. Dallal 1998). This is perhaps because her novels appeared at a time when Arab readers were more familiar with novels by authors who were primarily novelists. ‘Many Arab critics and readers are generally surprised at the accolades heaped on El-Saadawi’s fiction in the West, and some
have concluded that the popularity of her novels has less to do with their literary merit than with their fulfilment of Western readers’ assumptions about Arab men and women’ (Hafez 1989, cited in Amireh 2000: 232). Within the context of the modern Arabic literary tradition, the Egyptian novel, although mostly written by men, was from its beginning a woman-centred genre (Amireh 2000: 232). Women were the main characters as in Haykal’s 1914 زينب (Zainab), al-Saqqad’s 1938 سارة (Sarah), Taha Husein’s 1934 دعاء الكروان (The Call of the Curlew) and they continued to be central characters through the 1950s and 1960s. The period also witnessed attempts to overcome subjects considered taboo by writers such as IHsaan _ibdul Qudduus and Naguib Mahfouz through telling in an exciting narration the stories of young girls and women attempts to free themselves sexually and emotionally against their conservative families and traditional societies. The same period, which was at the heels of colonization and decolonisation in the Arab world, also witnessed a group of writers who were optimistic and focused on the struggle for liberation and who spoke the tongue of the oppressed and restricted. But after the 1967 defeat, the rebellious and struggling characters were silenced by the shock. This situation created a new generation of novelists who believed in the struggle for freedom and liberation both nationally and internationally to defy all forms of oppression. It also hailed El-Saadawi as the most recognizable feminist novelist, although not the first, because others such as Aminah al-Saïid and LaTifah al-Zayyaat were no longer active novelists (cf. Amireh 2000). By that time El-Saadawi’s non-fiction helped paving the way for her fiction to be recognized in the map of modern Arabic literature. However, her fiction is often criticized and questioned. Amireh (1996; 2000: 236) quotes Sabry Hafez, Salwa Bakr, Alia Mamdouh and Ahdaf Soueif on El-Saadawi’s fiction. ‘Sabry admires El-Saadawi’s intentions but pronounces her fiction a failure-
ideologically because it "inverts the prevalent patriarchal order without a clear understanding of the dangers involved" and artistically because of El-Saadawi’s "one dimensional approach" to her material. ‘The Egyptian novelist Salwa Bakr criticizes El-Saadawi’s views that “the problem of women is mainly sexual” arguing that priority should be given instead to women’s inferior economic situation’. ‘Mamdouh, the Iraqi novelist, charges her of “turning creativity which is imagination and living memory into a lab to show sick, deformed samples which she presents as generalized social types”’. Ahdaf Sueif, an Anglo-Egyptian feminist who wrote In the Eye of the Sun in English says: ‘El-Saadawi writes good scientific research, but she writes bad novels. It is unfair that the West thinks that what she writes represents Arab women’s creative writing’.

Although El-Saadawi is more celebrated in the West than in the Arab world, Western critics also point out problems in her fiction. In her review of The Innocence of the Devil Laura Cumming writes: ‘Her naïve iconography never varies... The rigid binary oppositions within which her novels operate constrict the purpose El-Saadawi avows in her non-fiction, which is to campaign against patriarchy as oppressive to men as well as to women... Determined to generalize centuries of female suffering, El-Saadawi creates a historical fiction in which women are reduced to symbols of sexual oppression and men are their interchangeable torturers’ (cited in Amireh 2000: 236-7).

El-Saadawi’s writings have resulted in her receiving many death threats. Since receiving these in Egypt, the United Nations contained her and represented her as the ultimate victim of Islam, sentenced by ‘fundamentalist Islam’s cruel and unjustified repression of women’ (Robert 1993, cited in Amireh 2000: 227). In addition, many Western commentators often claim that her imprisonment by Sadat
and the closure of AWSA (Arab Women Solidarity Association) by Mubarak were the result of her views on female sexuality and religion, subjects considered taboo (cf. Walker 2002; Belton & Dowding 2000). However, it was in fact her leftist political activism and her opposition to the Camp David Agreement in 1981 and to the Gulf War in 1991 not her feminism per se that resulted in her imprisonment and the closure of AWSA. This misrepresentation of El-Saadawi overrides her strong views on politics. However, the gap between the reception of El-Saadawi in the West and her local Arab society is central to the construction of her identity. Her works are often the only Arab texts that students in Western universities encounter to enlighten them about the Arab women, Arab society and culture; ‘students view her works as windows onto a timeless Islam instead of as literary works governed by certain conventions and produced within specific historical contexts’ (Amireh 2000: 240).

