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Politics of Translating Modern Arabic Language, Literature and Culture

The history of *The Arabian Nights* in Europe or, more generally speaking, in the West, is the history of the influence of a work in translation. This may first not seem an important statement. It is, however, necessary, to keep this fact in mind, for whereas translations made from Western language into another can usually be examined and criticized by a great number of people who read the original language, the same is not true for *The Arabian Nights*, since hardly anybody in the West was able to read the original text. So readers had to put complete trust into the reliability of the translation and the seriousness of the translator. (Fahndrich 96)

In the light of such ethics betraying the influence of literary works in translation on readership of a target language, this chapter splits into four main sections that knit well in the thesis's fabric as to reveal certain policies, attitudes and understandings with regard to translating Arabic literature and culture in English. To what extent are these translations reliable and trustworthy? And to what extent do politics of translation play a role in defining what to translate and how to translate? The analyses in the previous chapters have shown a lot to provide a sufficient answer, yet the discussions hereunder attempt to add more weight to the question.

5.1. **Politics of Stereotyped Perception, Propaganda and Representation**

To address such politics fairly enough an important question should be answered first: Who translates and publishes Arabic literature? and Why?
The answer to this question is likely to produce a long list of translators belonging to different races, languages and cultures. As a matter of fact, it is of little value to try to answer this question within the limits of individual attempts. The answer should show a list of the official institutions that care for translating Arabic literature. It is really the institutional efforts that can show the more serious politics behind translating foreign literatures. A likely answer can be institutions to which source Arabic literature belongs, i.e., Arabic institutions, and maybe other foreign institutions to whose culture and language the target texts should finally travel. The interest in Arabic literature cannot be exclusive to national producers and receivers. Real literature normally transcends its local limitations into other lands through translation. This is exactly why literatures are universal in nature, and consequently gain importance through translation. Arabic literature enjoys, unfortunately, more individually-oriented translations than institutionally-oriented ones. This can be the full stop to the above question, but there are still the publishers. The interest in publishing Arabic literature can be a determinant of Arabic literary translations. In my review of many translations I have found that there are no real academic or even cultural institutions in the Arab world that take care of translating Arabic literature in the modern age. Moreover, no official institutions exist to encourage translating Arabic literature. The political link seems to be lost between the Arabic literary author and the government which is supposed to encourage him. Many translators, national or foreign, realize this broken link. They also realize that their translations are not encouraged and supported officially. In her article that reflects on her interview with the distinguished Arabic-English literary translator Roger Allen, Hala Halim says that
For Allen the problems faced by a literary translator from Arabic "are totally practical: translation from Arabic is not a profession in which there are any degrees or standards or rewards. The best you can say is that nobody translates Arabic unless they are an 'amateur' in the original sense of the word, in the sense of 'lover'." The translator's concerns are as basic as "persuading any publisher to publish a translation and market it, and also persuading anybody to read the book". He places the responsibility for this lack of interest in publishing and disseminating translated Arabic literature squarely at the door of "representatives of the Arab world in the capital cities of the world, such as cultural attachés, who are supposed to project Arab culture [abroad] but seem to be totally unqualified and unequipped and unwilling to promote the literatures of their homelands". Concurring with a number of translators working into different European languages who were present at the SCC conference, he says that "the [2004] Frankfurt Book Fair [where the Arab world was guest of honour], from this point of view, was a massive failure on every level". The representatives and cultural attachés of the Arab world in Europe and the US, he adds, "may need specific instructions and funding -- but this should be available."("Between Words")

The clear tone of the statements above is as real as any Arab scholar can feel it realistically. The Arab authorities seem to be unwilling to promote their own literatures. The absence and passiveness of the Arab official cultural authorities abroad is not the only thing observed as has been pointed out by Roger Allen. More to this question can be felt with regard to the kind of treatment Arabic authors and their translators have inside the Arab World today. The moral responsibility of the official authorities is almost absent toward their literatures. To give an example, Yemeni literature has but little presence in English translation, let alone in other western and eastern languages. Cultural attaches do
not tend to do any thing serious to promote their own literature in its original language. Many departments of Arabic libraries complain of the lack of material on Yemeni literature. Once the complaint reaches the ears of those who are concerned in the related embassies, they tend to extend the complaint by a complaint about the passive attitude of the concerned authorities inside the country. Translated literature cannot enjoy a better interest then. The problem of interest is overcome by the problem of funding and the whole thing turns over to be claimed economic. Roger Allen's interest in Arabic literature seems to be individual. It gained him reputation inside the Arab world and outside it. Many foreign literary translators of Arabic literature are still dominating the literary translation circle in the absence of the official interest. In addition to this, most of the translators of Arabic literary works are non-Arabs. This is another problem that is crystal clear. Even on the individual level, Arab literary translators seem to be absent, like they were imitating the roles played by their official authorities inside and outside their countries. The translations scrutinized and discussed in this thesis are, mostly translated by non-Arabs and revised by non-Arabs too for publication, irrespective of the fact that not even a single Arab university seems to be without an English department and English scholarship as far as governmental universities are concerned. An Arab scholar of English at a university can play a big role in prompting the translation of Arabic literature. Yet the problem still takes extra-literary and extra-linguistic dimensions especially when such a scholar knowing English complains of the state of non- or lack of support of such a project. Even when translation units are promoted in certain Arab universities, almost no literary section does exist that should care to promote some famous literary works through academic translation. If such a passive situation exists, it is
probable that others should not really care for our literatures or even cultures. Here comes the role of the Other who will start thinking of translating what may interest him. Such interest is certain to be shaped by ethics and politics that differ from the ethics and politics expected by the original-literature peoples. In an interview published online with the distinguished Arab author, critic and translator Muhammad Usfur run by Sabrine Shamardal, he is asked if the West has any political intentions behind what it translates into its languages. Usfur uncovers the whole issue and says:

"Of Course. The West translates what may 'pour' into its interest. It translates either to recognise or to get recognised. America, for instance, translates a lot to let the world know what American is. This is quite clear through what is observed in News Week Magazine in Arabic and in other languages as well. The translations of American works are run by institutions or individuals in return for wages. We know a long history of such attempts where there are institutions that were established to disseminate the American culture itself. The western world translates for us in order to know how the Arabs and the Muslims think. They translate for a nationalistic cause. They are quite picky of what they choose to translate and they know that such a chosen book serves well their purposes for understanding a particular community... As a matter of fact, the Arabic books translated into English are not popular; they are just taught at certain departments at universities with an aim to study these peoples, know how they think and then launch attacks on their cultures in their own environments... The West wants to read books of the kind similar to The Thousand Nights and One. They have certain stereotypes on the Orient. They do not want novels on ordinary people thinking of issues related to our age. They draw themselves away from the serious literature that captures the attention of those who are specialised in the Mideast Studies... The Arab cultural institutions are not doing their
duties. They have failed to disseminate multicultural knowledge inside and outside the
Arab world. This kind of knowledge is reduced internationally into some shows and
exhibitions limited to cinema and folklore with a bit of a margin for Translation
sometimes...But still I insist on some other thing: We are not requested to apologise for
the West. If it was interested in us, it has to search for us and to come to introduce itself
to us. We are still thinking in an apologizing mode about what we have. We want to
make ourselves appealing for the West when we are not really compelled to do so. We
are not in a situation to say sorry. So it is when we have the power that we can find the
West more understanding. But the case is that we are still in a weak position and always
seek to please the West and that is wrong."

Usfur's statements above conform to those by Roger Alien cited earlier in this chapter.
The passive attitude of the Orient toward its own languages, literatures and cultures
makes the problem worse. If the West has created its own institutions to disseminate its
original languages and cultures, it has played well when it chose to also promote its
understanding of the world around it through translating other cultures. The bridges
erected by them have served them well. The Arab Orient has played the same role in the
peak of its civilization in the middle ages; but unfortunately has forgotten to play the
same role today. Usfur realizes well the politics of power and the role it plays in making
the Other more considerate. He has succeeded to point out that we have to know
ourselves before we seek to make the Other know us. Knowing ourselves cannot be
achieved unless our languages, literatures and cultures are respected by us first. If
translation is to play a role in this direction, then we should care a lot about the role it can
play. It should not be marginalised. Though Usfur does not seem to define the term
"power" in his statements above, it can very much mean "the ability to know oneself."
In any case, it remains a fact that modern Arabic literature is growing in Western countries and is nowadays enjoying a better translation and publication since laureateship was granted to Najib Mahfuz. Salih J. Altoma succeeds to bring home to us the status of Arabic literature to day when he says:

The post-Nobel phase represents, in several ways, a striking departure from the earlier phases. The first obvious development is the relative frequency and regularity with which Arabic works of fiction are translated or reprinted in response to demands. Note, for example, the various editions and printings of works by Mahfuz, Munif, Sa'dawi, Salih, and Shaykh. Second, a large number of publishers, including, for the first time, major commercial publishers and university presses, have become involved in the publishing and marketing contemporary Arabic works. Special reference should be made to the series that the Three Continents Press and PORTA (Project for Translation from Arabic) continue to publish or support in the U.S., and the several more recent series being put out by such American university presses and programs as Arkansas, Columbia, Minnesota, Texas, and the University of Texas's Center for Middle Eastern Studies. To this must be added the effective role which the mainstream journals have exercised in expanding the audience for Arabic literature. Such journals, especially library-oriented journals, have begun to review on a fairly regular basis Arabic works in English translation, and to recommend them for acquisition by public libraries.

In short by the mid 1990s an extensive corpus of Arabic fiction has become accessible in English translation to an equally expanded audience. [...] Arabists have, on the whole, focused more on Egypt than on other Arab countries. [...] The translation and printing of Egyptian works have been promoted through active support by such institutions, Egyptian and non-Egyptian, as the Ministry of Culture's General Egyptian
Altoma's list, though short, of the institutions that care for translating Egyptian Arabic literature into English draws our attention to the fact that the foreign institutions outnumber the national. This list can be prolonged tremendously to the extent that it would become quite obvious that the West becomes not only the reader, but also the observer, the interpreter, the translator, the critic and to a large extent the supporter and the publisher of Arabic literature. Many academics and scholars, authors and translators have started to notice this phenomena, and along with it the questioned "literary quality of the translated texts [... and] other issues and facets relevant to the whole process of selecting and translating specific texts and authors" (ibid. 139). What worsens the situation, and adds more wet to mud, as the Arabs say, is the fact that the hegemony of the West over the whole Orient creates its particular crises. "We are misrepresented, misunderstood and underestimated": voices that have never seemed to stop. "The Orient groans, and the West laughs" seems to be the slogan of the present political, economic, literary and cultural situation. Reviewing the above talk is sure to make the point clear: the Orient has created for itself what can be termed "the state of the sick man"; and since the remedy comes from the West, it is then sure that the groan should be increased and continued, lest the Orient is felt dead. Simply because it is the Other that gives the powerful identity in contrast.

Anyhow, there appears to be unanimous agreement that Oriental literature in translation in general is subordinated in the West. Arabic literature is not an exception - to a large extent. Misrepresentation of literature does not limit itself to the literary ethics of literary works. It goes beyond that to points of cultural import. In their generality.
translated source texts are underestimated and even subjugated. Such statements sound to be exaggerative; but this is a crystal fact. Edward Sa'id in his great text "Orientalism" concentrates on the idea of representing the Orient by the West through writings he terms as truthful depictions of the Orient. He relies on histories, philological and political treatises. Such sources are found to have depictions that are not natural depictions but "representations as representations". He focuses on features like style, figures of speech, setting, narrative devices and other social and historical circumstances through which such representations of the Orient are detected. Sa'id says that the "exteriority of the representation is always governed by some version of the truism that if the Orient could represent itself, it would; since it cannot, the representation does the job, for the West, and faute de mieux, for the poor Orient" (Said, Orientalism 21); Sa'id's French italics means "for lack or want of something better." This adverbial phrase seems to sum up the situation. Anyway, emphasis is placed here not on what Sa'id does in his leading book and his own methods to read such representations, but on the idea of representation itself. His remark opens to me the door through which I can get to the point where I can prove that translation also is another text through which representation of the Orient can highly be read. The current study has a lot to do with representation and misrepresentation. It is true that the empirical model of this research work has focused on the literary aspects, yet the cultural aspects have always been in mind and discussed throughout.