Amireh, an Arab feminist and an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at Al Najah University, Palestine, made an inquiry in 1995 into students’ responses to different texts by El-Saadawi as part of their university courses. She received comments from several instructors indicating that they had to work hard to prevent their students from using Woman at Point Zero, the most popular of El-Saadawi’s books, merely to confirm their stereotypes. One teacher informed her that ‘Western students tend to get fixated on clitoridectomy and the veil’ (Amireh 2000: 240-41). Other teachers said that this very image promoted them to ‘provide background material on colonialism to help establish a historical context, encourage students to break with essentialist and ethnocentric theoretical perspectives, and remind them of similar abuses that women undergo in Western cultures’ (ibid.). Another teacher said she had ‘to fight [her students] tendency to do the “oh those women over there have it worse” imperialistic view when addressing concerns of
women in other non-U.S. societies' (ibid.: 241). On the literary merit of El-Saadawi's *The Fall of the Imam*, graduate students taking a seminar on the postcolonial literature of North Africa and the Middle East at the University of Alberta did not mention at any point the relationship between the novel and the assassination of Sadat (Amireh 2000: 240). The *Fall of the Imam* is a novel that is often connected to the assassination of Sadat but in fact it is a critique of Ayatollah Khomeini and the Iranian revolution (ibid.: 228). The responses to the inquiry indicate that El-Saadawi's characters seem to fit within the hegemonic Western conscious that fanaticises the Arab women as veiled, submissive and/ or secluded. Woffenden (2001) says, 'she is accused of feeding the West stereotypes and this is true. She is also accused of basking in the limelight, and from her appearances on TV, this is also true'. This environment led El-Saadawi to reframe herself in accordance with her audiences' expectations regardless of whether the work is good or bad as El-Saadawi herself says, 'It's not a matter of who is good, who is bad. It is a matter of who has the power-who has the power and writes books' (quoted in Amireh 2000: 215). *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* is seen as a testimony to this statement. 'Her more recent works have been less satisfying and *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* is no exception' argues Woffenden (2001). He adds, 'For those many writers who sit in downtown coffee shops bemoaning the state of the literary world...this is a weapon they can use in their armoury'. When *The Hidden Face of Eve* was first translated into English, the introduction was problematic and caused discomfort to its British readers. As illustrated in Chapter Six, the undesired reception it received in the British community made El-Saadawi change her introduction to suit her American audiences who, she anticipated, would not have welcomed her views and celebration of the Iranian Revolution and her attack on the American foreign policies. In *Love
in the Kingdom of Oil El-Saadawi does not mention any of her political views. The United Nation’s representation of El-Saadawi as the ultimate victim of Islam and the constant claims that president Sadat imprisoned her solely for her feminist views on female sexuality and not for her communist views and political stands against the Camp David Agreement led El-Saadawi to reframe her image and concentrate on what satisfies her Western readers whom she is more popular within. Thus, although El-Saadawi sometimes tries to resist the West’s misrepresentation of her, she gives the West what it wants to hear allowing her works, as such, to be used to confirm prevailing prejudices about Arab and Muslim culture. In fact, El-Saadawi no longer cares what her Arab critics write about her as she declares them unqualified to appreciate her personality which she describes is different from anything to which they are accustomed (Amireh 2000: 237). She also no longer writes exclusively for the Arabic audience. She said in an interview, ‘At first I wrote for the Arab people, men and women. And I had to consider my audience... My audience was the Arab people. So, if I spoke about something they would totally reject, it would not be there at all. But now I don’t care’ (quoted in Amireh 2000: 238). Indeed, her sexually oriented novels alienated her from her Arab audience as they contradict their culture. On the other hand, her Western audience is not interested in her political views that disapprove of the Western, mainly American, foreign policies. Speaking at the University of Berkeley’s Centre for Middle Eastern Studies on November 25, 2001 addressing the topic ‘Religious, Fundamentalism, Globalization and Women’ El-Saadawi called the US foreign policy ‘Real Terrorism’ (Northern California Chronicle 2002). She insisted that the US-led war on Afghanistan is ‘a war to exploit the oil in the region’. ‘It has nothing to do with eradicating terrorism’, she added and urged the audience to ‘think how we can save our world from real
terrorism- US foreign policy and its steadfast support of Israel- not Osama bin Laden’. While not minimizing the tragedy of September 11, 2001, she pointed out the hypocrisy of US foreign policy by reminding the audience that according to United Nations estimates and due to the UN-imposed economic sanctions, 5,000 Iraqi children die monthly.

Indeed, the Western master discourse of representing Arabic culture, which hailed El-Saadawi a hero and the leader of a one woman’s battle for freedom erasing her political identity and praising her views on female sexuality, is what produced *Love in the Kingdom of Oil*. Her latest novel which mixes between sexuality, a woman’s search for goddesses’ remains and the barrels of oil proves that El-Saadawi writes for translation in response to the pressures and appeals of the Western marketplace. Contrary to *The Hidden Face of Eve*, *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* comes ready for Western consumption leaving little space for manipulation which better confirms the Western representations of the Arab/ Islamic culture but from the native and with no or little accusations of manipulation and extrinsic managing. Nonetheless, the translation presents instance of extrinsic management which further assist in meeting the expectations of her Western readers. The following examples derived from the language and structure of *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* illustrate in details.

2. Language

Many of the themes in the novel have been examined more effectively by El-Saadawi herself in previous works. The novel mixes between fiction and non-fiction and jumps from one theme into another without a connection. It shifts between the polemical writing and narration through which El-Saadawi preaches her views using sometimes weak language and in many cases incompatible. Consider for example:
It was natural for people to disappear. There was a law concerning men who did. The woman had to wait for her lost husband for seven years, and not take another man. The embryo remains alive in the womb seven years, and it remains the property of the lost man until he returns. The woman is no more than a container. Lost women have no law concerning them. A woman does not have to be lost in order for her husband to take another woman. In several occasions El-Saadawi presented her opinion as statements rather than through the layers of events. The main character seems like the tongue of El-Saadawi filled with the gaol of women’s liberation feeding the plot and narrative. Consider the following examples: The man’s voice pierced her ears. An imperative tone, completely natural when a man addressed his wife. An unpaid servant; Revelation descended without need for writing or reading. His Majesty raised his head upwards and revelation fell from the sky like rain. They poured it into jars and on the Festival they distributed it with the allowances. A man received a whole jar for himself and a woman half. A woman could not receive her portion for herself. Her husband or some other representative had to deputise for her). The forced and sometimes inappropriate thoughts and statements in the novel leave the reader guessing ‘whether this is a love story, a story of a woman rebelling against society, a sociological novel, a novel about the
relationship between the government and the people or a novel about the power of
the oil economy and its impact on romantic relationships’ (Zwein 2001). The author
herself poses the question (أتسكن هناك علاقة بين الحب والنفط؟) but she does not explain or expand or even develop within the
layers and events in the novel. The whole theme of oil and why women are carrying
barrels of oil and the nature of the relationship between the woman and the
ambiguous man are left vague. In addition, the novel focuses on the issue of gender
struggle instead of class struggle contrary to what the title suggests and although
most of the events in the novel take place in a village where oil is everything that
matters and where the illiterate king’s birthday is celebrated lavishly. Consider for
example:

There was nothing in the house apart from husbands hiding their faces behind newspapers. They wrapped their heads in clouds
of smoke. The wives stood in the kitchen, boiling frozen chickens with plastic heads. Tins of sardines made of magnetised tin. After eating there was a pleasure ship that
went out to sea and did not return. In the long queue the lady martyrs collapsed. And
at the end of the feast there was the dilapidated bus that overturned with all those in it.
Before the day had passed the mother would slaughter her children and then throw
herself in the sea. But nobody wanted to commit an offence and everybody
performed the rites. They drew on his face a sign of rejoicing. They drew it with a
coloured pen on his chapped skin. On the feast many faces leant out from the buses. And on the swings, and at the official celebrations. The only thing that dispelled the joy was a woman’s bare face. In general terms, the novel does not pose or handle any of the questions that the back cover promises. True El-Saadawi does pose questions and issues but they are not well developed within the context of the novel and sometimes they are even outdated. For example, 

أي امرأة تضبط و في حوزتها ورقة وقدم للمحاكمة

(Any woman detained with paper and pen in her possession shall be prosecuted) is a repetition of an old even inaccurate statement. In addition, the war between the sexes which most of the plot revolves around is clichéd and for the most part invalid. Nawal El-Saadawi already knows that her writings are often used in ways different from what she intended them for yet she chose in Love in the Kingdom of Oil, and regardless of the literary merit of this novel, to add statements that defend rather than challenge any misrepresentations of her. Below are examples of manipulation at the language level although it seems the novel was written with the Western audience in mind. Due to the incongruous nature of the relation between Arabic and English, translations between these two languages will inevitably include cases of non-equivalency on different levels resulting from the translators’ intrinsic managing which is essential and unavoidable as the examples in Chapter Four and Chapter Five illustrate. Therefore, for the purpose of this research, only examples which refer to cases of extrinsically managed non-equivalency are included.

Example 1:

الحب في زمن النفط (literally, love in the time/age of oil) is translated into Love in the Kingdom of Oil (الحب في مملكة النفط) which is a major shift from the original. There must be a reason in the mind of the author why she chose (time/age) over (kingdom). The decision to replace it with (kingdom), which is not clarified, situates
love within a kingdom claiming as such that the problem is only limited to a specific area and not to a whole age where oil has become the motive for many decisions and actions. Indeed, while the original title invites readers to get to know what love is like in the presence of oil, the translation, in using the combination kingdom + oil, places the novel in the realm of the Arab woman’s search for love not women’s search for love in general which further confirms El-Saadawi’s position as a representative from the Arab world and creates an interstice between women and feminists from the Arab world and their sisters worldwide.

Example 2:

In a resemblance to the Arabian Nights narration, in the first page of the novel, يُصْرِعُ الْمَلْكُ بالإحتفال بالعيد للميلادي الملكي is translated as ‘The King’s birthday party’. The English translation brings to the mind images from the Arabian Nights where the King would have a massive birthday party with harem, oriental music, and long lines of meals and dishes. The original meant celebrating the royal birthday, which does not necessarily have to be in the form of a party. In fact the novel gives examples of how it was celebrated: colored photos of the king in the newspaper, paying employees extra, etc.

Example 3:

The phrase إِنَّ فِي مَرَّةً is translated as ‘You woman!’ This translation is very controversial. The word مَرَّة, which is different from إِمْرَأَة, in colloquial Egyptian has a very bad indication. It means a woman with very bad manners. The author of course is not required to make it clear that she is using the vernacular. But since translating it in English as ‘woman’ would be controversial, the translation should have a footnote explaining or at least use an equivalent in the vernacular if available.
especially that in the following lines the character was very upset at the word and
considered it an insult. Translating it as ‘woman’ may have been a deliberate act but
it could also be a result of the translators’ unfamiliarity with the word. For the
English reader, being a ‘woman’ in the culture from which the novel stems becomes
synonymous with insult. Whether intended or not, the English translation once again
replaced it with ‘woman’ without explaining why the character was very upset
because the man called her ‘مَرَأَة’ and why she referred to it as ‘ugly word’ as the
following example shows:

Example 4:

- The word ‘woman’ pierced her ears like a silver of glass. The muscles of her
  face stiffened. What gave a man the right to order her to stop by the side of
  the bridle path and then pour invective upon her? She turned her back on him
  and continued on her way. He followed her, beating the ground with his feet.
  His voice never stopped repeating that ugly word.

Indeed, translating مَرَأَة as ‘woman’ misguides the English reader into believing that
the word woman in the Arab world is used as an insult, which again reinforces the
cliché that women in the Arab world (as indicated by the ‘keffiyah’ the man is
wearing which is explained in a footnote as the square cloth of the Arab headdress)
live in a society that is sexist and insults women for just being women. Although it
might be an unintended mistranslation, the foreign culture deserves to be translated
accurately to avoid misrepresentations which thus requires those involved in
translating a foreign culture to be very careful and accurate. It must be mentioned, however, that translators as well as editors and publishers can be unconsciously affected by their culture’s master discourse of representing foreign cultures. In effect, the Western master discourse of representing the Arabs, their culture and Islam which represents women as victims of an oppressive culture and religion may have made the statement in the novel seem normal to those who produced the translation to the extent that they did not notice it may not be the straightforward equivalent ‘woman’. On the other hand, changes to the translation may have taken place on the editing level. What matters is that the end result very misrepresents the culture.

Example 5:

These two lines are translated as follows:

- Women’s rights! Don’t you know about them?
- We have never heard of anything like that. We have the rights of men only.

While the original  حقوق الإنسان would be ambiguous had the translator translated it as ‘human rights’, the translation was even more controversial. For an English reader who cannot read Arabic, translating  حقوق الإنسان as ‘rights of men’ instead of (human rights) reconfirms the cliché that Arab women are marginal and have no rights in a repressive, male dominant society. In doing so it confirms El-Saadawi’s arguments about the position of women in the Arab world. However, in another paragraph the same word was translated as ‘the rights of women’ although the original was once again referring to the rights of human beings, men as well as women. The division between the rights of men and women supports El-Saadawi’s image as a feminist and
reconfirms to the English reader the idea that women, assumingly in the Arab world, are unequal to men. It also puts El-Saadawi’s borderless fight for the rights of the poor and weak, of which women, men and children alike, within the borders of women only.

The translation once again reinforces the gender fight when it chooses to translate بني آدم as ‘the children of men’ instead of ‘human being’, which is the dictionary meaning of the word. This is explained in the following example:

Example 6:

- و صوت خالتها يرد في ظلمة الليل: ما شيطان إلا بني آدم.

- Her aunt’s voice resonated in the darkness of the night, ‘The only devils are the children of men.’

In Example 7 the translation once again favored a specific translation of a word from a list of equivalents. The dictionary translation of غشاوة gives a list of options of which, haze, mist, cloudiness, blur, film, veil, wrap, cover, envelope. Nonetheless, the translators chose ‘veil’ although the story line says the woman was naked and unclear if the man calling her is actually her husband!