The Arab Orient is found to be even poorer in English translations, the language of the most dominating countries of the world today and its politics. Most of the translators of Arabic literature have proved that the Orient for them is something that is difficult, obscure, mysterious and even inferior. Such expressions are not very much
explicit, but implicit and can be detected through the way western translators deal with
the cultural, literary and linguistic input the literary texts have. Such a western vantage
point is certainly influenced by a political discourse and the general western perspective
of the Orient, its languages, people, cultures, and literatures. If the image of the Orient
had been modified by the West politically and culturally, translators could have produced
more respected translations of its literatures and cultures. Sa'id's remark is effective in his
own contexts and in contexts similar to what this thesis tries to prove. Yet, this is not the
place in which I intend to check my findings against Sa'id's parameters and the way he
addresses the subject. What is concentrated on here is what is offered by translation. I
regard my discussions here and elsewhere in the thesis as one trajectory that contributes
to the meaning of eastern-western relations and the image of the Arab-Islamic Orient as
one major point discussed by Orientalism. Such relations are determined by "a growing
systematic knowledge in Europe about the Orient, knowledge reinforced by the colonial
encounter as well as by the widespread interest in the alien and unusual, exploited by the
developing sciences of ethnology, comparative anatomy, philology, and history." Sa'id
seems to hint at the role of translation and its contribution to the establishment of such
knowledge when he further says, "furthermore, to this systematic knowledge was added a
sizable body of literature produced by novelists, poets and translators [...]" (Said,
Orientalism 39- 40). I stop at this word of the quote i.e. translators so as to indicate its
contribution to what has been making the image of the Orient. Translation plays a role in
the same direction. Edward Sa'id was one of those Orientalists who scanned Najib
Mahfuz in English translations and lamented him by the same word he lamented the
Orient when he described him as the "poor Mahfuz." Sa'id's lamenting statements for
Mahfuz in English translation comes from his understanding of the politics and ideologies that surround the translated text and the translational strategies that were preconceived as suitable and appropriate for translating the Orient. "The poor Orient" and "the poor Mahfuz" are twins born of the same awareness of how western policies manufactured the image of the Orient. Translators are good participants in the making of the re-created or even created images of oriental literatures and cultures in general and Arabic literature and culture in particular.

Even after the driving away of most colonial troops out of the Arab world, translation has not changed its general look at modern Arabic literature. Translations from Arabic into English continued to flow in the same direction and through the same ideological channels on the official general level. This is to exclude some well-appreciated attempts and efforts on the individual level, of course. That is because some translators showed great neutral interest in the east and its literature and translated from a vantage point that puts Arabic literature on an equal footing with its western counterpart: "Arabic is a language no less important than English in the overall history of ideas, culture, and science, reaching into the distant past when Cambridge and Oxford were crude villages on riverbanks" (Beaugrande 1).

Even though the Arabic language and its culture have been rightly recognized by some westerners, many others still have continued to claim otherwise doubting or denying even the existence of its literatures. An example of such an attitude is demonstrated in Reuven Snir's article titled "Modern Arabic Literature and the West: Self-Image, Interference, and Reception":

*Modern Arabic Literature and the West: Self-Image, Interference, and Reception*
Until the 1960s, among all the other modern literatures of the East, Modern Arabic literature received singularly little attention in the West. Even as late as 1971, John A. Haywood complains that "modern Arabic literature has been largely neglected until the last few years."[... One] explanation is the general negative Western attitude towards Arabic literature as a literary phenomenon. The strongest variant of this attitude may well be G. Young's dictum that nearly all national movements begin with a renascence of the national language, legends, and literature, "but Modern Egypt has no language, no literature, no legends of its own. (60)

According to Salih J. Altoma there are extraliterary considerations which seem "to subvert the 'literary merit' principle when Arabic literature is involved. This negative approach extends at times "to the Arab people and their culture as a whole" (ibid. 60). Such negative approach which "extends at times to the Arab people and their culture as a whole" has not changed so much after the rise of post-colonial literatures and "is still encountered at this century's end, even where least expected" (Altoma, The Reception of Najib 162). Such literatures have attempted to reconstruct the destroyed image and claim back the rights that were taken away by the imperial western powers. But this attempt of those Arab writers who have taken such a project in the west was a failure in itself. It was a failure because the postcolonial texts were composed originally through the languages of the imperialists like French and English. Such an attempt has, unfortunately, fed itself from that cultural hegemony of the West that gives a sense of superiority to their languages. This is one of the ironies that show how the Orient is incapable of expressing itself through its own languages. Such endeavours have attempted to do nothing but to "inscribe neo-colonial hegemony by privileging the languages (and consequently the canons) of the major colonial powers, Britain and France" (Hassan 48).
The point is that the Arab Orient, and for the same reason the whole Orient and other subjugated cultures and literatures, can never bring a balance by writing their literatures in the languages of those who have terrorized them for centuries. The change can be brought by the realisation that languages and literatures of the Orient are equal and may be superior for some of them. Even in translation, English takes the priority over languages due to the political power of the countries that speak it. "The economic and political ascendancy of the United States has reduced foreign languages and cultures to minorities in relation to its language and culture. English is the most translated language worldwide [...] (Venuti, Scandals 10). Even when such a critical post-colonial work like Edward Sa'id's Orientalism is found written in English, it adds more to the weight of such a language and its culture than to the language of its author and his culture. But so long as literature belongs to culture, the question remains: Could such a famous book had seen the light if it was written in Arabic in a post-colonial context still culturally dominated by the West? The answer to this question may tend to be more ironical if we think of the West as an opposing entity to the existence of Arabic language itself, let alone developing its literature and culture, which is more Islamic than anything else. Testifying to this are two literary incidents:

- The first is that the Arabic literature written originally in, say, English or in French is not given its due in academic circles or curricula, though such literatures have become part of English or French literatures. They are "housed on the margin" (Hassan 45).
The second is that even its published translations that exist in the West are guided more by politics of censorship. Arab writers who promoted the West and its cultural values in their writings are placed in the front. Najib Mahfuz and Nawal al-Sa'dawi from the Arab world and Salman Rushdi from India are best examples. This is not to say that their works are not important for their literary aspects; but the fact is that their works have been weighed by western publishers against the cultural input they contain. Moreover, they were encouraged by western prizes for the same reason at large. Till this date, the first decade of the third millennium, the Arab Orient is placed literarily and culturally under the same politics of perception and representation.