Example 7:

- وهي تنظر إليه من خلال غشاوة.

- She looked at him through a veil.

The combination veil + women within the context of the lines that followed adds a sense of exoticism. It triggers in the reader’s mind the image of exotic yet oppressed and mysterious Arab women. In another situation ‘veil’ is the translation of حجاب as the following example shows:
Example 8:

- رأت أمامها امرأة من الجوار، تحمل البرميل فوق رأسها، وجهها يختفي تماما وراء حجاب أسود لا يطل

منها إلا نصف عين، فانفجرت فيها مثل بركان.

- She saw one of the neighbor women carrying a jar on her head. Her face was completely hidden behind a heavy black veil, and all she could see of it was half an eye, and something like a volcano exploded inside her.

In this case it is clear that the woman is veiled but the translation added ‘heavy’ before ‘black veil’ although it is not in the original and there is no reference to it. Adding ‘heavy’ to ‘black veil’ adds yet another negative effect to an image that is already terribly equated with oppression and cruelty.

The word حجاب was again translated as ‘veil’ giving yet another very damaging effect as in the following example:

Example 9:

- كان لكل عريش من الجن حجاب خاص.

- Every demon used to have a special veil.

In this context the word حجاب meant (amulet, charm, periapt, and talisman). Translating حجاب as ‘veil’ and linking it to demons depicts the image of ghosts and the dead, precisely what mainstream orientalist discourses maintain in their portrayal of the Arabs and Islam; what Bobby Sayyid appropriately describes in his (1997) A Fundamental Fear. Now consider the following example:

Example 10:

- مصاحب الجلالة يتبرع بثلاثة ملايين دولار لحديقة الحيوان في القطب الشمالي.

- His Majesty donates 3 million dollars to zoo in the north.
In the above example, the القطب الشمالي (the northern pole) is replaced with ‘north’ omitting الشمالي. The terminology ‘north’ is used in contrast to ‘south’ in terms of the political-economic relations. It is often used in highlighting the asymmetry of power between Western and non-Western worlds. El-Saadawi uses this terminology in much of her political discussions. In the two lines that followed the translation conveyed yet another astonishing slip as shown in the following example:

Example 11:

- His Majesty forbids the distribution of sweets on Children’s Day.

Whether intended or not, translating حرمُ as ‘forbids’ instead of ‘his majesty’s wife’ for the English reader who has just read ‘His majesty donates 3 million dollars to zoo in the north’ provokes the debate on freedom and the oppression inflicted by the corrupt and illiterate kings of oil-rich countries on their people of which women and children. These two sentences appearing consecutively feed readers assumptions and prejudices of the regimes in the Arab world. It must be mentioned, however, that this could also be the result of a hasty reading of the original or an alteration that took place at the editing level. But as mentioned above, it is the duty of the intercultural mediator to do the foreign culture justice by rendering it carefully.

Example 12:

- The newspapers published her picture and they brought her back before she had gone beyond the fixed boundaries of religion.

The translation of the above sentence should be (the newspapers published her picture and they brought her before she crossed the borders). There is no reference
in the original to religion, thus translating as such misguides readers into believing religion is the one and only informant of decisions and that the woman is not worth searching for unless religion is involved. The translation thus contradicts the original in which they wanted to catch the woman before she runs away outside the boundaries of the place where she was living. For a reader who is not familiar with Arabic and cannot compare Love in the Kingdom of Oil with the original, this line corresponds to the illustration on the front cover of the book.

Example 13:

- The sun was just going down below the horizon. In the twilight she began to orientate herself on the ground. She found the patch of ground specified on the map. She raised her arm and hit the ground with the chisel time after time. Suddenly she felt it hitting against something solid. It was a small bronze statue. The breast was clear and did not brook any doubt. The bottom also
confirmed that it was a woman. On her head she carried the disc of the sun and the horns tilted forwards. There was no doubt that it was the goddess Hathur. Who else could it be? There was a hole in her head and the skin was eaten away because of the oil and the underground sewage. However, the face was round; there was a smile on the lips and the chin and the nose were very delicate. There was a belt around the dainty waist and a snake wrapped and tied around the forehead. On her chest there was only one breast; perhaps the oil had eaten away the other one. However, the letters were carved on the rock and the name was set in a frame: the one-breasted god. Her eyes widened and she looked more carefully. She realized that one of the breasts had been removed by somebody. He had intended to remove the other but there had not been enough time. He had also tried to wipe off the smile, or to draw lines around the mouth to complete a frown, but the body remained as it had been, with a plump bottom and the spirit hovering around the one breast as if it was the breast of a mother.

The translation added 'he' to the text twice although it does not appear anywhere in the paragraph and there is no reference to a male interference. Assuming that it is a 'he' contributes to the idea that women, even goddesses, are the victims of male abuse. Now consider the following examples:

**Example 14:**

و أَسْتَوْقِفُهَا رَجُلٌ يَلْفُ حَوْلَ عَنْقِهِ كُوفِيَةَ سَوَاءٍ (a man with a black keffiyeh round his neck stopped her) is translated as ‘A man with a black Keffiyeh round his neck ordered her to stop.’ There is a significant difference between ‘ordered her to stop’ and استوقفها. While the latter literally means ‘stopped her’ and does not involve any
orders, ‘ordered her to stop’ (أمرها بالوقوف) carries a clear imperative mood that hints at the relation between men and women which part of El-Saadawi’s reputation lends itself to and to which she makes reference throughout the novel.

Example 15:

هل خرجت يوماً عن طاعتك؟ (did she ever disobey you?) is translated as ‘Has she ever previously left the conjugal home without your consent?’ The back translation into Arabic of the English sentence would be هل سبق لها أن خرجت من بيت الزوجية دون موافقتك؟. The translation indicates that the woman was imprisoned and was not allowed to go out at all unless she has permission. There is a significant difference between disobeying orders and having to ask for permission. The original asks if the woman ever disobeyed the man but does not mention anything about ‘must having permission’. The difference between the original and translation can refresh in the mind of the reader images of the oppression inflicted on women, confirm and enhance them.

Example 16:

I beg you, haven’t I got the right to have a drink of water.

The dictionary meaning of أرجو is (I hope, I look forward, I wish; please, will you please). The translation of the above sentence should be (please, can I have a drink of water?) Nonetheless, it was translated as ‘I beg you’ which is the translation of إليك أتُرسل أرجوك, هل لي في شربة ماء؟. Since part of El-Saadawi’s fame in the West stems from her criticism of social practices particularly with regard to women in the Arab world, and because the back cover of Love in the Kingdom of Oil presents El-Saadawi as an icon of Arab feminism, the above translation, for readers
who are not familiar with Arabic, presents an example of the nature of the relation between men and women.

Unfortunately the translation contains a number of cases of non-equivalency on the language and grammar level, and omissions of sentences and words that must be due to a hasty reading of the original, of which we include the following: For example: خرطم رفع أسود اللون is translated as (a thin white stream) where أسود should be (black) not (white). Also, لا شيء ينبغي إلا البحث is translated as (thinking of nothing except her research) although the paragraph makes it clear that it is (search) and not (research); إحساس جديد بدأ يترسب إليها على إستحياش is translated as (A new sensation began to flow into her, one of embarrassment). Obviously the original meant that the feeling was crawling into her (gradually) which is totally different from what the translation gives. Also من أين أتيت؟ is translated as (where are you from?) instead of (where were you coming from? Or, where are you coming from?). Similarly في الوسط حجر كبير جلس عليه رئيسهم is translated as (In the middle of a large stone sat their chief) instead of (Their chief sat on a large rock which was in the middle). Likewise، بيع الدرون الخارجية بالمزاد is translated as (Foreign ministry to be sold at auction) while it should be (Foreign debts to be sold at auction). Likewise، ألم تحصل على إجازة؟ is translated as (Haven’t you got a BA?) where إجازة means (vacation, holiday, break). The same word is again translated as (BA) in ألم تنجح امرأة واحدة في الحصول على إجازة؟ (Hasn’t any woman here managed to obtain a BA?). Even more hilarious، ربما هي زوجة النفط تجعل الأشياء تترقص where زوجة النفط means viscosity is oddly translated as (Perhaps it belongs to a wife of oil that made things stick together)!

3. Structure

The translation of الحب في زمن النفط in terms of the structure is a straightforward one unlike The Hidden Face of Eve. There are few missing words,
sentences even paragraphs from the translation; however, their absence is not due to any deliberate manipulations rather to carelessness. The main alteration to the structure of the novel takes place on its back cover. The back cover of the original records few lines from the novel. That of the translation, however, starts with a short summary of the story as follows:

A woman disappears without a trace. The police commissioner investigating the case enquires: was she of dubious morals, was she the rebellious sort? Nobody understands how a woman could simply walk away from it all, leaving husband and home behind. After all, in the 'kingdom of oil' where 'His Majesty' reigns supreme, no woman has ever dared disobey the command of men.

When she finally reappears there is a blurring of the distinctions between the men in her life. She leaves one to become the wife of another, and when she eventually returns to her first husband, she finds he has taken a new wife. In many ways, to her all men are one and the same...

The summary focuses on the relation between men and women and does not mention anything about the woman's search for the goddesses. The back cover supports this summary by promising readers that El-Saadawi in this 'rich' novel will once again confront issues and questions regarding women's role and position in a repressive, patriarchal order. In addition, it gives a short biography of El-Saadawi describing her as 'an internationally-renowned Egyptian writer and feminist' who studied psychiatry and practised medicine in cities and country sides but whose writing 'made her increasingly the focus of controversy' for 'dealing openly with subjects considered taboo'. Pointing out the fact that El-Saadawi is a practicing medical doctor and a feminist gives readers guarantees that the novel is not just a novel but contains facts from the tongue of an expert. Taking off from this premise, the reader
who is neither familiar with Arabic nor aware of the strategies adopted in terms of choices is misguided.

The back cover of *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* concludes with the San Francisco Chronicle’s inscription which adds yet another guarantee to readers that what they are about to read is the work of a woman who encountered ‘the’ problems of Arab women. In addition, it pre-shapes readers assumptions and perception of the novel through locating the struggle of Arab feminists, of which El-Saadawi, and Arab women in general within a limited comprehension, precisely sexuality and oppression by men and religion, ignoring their political stances.

Love in the Kingdom of Oil and *الحب في زمن النفط* share the same front cover apart from the title.

4. References

Love in the Kingdom of Oil employs two means so as to relate the novel to the already existing perception of the Arab world and its culture and the language that defines it in the mind of the readers:

a. Perceptual:

The cover illustration of *الحب في زمن النفط* and *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* is the same one. It features the image of a confused and sad-looking but uncovered woman positioned between a picture of a mosque and another of a man dressed in the Arabian Gulf costume. The cover is a reference to the position of the Arab woman in a male dominant Arab/ Islamic society who, although has come far to be liberated of the veil according to El-Saadawi’s views, is still treated within an already specified space marked out by religion and men. The decision to change the title but reserve the cover illustration of the original, which ostensibly El-Saadawi chose as part of
her attempts to tailor her writings towards meeting her translation audiences’
expectations, serves the new title as it links (kingdom) and (oil) to the image of the
 man and (mosque). In addition, the decision to retain the front cover, which does
not reflect the reality of the novel, tells readers, indirectly, how to read the novel. The
picture of the man and the mosque relates, in the mind of the reader, Islam to the
Arab culture although not all Arabs are Muslims and not all Muslims are Arabs and
despite the fact that the ill customs and practices in the Arab culture are either the
result of misinterpretations of Islam or wrong beliefs.

b. Textual:

Love in the Kingdom of Oil is a clear departure from الحب في زمن النفط. As
mentioned above, the replacement of زمن with (kingdom) locates the setting of the
novel within the narrow borders of a kingdom instead of the more general conception
of زمن (time). The word kingdom itself triggers the image of kings and emirs and
combined with love it provokes the essence of the Arabian Nights, harem and
sensuality. In addition, the combination of kingdom and oil often refers to the gulf
oil-rich countries, precisely Saudi Arabia that is denounced for imposing an Islamic
law and accused of being an autocratic and authoritarian regime that violates human
rights, particularly against women.