Such stereotypes have affected translating Arabic literature to a great degree to an extent that we start to hear some Western sounds that belittle Arabic literature without exception: A biased Orientalist like Wickens pretends that most of Arabic literature is "little but a servile imitation of the worst features of our modern literature." Altoma, the Arab scholar, quoted below, refers this bias to other allegations put by another Western scholar who had read Arabic literature only in translation:

[T]his denigrating generalization about eminent writers and Egyptians in general was not made on the basis of the author's[Wickens's] knowledge of Arabic or a reasonable familiarity with Egypt's extensive literary output, but rather was simply based on Poss's rudimentary readings of a few texts in English translation.

(Altoma, Reception of Najib 164)

The biased talks by Westerners on Arabic language, literature and culture do not stop and will not. Here I tend to wrap up the discussion of this section and say if Arabic, as any
other language in the world, has difficulties. These difficulties should not be exaggerated and
should not be viewed as an insurmountable hurdle for truly serious students or competent
serious translators, nor should they be used to legitimate the dearth of translations from
Arabic. Indeed if a better understanding and a wider appreciation of Arabic literature and
culture are to be achieved, translation, which is likely to remain the primary channel of
reception, should be perused more regularly and on a larger scale." (ibid. 165)

Such partial views on Arabic and its literatures and cultures apparently came into being
with the start of the modern crusades when the sword was on the head of the colonized
Arabs of nineteenth centuries and the first two thirds of the twentieth century. They have
been luring the Arabs away from their indigenous beliefs about the loftiness of their
literatures and cultures, let alone their language, the language of the Qur'an which is
believed by all Muslims to be of no equal in the world. A language that is not difficult to
be understood or interpreted, and remains of excellence that is unmatched according to
statements drawing on the opinions of many westerners and easterners who have known
and studied Arabic and expressed their views on it, personally and academically.

The Arab Orient has deteriorated only when it lost its faith in what is recognized by their
peoples as certain. Under Western propagations and propaganda, many have not only lost
the faith in their fundamentals, but have gone too far to the extent that they started to
become just trumpets for the West against their own language, their own classical and
modern literature and even against their own conventional values.

5.2. Politics of Power, Publication and Reception
As far as quantity is concerned, the number of translations flowing from English and other western languages into Arabic were greater in number. Modern Arabic culture remained a captive under such foreign cultural influences in times of political occupation. Even after independence western styles of living and modes of expression continued to flood the Arab world through scientific and literary translations as well as through other cultural contacts. Egypt, Syria and Lebanon played a big role in translating the West and introducing its cultures to the Arabs. The western values started to conflict with Arabic traditions especially the Islamic. Such conflict has given rise to two main opposing trends: one encouraging the western culture, the other rejecting it. But the flooding of literary translations from the West was so strong that it could not be stood against. The number of those translations was increasing rapidly since its early modern beginnings in the second half of the nineteenth century. Literary translations into Arabic gradually increased in number with no real consideration of the literary quality of what was translated. What is quite obvious is that they were translated to entertain the public reader; but quite interestingly they attracted the attention of the Arab writers and influenced their modes of writing and thinking as is the case with Najib Mahfuz and his generation and even later generations. Then it can be said that right from the second half of nineteenth century till as late as the time when Najib Mahfuz was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature, translations into Arabic overrode translations from it. The course of translation, however, was changed greatly afterwards. Such hegemonial flow of translations from the entire West, particularly, French, English and Russia reveals to us the fact that during times of occupation and for a long time in its wake the West enforced and reinforced its cultural hegemony and superiority over the Arab world, as though
convincing them that they should remain attached to it. Edward Sa'id's observations suffice to say a lot on this issue. The role of translations was as great as was observable. Many writers, hired or none-, preferred to adopt the western values and propagate them against the indigenous traditions of their own people. Islam was always in point and many Islamic laws were questioned as is the case witnessed in the works of Najib Mahfuz.

The translations and adaptations of western literary texts were not determined by their literary values but by their cultural inputs. Westerners or their supporters in the Arab world aimed at invasion and not only ordinary introduction. It is of no point for both to question the literary value of those translations of western texts particularly the French and English. The translators and adaptors busied themselves with transferring western culture and its values. The quality of the original literature of the West was taken for granted to be superior namely for novel and short story writing. Guaranteeing this, they cared more for invading the Arab Orient culturally. Their customs and costumes, languages and modes of expression were introduced along with lofty beliefs to support their superiority and to create doubt about the indigenous beliefs and customs which the Arabs prided themselves on for long. To this effect, Tawfiq Yousef emphasizes such changes happening in the second half of the 20th century after the West, particularly America, has developed its technologies on all levels:

Arabic literature and culture began to open up to the new literary, cultural, scientific and technological values coming from west of the Atlantic. As the Arabs realized the growing military, economic and political power of the United States, they tried to come to terms with the newly-rising world power. One way of achieving that was to learn about the
culture, the literature, and the philosophy of that country, and translation proved to be a key to that objective.

[...] Since the 1950s, Arab scholars and intellectuals have been translating the most important works of American literature. [...] The movement to translate American literary works into Arabic gathered momentum in the 1960s and 1970s and has been growing steadily ever since that time. ("The Reception and Translation" 80-81)

His whole article is an example of how modern Arab thinkers and scholars speak of western influence on Arabic literary expression. It is good to open up to new literatures and cultures, but not at the expense of the pride of the nation and its traditional values.

Then it is the political power that gave the West its meaning. In addition to its power, the help of propagators outside and inside the Arab world strengthened the Western values to an extent that all indigenous values started to be questioned. Yousef's article mentions the considerable number of institutions that were established to translate western literature and culture inside the Arab world. After establishing their culture and literatures in this way, they left it to the hired Arab intellectuals or the blind admirers of Western values, who started speaking and writing against the Arabic literary values and modes of literary expressions in favour of the western literary values and their literary schools, their literatures and even their styles of living. Under such circumstances one cannot expect the other, the West here, to recognize literatures or even cultures of the East as an equal. This is the frame in which Arabic literature and culture are placed and looked at.