In addition, some of the words mentioned above under Language of which
veil, religion and human rights are textual references. حجاب (veil) in particular is one
of those words like jihad and fatwa, the definition of which is a misconception
propagated by the various means of the media. Attaching veil to demons, the evil
spirit, erases the true essence of حجاب and confines it to the past, the evil and the
unknown in contrast with modernity, identity and vitality. In doing so it confirms
what the mainstream orientalist discourse maintains in its depiction of the Arabs and Islam as Bobby Sayyid (1997:1) appropriately describes,

Muslims too, it seems, are often thought to be out of time: throwbacks to medieval civilizations who are caught in the grind and glow of 'our' modern culture. It is sometimes said that Muslims belong to cultures and societies that are moribund and have no vitality...

7.4 Discussion and Conclusion

In her novel, Love in the Kingdom of Oil which was confiscated from the 43 Cairo International Book Fair, El-Saadawi takes off from a negative analysis of society to create an image that would entertain a specific anticipated audience. El-Saadawi, writing for translation and knowing very well that her anti-Western political stances will not buy her any Western audience, chose topics that would appeal to her readers: Arab women, sex and oppression. The woman of حب في زمن النفط is absence, negativity, subordination and darkness. The society is described as irrational, depraved, dark, naive and different which hints at the existence of others who are the opposite in everything. The new title Love in the Kingdom of Oil seems to invite the English speaking readers to experience the novel as a glimpse into what love is like in the kingdom of oil, and by extension the wider Arab societies.

Instead of presenting an exploration of the effect and power of oil on the lives of people, حب في زمن النفط presents a Western text by a non-Western: an oriental, leaving thus little space for manipulation. Nonetheless, the translation of the novel under a new title gives English speaking readers what they are generally familiar with as represented and stereotyped through the politics and ideologies of their culture but in the voice of the Other. Within this context the figure of the author appears as authority to the unknown Arab culture: an exotic, yet oppressive and
violent East. The Western master discourse and norms of translation from Arabic and representation of Arabs, Arab culture and Islam, reframed El-Saadawi in a way that fits Western agendas rewriting her anti-imperialist voice into a native informant one. El-Saadawi herself, although makes some efforts to resist the Western misrepresentation of her, invites it by allowing her works to be used to confirm prevailing prejudices about Arabs, Arab women and Muslim culture. She uses examples from the Arab society as generalized forms, which promotes Western critics to use them as evidence that the stereotypes and clichés used to represent Arabs and Islam are true. These forms ultimately reinforce the dominant discourse of the Western culture of representing the Arab and Muslim Other especially that they emanate from the Other. And even though not representatives of the Arab world as a whole or Islam, voices like El-Saadawi and others who write for translation, are taken as representatives of that part of the world. Indeed, for a reader who is not familiar with Arabic, the translation of حب في زمن النفط feeds his/ her assumptions and expectations of what the book promises.

*Love in the Kingdom of Oil* in many cases does not successfully render the meaning of the original text. In many cases the meaning of the original is impaired through the inappropriate choice of equivalents whether consciously or not. Less justifiable is the distortion that results from misreading which led to faulty translations. It is obvious that the translation does not do justice to the original. Therefore, to judge the translation of حب في زمن النفط, considering the above analysis, might lead to the conclusion that the translation is not successful. Baring in mind the fact that no two languages are equivalent, and that in all culture-bound texts functional equivalence may not be possible to maintain because the aim of the original text for its audience is different than that of the translation to its new
audience (as discussed in Chapter Four), it is assumed that the overall structure of the original should be preserved and that there be no distortion of meaning. The above examples, however, show how this has been violated on a number of occasions. The translation has not been adequate nor can it be considered an artistic creation in its own right because the many occasions of misreading produced meaningless sentences. Still, a work should not be judged in isolation from the purpose for which it is intended. The intention in the case of *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* has been, as the back cover informs us, to build a bridge between the English speaking world and the Arabic one especially with regard to the issues surrounding women. In light of this, *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* and the translation do not serve the purpose for which they were intended. The translation was inappropriately done and the novel itself as many critics have commented is outdated and poorly written.

The Arab world is a mixture of backgrounds and ideologies due to its long history. And with the complexity and diversity of its literature, it is only fair if a wide range of works can represent it. Nonetheless, the current trend in translating from the Arab/ Islamic world is very selective in response to the constraints and disciplinary demands of the master discourse that underlies translation. Consequently, the translation traffic from Arabic is witnessing a state of dullness. A number of Arab writers, precisely female Arab writers, are continuously translated, overexposed and over cited. Occasionally a new name is added, but the outcome remains the same; repeated statements that fall within the two dominant concepts: Arab women and Islamic fundamentalism.

However, if Western readers are exposed to a variety of texts, styles and ideologies, they will recognize that the Arab/ Islamic society is a collection of different people from different cultures even religions and backgrounds, and that
writers are individual creative persons who represent their ideologies in the forms they choose using their own tongue. In doing so readers will be left the freedom of choice and translation will yield a better understanding of the Other and a more fruitful intercultural communication.
Chapter Eight

8 Conclusion

In a rapidly shrinking world, intercultural communication has become an inescapable reality. The world has never been as demanding as it is today to know its others and to share the latest text be it film, song, or book simultaneously and across cultures. Translation, amongst other means, has made this possible. However, as simple as this task may seem, its implementation, often, if not always, creates problems of all kinds and at different levels. Translation of texts from cultures that are unequal developmentally and between which exists unequal power relations manifests extremely complex processes. The political and economic domination of the Anglo-American world, precisely the United States, which was the outcome of World War II, led ultimately to its dominance on the cultural sphere. This asymmetry of power created a dichotomy of dominant/dominated, superior/inferior, minor/major, us/them, etc., within which translation became a tool for the competing ideologies. It is a point of fundamental importance, however, to recognize that these dichotomies are dynamic, not static. Imposed on the dominated societies, translation was a vital mean in order to catch up with the rest of the world and to stimulate and enhance their position. For the dominant societies, however, it was a tool that different institutions had at their disposal to manipulate a given society and construct the desired domestic identity of that foreign culture. We have shown in the previous chapters how the West, the predominantly dominant, operates under certain constraints during the selection, production and circulation of foreign texts in
translation. These constraints usually involve manipulations of power relations and deviations from the basic norms of equivalency that aim at constructing an image of the source culture that fits within the domestic framework of that culture and which assists in preserving and/or extending the hegemony of the dominant culture. Adhering to these constraints eventually produces a master discourse of representation through which the other is represented/translated. On the other hand, the fixedness to this master discourse's requirements and constraints produces stereotypical representations, often negative, of the Other. In support, this process often accompanies a strategy of inclusion and exclusion. Certain native voices and texts, to the exclusion of others, are frequently attached to the specific cultures, over cited and over exposed, as truthful and valued informants. Only texts and voices that conform to the dominant norms and values of representing the Other are included, hence globalized. On the other hand, the culture of translating, which comes already formulated as a master discourse, rewrites these texts and voices to meet the target readers' assumptions and expectations, hence accommodates and localizes their associated cultures. Thus, the representation of otherness through translation neither enhances cross-cultural communication nor serves the globalization of cultures.