Then it is under such politics of propagation and domination that we can think of what came next when Arabic literature started to occur translated in the West. This is a kind of translation back or rather a repay. Modern Arabic literature, as talked of by many
observers, enjoyed little recognition or none at all in the West before Nobel laureateship, which seemed to have worked as a sign of recognition. After being given the go-ahead, it is now the time for Arabic literature to claim its importance and rank among world literatures. The Western audience has started to hear of such names as Najib Mahfuz, Ihsan Abd al-Quddus, Jurji Zaydan, Taha Husayn, Tawfiq al-Hakim, etc. Such names were recognized as very eminent in the Arab world long earlier. Their place in world literature started to gain momentum only after the recognition. In fact, the Arabs who have not dominated the West cannot think of their culture as superior or even equal, in spite of their awareness of their glorious past, particularly, the Islamic renaissance of the middle ages, which was for the whole Europe times of darkness. It was the Arab translators and their cultural centres that introduced to the West knowledge in all spheres of life. Even the Western Latin and Greek literary traditions were known to the West by the Arabs. Today what remains for the Arabs is to insist on the importance of their modern literatures and cultures. Here comes the role of translators who started to believe, with the advent of globalization and the "end" of colonization, that human values are to be shared. But, this cannot happen unless the world becomes open to itself. The East should participate actively into the making of world literature, world culture and globalization. The attitude of the translators has been fair enough. They shared all intellectuals of the world their views. They started translating from languages they already knew as languages of the inferior world, or to use a milder term suggested by them and accepted by the whole 'poor' Orient, the Third World: A term that is no more than a permanent designation of culture, though understood widely otherwise. Kuwait and Japan, to mention an example, are still within the prescribed frame by the West.
Reflecting on Arabic literature in English translation, whether the classical or the modern makes us very much aware of what politics is governing our languages. After colonial eras there has seemed to be a return to what once acknowledged by 'such Western scholars as von Grunebaum asserting that "there is hardly an area of human experience where Islam has not enriched the Western tradition'' (Snir 60). Modern Arabic literature is acknowledged again in times where the West has power over the whole Orient. The status of modern Arabic literature is still questioned, and the translation of its culture has not yet gained its importance. To be a little optimistic one can think of a change in such politics of reception regarding Najib Mahfuz and Arabic literature in general after the recognition. To this effect, and contrary to the pre-recognition state, Salih Altoma outlines such politics of reception in the American West and optimistically remarks:

No discussion of the post-1950 period can ignore the largely positive impact which the newly-established Middle East/Near East programs have had on the study and the advancement of Arabic literature in the U.S. It was inevitable that such academic development and the teaching of Arabic literature at numerous colleges and universities would create conditions favorable for the dissemination of information on the literature or culture of the Arab world. Thus a variety of textbooks, readers, or anthologies were prepared in response to the new situation and began to contribute, albeit in a modest way, toward an appreciation of Arabic literature. (The Reception 197)

Altoma goes on to talk on certain evidences that changed the politics of reception after the 1980s, or rather after Mahfuz was claimed to be the first Arab to have the Nobel Prize for literature in 1988. "Fortunately, the post-Nobel period shows a marked departure from
the earlier phases when Mahfuz's works have begun to achieve what may turn to be a breakthrough as far as the American reception is concerned." He concludes with this uncertainty: "However, whether the Nobel Prize's effect will continue beyond its temporary positive results or lead to a genuine American appreciation of Arabic literature in general is a question that only subsequent developments can answer" (ibid. 198-99).

And in his other article titled "Contemporary Arabic Fiction in English Translation, a Chronological Survey: 1947-1996", Salih Altoma leads his talk further to spheres of reception of Arab women writers and the growing interest behind translating and publishing them. In connection with this he mentions two facts:

- The appearance of talented women who contributed to Arabic literature
- The global orientation of feminism in the west, and the success of those women writers to express their social and political issues in their writings

But what is interesting is that he gives an example of a well-reputed Egyptian woman writer, well-circulated and published in the west in general i.e. Nawal al Sa'dawi. He points to some politics of reception and publication of such a writer that consolidate the view that the West is still hegemonial in its reception and publication of Arabic literature and culture:

There is no doubt that of all Arab women writers Sa'dawi has been the most widely received and accorded the most favorable reviews in feminist literature. This is due perhaps more to her radical and outspoken approach in portraying women's conditions in Egypt and Arab societies than to the intrinsic literary value of her works. While censored or banned in Egypt and elsewhere in the region, Sa'dawi's works, both fiction and
nonfiction, have received wide circulation in the West, reaching beyond the usually
limited audience which Arabic literature had up until 1988. (138)

This reveals to us clearly and critically enough that politics of reception of modern
Arabic literature is determined not by literary values but by the cultural input of what is
translated. Novelists of Islamic or traditional views are not really welcomed neither by
publishers nor their readers. To support this view, one may enquire: "How many out of
thirty novels by Tharwat Abazah has been translated into English by the American
University in Cairo Press till today?" It seems that the literary merit has been overlooked
for the sake of content merit as it were. Those liberal Arab writers, in the Western sense
of course, either men or women enjoy more translation and more interest and readership
in the West as opposed to those who are conservative or less liberal in their views. Such
discrimination brings to mind the question of quality and equality. It also emphasizes the
one-way flow of Globalization: one that seeks to foster the West and its cultural and even
ethical notions with no enough space given to the different Other and his or her culture.
However, there are individual cases that find their way out of this general practice.

The matter is not then the literary merit and the quality. It is rather the content or
the message that controls publication and consequently direct reception toward pre-
defined trajectories: When the works are found to serve the West and its values they are
to be published. That is exactly the reason why we have translations marked by exclusion
than inclusion and by obliteration and substitution than by explanation and interpretation.
And the new ethics of Globalization do favour the West and its cultural hegemony. The
new notion itself has been exported by the West. The Arab Orient is still in a passive
position to exploit such a notion for its own interests and the interest of its culture and
literature. When the world of advanced technologies approaches its different corners, it
carries to every part of it a hegemonial culture along with it. Makers of world policy are
certain of what such modern technologies do to the world. Culturally speaking, such
technological advances helped in fostering the Western values more than the eastern
ones. Look at translation then. These eras of Globalization seem to be the best times for
the Orient to reveal itself and claim an equal status to the West. But unfortunately, it is
the West that translates it, its literatures and cultures. Their translations consequently
come with strategies that exclude rather than include, makes similar rather than recognize
differences, and disperse rather than bridge; all this under the flag of Globalization,
which seems to many as well as myself a twin to Westernization as far as culture is
concerned. This is because Globalization has been announced by the West as one way to
convince the world with new politics of sharing and mutual understanding and world
policy making with the aid of technological advances. In reality and on the ground, things
appear differently as if the West coined the term in order just to convince but not to really
believe. However, translation as a trend seems to be working against such politics of
Western globalizational notions where the

functionality of translation has worked just as well as in initiatives mounted from
subordinate positions, some directed against empire, others in complicity with globalized
capital.

[...] The status of translation in the global economy is particularly embarrassing to the
major English-speaking countries, the United States and the United Kingdom. It calls
attention to the questionable conditions of their hegemony, their own dependence on the
domination of English, on unequal cultural exchange that involves the exploitation of
foreign print and electronic media and the exclusion and stereotyping of foreign cultures at home." (Venuti 158-59)

Taking such preliminaries in mind, it is then clear that adopting such translational strategies as omission, addition and substitution cannot go without being affected by such general dilemmas of thought and understanding. Such strategies have started to function as rather ideologies in translating Arabic literature; and most of which are complying with the above discussed politics of stereotyping, publication and reception. In addition to the literary damages and changes discussed in the previous chapters, cultural matter can throw more light on such policies that govern translating Arabic literature in English.

Here are specific cultural categories to be reviewed that will show us how Arabo-Islamic language and culture is treated in English translations:

5.3. Cultural Categories in Point

Our examples below will crystallise into three categories that are found to be most affected in English translation due to either the fore-discussed politics or due to the translators' mere individual conceptions and their separate personal idiosyncrasies, ideologies, understanding or abilities. The study of this thesis has detected cultural manipulation more on the following two main levels:

- Translating names of persons and places
- Translating epithets and titles of people and ways of vocative address

Mahfuz's works have been translated to English by individuals not establishing themselves under any Arabic institution either academic or cultural, except few. Most of his translators are natives of English and most of them remain unguided and not helped with regard to culture-specific items. Even when collaborations are detected, many
conflicts occur as if there were no agreement between the translators on the same text. A good example of this is the translation of Mahfuz's *The Thief and the Dogs* checked earlier. What seems quite interesting is that some academic scholars like M. S. Farid blames the translator of *Midaq Alley* for not taking the help of an Arab knowing Najib Mahfuz's literary world quite well. He points out the mistake of misunderstanding the name of a place for the name of a person. The fun rises when the same translator seems to have responded positively to such a call in his later translation of *The Thief and the Dogs*. This time he has taken the help of a distinguished Arab scholar, a university professor.

Unfortunately, as the scrutiny of this novel has revealed, the translators did not seem to agree on many things. The evidence to this is the diversity of what is supposed to be one and of the same nature. We find a dichotomy in the translation of the Arabic word "shari" [literally street]: in one place we find it translated as "street" and in another translated or rather transliterated as "Sharia". The latter cannot stand correctly either on the level of translation or on the level of transference or transliteration. What is to be noted also is that the word "sharia" has entered the English dictionary as a loan word meaning "a system of religious laws followed by Muslims" ("sharia," def. 1312). Let's have more examples on such a problem.

5.3.1. **Translating Names of Persons, Titles and Epithets**

It is true that names of places and persons in a literary work like a novel are fictional; but they cannot be thus all the time, especially in novels classified as realistic. The novels checked in this study belong to Mahfuz's realistic period 1945-57. Even the existential psychological novel *The Thief and the Dogs*, 1961, which marks a fresh start
in Mahfuz's development as an artist has many realistic aspects and remains realist to a great extent. In a realist novel, a writer is sure to bring names as close as possible to names of real people, and names of real places so as to make his readers feel their reality, their problems and their social issues. This is clear in Mahfuz's novels: Zuqaq al-Midaq, Bayn al-Qasrayn, Qasr al-Shawq, and al-Liss wa al-Kilab. In contrast, for instance, Mahfuz's characters and places in say, Awd Haratina, are allegorical because the story is symbolic. Therefore, Mahfuz's names and places are to be maintained intact through correct transliteration and right translation, particularly if they have their connection with a special cultural milieu. Ridwan al-Husayni of Midaq Alley is transliterated as Radwan Hussainy. The similarity is much, still the representation is wrong. The "al-" which is indicative of family tribal names in the Arab world is deleted. The double "s" of "Hussainy" brings fun to the name. By comparison, the name "al-Husayn" of the trilogy is well represented and reflects respect of Arabic culture. The "al-" is maintained though it is part of the proper name failing which cannot bring the same damage as in the first case. The "s" remains single as it should be. Some translators prefer to work against their knowledge. There is an ideology here, even if it remains suspected and does not gain the degree of certainty. Many Orientalists have preferred the manipulation of Arabic names. One of the most obvious examples is the name of the prophet of Islam, which remained misrepresented by Orientalists as "Mahomet" in many western writings until only recently after many Muslims have insisted on its correction as "Muhammad." Moreover, in almost all the translations of Arabic literature, the name of God, Allah in Islam, is misrepresented by westerner translators as just God. What is unfortunate is that many Arab translators adopt the same type of representation in their translations as if guided by
the preconceived stereotypes proposed by Orientalists under the deceptive concept of assimilation or what is called ethically the target language law. To add more weight to this point, I discuss the existence of two pronunciations in English of "Muslim" and its other written variation "Moslem" that refer to the follower of Islam: they are pronounced as /muslim/, or, /muzlim/. The first word is right and is derived from the Arabic verb "aslama" literally means "to resign oneself to Allah"; the second is wrong and is literally derived from the Arabic "zalam" literally "a piece of wood like a featherless arrow," which has to do with a pre-Islamic practice of divination strongly forbidden by the Qur'an (Maghniyyah 11-12). It is quite good, however, that some English dictionaries like Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English have started to point the unacceptability of the wrong pronunciation ("Moslem" def. 927). It is suspected that some of the Orientalists knew the difference between the two terms in Arabic and prefer the wrong pronunciation as one way of deception. Many Arab and non-Arab Muslims not knowing do commit the mistake of adopting the second wrong pronunciation of the word. The seriousness of such misrepresentations is well-commented on by T.B. Irving:

The spelling of "Moslem", "Kaaba" (for Ka'ba) have a true beginning in ignorance, but they never seem to point any way to salvation. The spelling "Koran" is often used by non-Muslims and western-trained Muslims, the same people as use the spelling "Moslems", as the late Professor Hitti did in his book Islam in his incredible quotations: "An old-fashioned Moslem (sic) goes through the legal ablutions before he opens the book" (pp.26-27)! What sort of Muslim did he get his information from? When this is pronounced with a voiced "s", it gives us "Mozlum", which means the exact opposite of a
man of peace, for dhulm or zulm is 'harm', 'evil' etc. A "Moslem" thus means a 'cruel' individual like any Oriental tyrant. (Introd. XXXI)

In his commentary here on the problem of misrepresentation, Irving is still committing a mistake with regard to the derivational sense of the word "Musilm" if pronounced as /muzlim/. He thinks of its morphological root as "zulm." This cannot be the root because Arabs pronounce it as "dhulm" according to standard phonology of Arabic with no /z/ sound at all. Irving is building his explanation on the way non-Arabs pronounce this word. The root, however, is "zalama" which is explained earlier here. His comments, however, are important to indicate that linguistic and literary manipulations are to be stopped and any existing misrepresentations should be corrected. Similarly, in fictional writings, and following the same course, many translators of Arabic literature tend to misrepresent proper names intentionally or non-intentionally through mistransliteration. The commentaries of this research work adopted more appropriate transliteration of names to highlight the mistakes of the translators regarding this point, after all.