The history of translation in its different epochs records cases of domestication and appropriation that were the result of the socio-political constraints of the culture doing the translation. Translation into Arabic, for example, as discussed in Chapter Two, was selective in its choices of texts and topics. In addition, translators often practiced extrinsic management in order to produce texts consistent with the local culture and religion. The strategies that a culture adopts in translating another cannot be judged as good or bad unless undesirable effects materialize.
As far as translation from Arabic is concerned, there seems to be a continuous interaction between the Western perceptions of the Arab/ Islamic culture and the politics by which texts from Arabic are chosen, rewritten and circulated into mainstream European languages. As the different examples provided illustrate, translation from Arabic is carried out within an already established framework in which the Arab/ Islamic culture has been associated with a mixture of characteristics of darkness, violence, naivety and barbarism which impress and appeal to the Western public. In addition, as illustrated in section 7.2, and despite excellent literary work and a Nobel Prize in literature, the number of books translated from Arabic, one of the official languages of the United Nations and the language of approximately 1200 million people, into English is very minute. In addition, the general Western public perceive Arabic only as the language of Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden (Anderson 1999: 18). The accounts of some specialists indicate that this situation is the result of the politics by which texts are chosen for translation. According to an orientalist who spent years in the Arab world studying its history and culture and its values and belief system, 'it is the negativity that the West is after in Arabic literary works; they seek women, circumcision, backwardness and poverty. They are not interested in the art as much as in the gloomy image' (my translation, cited in Jebriil 2004). This is especially true in the case of female Arab writers in the Western market place. The existence of their writings in the Western market place is controversial. Nawal El-Saadawi, the Egyptian writer is one of the most recognized Arab female writers in the West. El-Saadawi who is also a feminist and a medical doctor, gained access to the Western market place through The Hidden Face of Eve which was published in English in 1980. Many critics, Western and non-Western, argue that she is celebrated in the West not so much because she champions
women's rights, but because she tells Western readers what they want to hear. In this view, her writings are welcomed because they conform to the existing stereotypes about the Arabs, Arab culture and Islam and they play to Western prejudices. The reception of female Arab writers in the West in general corresponds to the Western interest in and hostility to Islam. The colonial project which stereotyped women in the Arab world as victims to be rescued from Muslim male violence, and the continuous reference and fixation on the veil, the harem, excision, and polygamy made Arab women symbols of a region and a religion that is exotic, yet violent, and inferior. As has been mentioned earlier, the reception of El-Saadawi, in particular, coincided with the Iranian revolution and the first Gulf War, which cast the Middle East as violent and threatening. This rendition was reflected on the way Arab female voices are chosen and conceived, the way their books are marketed and received in the West and how they are manipulated to meet the expectations and assumptions of Western readers. This situation did not only contain their voices and writings within a predefined space but also led many female Arab writers to write for translation to satisfy their readers, which alienated them from their local readers. According to the sample analysis in Chapter Six, El-Saadawi's *The Hidden Face of Eve*, for example, was a clear departure from the original not only in terms of contents and structure but also the very title of the book. In addition, El-Saadawi herself changed the introduction, which celebrated the Iranian revolution, for the American edition of the book as a result of the undesired welcome she received from her British edition audience. Moreover, she reconsidered her topics focusing on those which appeal to the Western reader on the expense of her strong political views. El-Saadawi, who was imprisoned for her communist beliefs, is also well spoken politically and frequently opposes Western foreign policies. But unlike the celebration she receives
for her discussion of women’s issues and accounts of female clitoridectomy, she is not considered an authority on politics. Within this context, Chapter Seven demonstrates how the translation of Nawal El-Saadawi’s latest novel تحب في زمن النفط under the new title *Love in the Kingdom of Oil* is a testament that some Arab women writers write specifically for translation and that, regardless of the merits of their work, they are being translated, manipulated and used by the West. In this novel, which tells the story of a woman who leaves work to search for the goddesses remains, El-Saadawi reiterates the usual clichés about women in the Arab/Islamic society: simplicity, subordination, tyranny, hopelessness and weakness. The analysis has shown that the translation indeed plays into readers’ expectations. In addition, the translation, assisted by the promises on the back cover of the book (a confrontation of the major issues and questions regarding the position and role of women in an authoritarian and oppressive society), confirms El-Saadawi’s image as a representative of the Arab world especially on Arab women in the Arab/Islamic society, hence a native authority and informant on both.

The Western master discourse of representing the Arabs, Arab culture and Islam, rewrote El-Saadawi through the translation of تحب في زمن النفط in its choices of words and strategies. The decision to change the title but reserve the illustration on the front cover and add a telegraphic introduction about El-Saadawi tells readers, before they embark on reading, how to read the novel. Indeed, the politics of inclusion that introduced El-Saadawi to the West as representative of Egypt, and by extension the Arab world, globalized her voice and texts but localized the culture.