As for epithets, titles and vocatives, highly problematic for translation, there can be one alternative or another to deal with them. Here are some of these epithets. The word "shaykh" is no longer a problem if it happens to be a title referring to either "a religious scholar" or "a chieftain of a tribe or area." This is because it has entered the English dictionaries as a loan word with these two meanings. But it poses a problem if it is used as a mere vocative "addressing any person either sarcastically or non-.

Suggested is that the same is to be maintained and the new usage is alluded to skilfully with the fewest words to indicate its meaning. This is of course in addition to the context that will certainly provide a clue to its meaning (see ch. 3 for details).
One of these titles is also the title "al-Mu'allim" and al-Mu'allimah" which are translated respectively as "Mr." and "Mrs." Such cultural titles may not have the chance to be borrowed by English. They will probably remain translated. Translators adopt the English titles as equivalents while they are not. Suggested is that they should be translated so as to maintain the implicature and designation of the person. Al-Mu'allim Kirshah of *Midaq Alley* and his wife are translated as Mr. and Mrs. Kirshah. A better translation in my opinion is Kirshah the café owner for Mr. Kirshah, and "wife of Kirshah the café owner" for Mrs. Kirshah. "Al-Mu'allimah Husniyyah" of the same novel translated as "Mrs..." can be translated as Husniyyah the bakery owner. Al-Sayyid Salim Alwan of the same novel can be translated as Salim Alwan the company owner. It is the line of business that they do which gives significance to such titles. Their titles would have not assigned to them socially if they had not had such businesses.

And in *Palace Walk* and *Palace of Desire* the title, "Al-Sayyid," can be translated as the "Patriarch." This is in order to avoid making it sound as if it were the first proper name of the person called "Ahmad Abd al-Jawwad," a tyrant in his house as the texts show. "al-Mu'allim Tarazan" translated as Mr. Tarazan in *The Thief and the Dogs* is to be translated as "Tarazan the gun-smuggler". Such alternatives to the translation of epithets are suggested here to all translators of Arabic literature without any intention to impose them or exclude other better alternatives that can occur in the field of comparative and cultural studies.

All in all, it seems that politics of cultural assimilation has affected this area of translation that deals with Arabic names, titles, epithets and vocatives to an extent that they have become one in almost all existing English translations. These names and
epithets are as culturally important as they are literarily significant. They, irrespective of the differences between Arabic and English cultures, should be translated in a way that keeps their specificity intact. The two different cultures, I believe, can be bridged by pointing out the differences and not by obliterating or assimilating them under the target culture values. The phonetic hurdles can also be minimised to the utmost by adopting the closest possible sounds in transliteration.

5.3.2. Translating Names of Places

Names of places are not much different on the level of misrepresentation. Such point finds its best examples in *The Thief and the Dogs* and the trilogy. In *The Thief and the Dogs* the Arabic word "shari,' which means "street" is transliterated as "Sharia," which means "legislation." What's interesting on this point was discussed in this chapter earlier.

In the trilogy, the translators prefer to change the titles of the three volumes radically as follows: *Palace Walk* instead of *Bayn al-Qasrayn*, *Palace of Desire* instead of *Qasr al-Shawq*, *Sugar Street* instead of *al-Sukkariyyah*. The titles in Arabic refer to three streets in al-Husayn quarter in Cairo. Their counterparts in the English translations are not good representatives. They look like titles of fairy tales with no connection to reality. There is nothing like a walk in the palace or a walk around it, "Palace of Desire" is a literal translation of the words of a name of a street, and "Sugar Street" is nothing but a street in which sugar is traded. If things are to be well represented one should think of the following facts:
Najib Mahfuz's novels of the trilogy are all realistic. That's why they take their titles as names of places.

Names of the places are real in these novels. They refer to three streets in Cairo.

Titles in translation should be authentic enough to indicate their author's texts. One cannot expect Mahfuz to admit writing a book called "mamsha al-Qasr or nuzhah Bayn al-Qasrayn" if the English title of his first novel "Bayn al-Qasrayn" is translated back into Arabic. It is real fun if one interested scholar or a tourist who has read Mahfuz is found in Egypt asking about "Shari' al-Sukkar" as a back translation of the English title "Sugar Street". Of course he will be led to the nearest street that sells sugar, while what he really wants is to see a street that has such a name.

Having considered all these thoughts together, it is suggested that translating foreign names of place, just like names of people, should be maintained as real. Suggested translations of the above titles of the trilogy are as follows:

- **Palace Walk** can change into *Bayn al-Qasrayn Street* as a translation of *Bayn al-Qasrayn*
- **Palace of Desire** can be *Qasr al-Shawq Street* as a translation to *Qasr al-Shawq.*
- **Sugar Street** should be retranslated as *al-Sukkariyyah Street* as a translation to *al-Sukkariyyah*

Why extra burden is taken in translation when things are so simple. Politics of publication and commercialism might be the reason behind such shifts where the cultural foreignness is sacrificed. To remember a case mentioned by Lawrence Venuti in his
leading book *Scandal of Translation: Towards and ethics of difference*, he writes of the Czech novelist Milan Kundera as one who

seems unique not only in scrutinizing and correcting the foreign-language versions of his books, but in asserting his preferred translation practice in wittily pointed essays and prefaces. The most notorious case involves the different English versions of his novel *The Joke* (1967). The first in 1969 appalled Kundera because it edited, excised, and rearranged chapters; the second in 1982 was "unacceptable" because he judged it "not my text," a "translation-adaptation (adaptation to the taste of the time and of the country for which it is intended, to the taste, in the final analysis, of the translator). (5)

If such a writer knew English and had the chance to judge his translations in English, this can be taken as an example by which we can reach a non-biased definition of "moral responsibility": an important notion that should take some space herein.