The argument is, with the depth of the Arab culture and the diversity of its literature and ideologies, there is no reason why only one writer or a group of writers should represent it. In a rapidly globalizing world, the ethics of translation postulate
that translation should create a readership that is open to cultural differences for a true globalization of cultures rather than being a tool for reinforcing existing representations and images of one culture about the other. We have shown that the problem resides outside translation but in the ideologies that underline translation and the poetics that make up the master discourse of representing the Other. Through discussing the different aspects of globalization in Chapter 3 and how they affect relations between the different cultures, we have exhibited how the powerful forces of globalization whether political, economic or cultural have consequently affected translation between cultures especially between the so-called major and minor ones tremendously. We have also shown through considering the case of Medieval Arabic translation that languages grow and cultures develop not only through interaction with nature and the environment but most importantly as they come into contact with and learn from other languages and cultures, obviously through translation. In fact, as Cronin (2003: 169) puts it, ‘if translation is a science of anything, it is a science of difference, for without difference there would be no translation’. In today’s world, the different, the exotic, the once remote is no longer miles away but in the backyard. Translation can be an enemy, threatening, oppressive and disabling or a friend and enabling. For translation to be an enabling force we must be open to differences not shut them down, which is the responsibility of both the translating and translated culture. We therefore have the following recommendations, based on our research, for both the exporting and importing cultures so that translation can be an efficacious constructive tool:

1. First of all, Arab writers and authors are urged to produce literature that is worth translating and to escape the pressure of the major languages. They should focus on literature that reflects the reality of
the Arab world and avoid the repeated statements and clichés or the bruised ego of historical loss.

2. We also believe that the Arab world should pay more attention to outward translation and have more control over the translation process.

3. For inward translation, more attention should be paid to translating scientific and technical texts. Since this is the age of a scientific and technological boom, translating texts into Arabic of this nature will prove that Arabic is capable of being used in the modern world and defy any claims that it is a literary language.

4. Translation should be free of any perceptions or interests of those doing the translation.

5. The Arabs, as well as any other speakers of a language and culture considered minor in translation, must see translation not only in terms of literature but in all dimensions as cultural because culture is about a whole set of human activities not one subset that is privileged by the gaze of the commanding other. They must aim to translate and recover the prestigious, true Islamic and strong literary and historical texts in order to counter the charges of ignorance, lack of creativity and barbarity against the Arab/ Islamic world regulated by Western propagandists and supported by local Arab voices.

6. Translators must not confine themselves to translating specific texts and neglect all the other realms of human experience that constitute a culture.
7. Transparency and avoiding the discomfort generated by the existence of others by means of ignoring difference have not brought bliss. Likewise, the manipulative celebration of difference has caused more and bloodier wars that the history of mankind never witnessed before. Having said that, we therefore suggest that all differences be highlighted and give this option the chance to prove its worthiness.

8. We recommend that the kind of critical prejudice that the back cover of Love in the Kingdom of Oil makes be dropped because it makes the publication and reception of translations in a major language like English even more fraught than ever and is further demonstration that major is transformed into minor in translation.

9. Translation projects should move away from being the mirror through which the other sees itself and gets to know itself, for if the situation remains as it is we can only wonder what kind of future there is for the less known, inferior and minor languages and cultures (the Other) in translation theory and practice.

10. It is recommended that rather than refusing the foreign that does not fit the domestic agenda or manipulating it to conform and confirm the local master discourse and its norms of representing that Other, why not perceive the presence of the other cultures as an actual benefit and source of future cultural, and perhaps economic too, wealth.

11. In addition, translators who are by all means involved in a highly complex process of judgement and selection must possess well detailed linguistic and cultural knowledge which allows them to
identify a meaning and assess its potential effect on source text readers in order to be able to find the most suitable equivalent in the target text and for the target receivers.

12. Furthermore, publishers must take the risk like Donald Herdeck of the Three Continents Press which has become one of the major publishers of Third World literature. Herdeck's idea for the press was born at a time when other major publishers had no faith in African, Latin American, Asian or Middle Eastern literature. The outcome of representing other ways of viewing the world and other ideologies is guaranteed to serve the cause of cultural globalization and promote fruitful intercultural dialogues and self-criticism notwithstanding the risk involved.

13. We also feel that much more needs to be done to encourage exchange between Arabic and languages other than English in order to widen the circle of readership.

14. It is also greatly recommended that the translators' methods and strategies should not be ignored in critical commentary and book reviews. As we have shown, texts are not magically transported and straightforwardly transparent.

15. In order to realize a proper development of the world as a unit, it is essential to translate and document difference in all aspects, not to mention ideological difference, for it could constitute a tremendous economic and scientific gain to the human race. As stated above, 'minority' is dynamic. Arabic was once a major language but when
the translation movement declined whether inward or outward, so did the language and culture. A culture should not wait until it reaches a state of generic crisis or be minor or weak and overshadowed by a larger and more powerful one for translation to occupy a central position.

16. Academically, it seems fundamental that more and more schools in the Western world should start introducing more languages to their translation and interpreting courses. Courses should include the history and nature of the languages and cultures. Most importantly, the languages and cultures must be introduced without any attempt of manipulation for any reason.

17. Also, Arab scholars as well as others of minor languages in translation should be more visible in translation studies debates and conferences.

It is hoped that in light of the thesis in hand and the above recommendations further research can establish ways of making translation more friendly and enabling. It is also hoped that based on the information above further studies can research how and what schools of translation can introduce in order to produce amateur translators to deal with foreign languages and cultures. In addition, perhaps an interesting research could be one which conducts an investigation into how the Arab/ Islamic culture have been represented through translation during specific periods. Most of all we anticipate that this research be helpful not only for further research in the field of translation, but any other discipline interested in any of the subjects handled. Least of all, we hope it is a delightful and enlightening reading.
Translation, for its part, can make a powerful contribution to understanding and respecting distinctness and difference as well as relatedness. Within the context of globalization, translation can either both strengthen the fragile cultures and make their less known languages well known, or cause hostility, more bloody wars and resistance if shutting the Other or allowing only mirror images remain possible responses to difference and to the discomfort of the presence of others. As it is today, there is no indication that the flow of migration will cease. Rather, it seems even the small cities will be complex linguistically and culturally which will require, contrary to the general conception suggested by the powerful, not closing down on difference but opening up to all differences.

To sum up, we inscribe the following quote by Jean Grimshaw (1986: 182-3) in which she expresses the necessity of celebrating difference precisely in terms of relations with others,

Care for others, understanding of them, are only possible if one can adequately distinguish oneself from others. If I see myself as ‘indistinct’ from you, or you as not having your own being that is not merged with mine, then I cannot preserve a real sense of your well-being as opposed to mine. Care and understanding require the sort of distance that is needed in order not to see the other as a projection of self, or self as a continuation of other.

(emphasis in original, cited in Cronin 2003: 171)
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