Unfortunately enough many distinguished theorists in the field of translation studies still misdefine this notion and misdirect the issue and talk of it in terms of target-text readers' rights. The above case of Kundera manifests the right, as far as I would believe, orientation of the moral responsibility of literary translators. Once the author, his language, and culture are given priority, it is only then that the translator is paying tribute to the readers of the target text. Moral responsibility cannot be defined in terms of "blind assimilation":

Potentially, any situation where we try to relate meaningfully to difference can be described as a translational situation. In this sense, translation points to how different languages, different cultures, different political contexts, can be put into contact in such a
way as to provide for mutual intelligibility, without having to sacrifice difference in the
interest of blind assimilation. This also explains why the question of the ethics of
translation and of the politics of translation has become all the more pressing in our time.
(Ribeiro)

Contrary to this, Susan Bassnett insists on placing the notion of moral responsibility
within the target text' culture:

"To attempt to impose the value system of the SL culture onto the TL culture is
dangerous ground, and the translator should not be tempted by the school that pretends to
determine the original intentions of an author on the basis of the self-contained text. The
translator cannot be the author of the SL text, but as the author of TL text has a clear
moral responsibility to the TL readers" (23),

However, such a viewpoint by Bassnett cannot be the right guideline to the question of
moral responsibility in literary translation. Social and religious parameters of literary
texts cannot simply be changed to fit in Bassnett's definition and understanding of moral
responsibility. Revisiting this notion needs more space, but it seems that the Czeck's case
mentioned earlier speaks louder than further argumentation. The differences between
cultures should remain differences if the issue of moral responsibility is to be fairly
addressed. Being an affiliate with Arabic literature and culture, it is found really hard to,
for instance, accept the appearance of the name "Allah" as a female in any other foreign
target texts whose cultures just have female deities.

Hence, it is reckoned that untranslatability can be easily broken if differences
between cultures are sought to be understood. Many source texts are called for to be
rechecked in their translations in other languages and cultures. Different ways of
understanding is a type of translation politics or even politics in translation that can lead to undesired results. Kundera's voice of objection to the translation of his literary texts in English should redirect our understanding of the issue of moral responsibility in literary translation. The following brief section sheds more light on the so-termed "undesired results" above.

5.4. **Translational Strategies and Culture**

The translation strategies detected in our analysis and scrutiny has revealed themselves as rather ideologies of treating Arabic culture and literature. The discussion of the previous chapters has brooded enough on aspects of manipulation of the literariness of the Arabic literary texts. Here it is intended to reflect more on how such ideologies affect certain cultural values, particularly the Islamic.

In *Midaq Alley*, for example, the name of God, a point referred to earlier in this thesis, is just replaced by the word "God." The word God, we all know, has the simple meaning of "deity". This word is not a variation of the name of God. According to Arabic language, there are these words, "ilah" and Allah. The first simply translates as "god or deity," the second is the exact name of God according to Islam. In literary texts we tend to face the two words together. It is not true that we render the two terms as neutrally as God. This is a cultural point. In most literary texts, original in English or translated into it, or even in translated films, there is the problem of omitting the word "Allah," and substituting it with the word "God". Even Arab translators, or even those of them with stronger Islamic orientation, are simply misled by non-Arab translators or by naïve
imitations of what occurs in English. The word "god" assimilates the foreign; and what is needed is to recognize the difference.

The critical analysis rendered by the chapters of this thesis manifested three major translational strategies: omission, substitution and addition. The first two of these are found to be the most destructive to foreign cultures and ethics of true literary representations. In the translation of Midaq Alley, for instance, omissions exceeded the tolerable limit not only literarily but also culturally. The translator's Orientalist attitude was clearer even through the note provided to his translation where he claims that Arabic is not easy and cultural items and poetic expressions cannot be easily translatable. All he does is taking recourse to omissions and substitutions. To prove his misunderstanding and false allegations, Mahfuz's Place of Desire has been translated by a group of three English-native translators. In their translation, omission and substitution can hardly be detected at all levels of representation. To the best of my belief, it is contended that those English translators who defend the target culture system and its readership are not really willing to respect foreign cultures. This is due probably to the trust and confidence they have about their own cultures. They are sure that the political domination of their countries over the East has made of them masters and of their cultures examples to be looked at with respect and even imitated. Being sure of this, they are not willing to recognize other cultures in their literary representations. They are not fearful of being misrepresented themselves. They already gained worldwide recognition. Their cultures have started to dominate even under the banner of 'the global village'. The big talk here should not sound more Occidentalism (though it is really there) than a call for reformation and re-representation. And this call is not directed toward the West. The
mistake is not to be repeated. This call is for the whole Orient to start representing itself and translating itself. I got shocked coming to know who translates Arabic literature and culture today: most of them are Western official institutions or Westerners of 'Orientalist' orientation. Even the best of them on the individual level cannot avoid making themselves suspected. The translators of the trilogy, regardless of their commendable services and efforts in translating Arabo-Islamic culture, prefer to translate the Arabic common prayer "salli ala al-Nabi "[pray for the prophet] with three different representations in the same novel, all of which are wrong and against monotheist Islamic beliefs, not even intended by the author, who himself is not Islamic by nature( a point discussed in details in ch. 3). The real point is that western translators of Arabo-Islamic literature and culture cannot be trusted completely and all the time. Doubt can have its benefits sometimes, particularly while checking the western representation of the Islamic values, either ethically or culturally in translations or original writings.

A Post-Thought

Any literary text translated through certain ideologies that care more for the target system than for the foreign culture it is translating from, should be checked for extra-linguistic values: values that may have harm at the very heart of their expressions. When once given a text written in English about the Keralite culture to be translated into Arabic, I didn't hesitate to include what was foreign either linguistically or culturally. I realized that there are transliterated words from Malayalam, the language of Kerala in the text written originally in English. These transliterated words have their ready equivalents in English. Yet, the Indian authors of the English text chose to transfer the words rather
than translate them when writing about their own culture. Being asked to translate it into Arabic for research purposes, I could not but reproduce the Malayalam words similarly through transliteration in Arabic with a bracketed translation. It was all due to my understanding of certain ethics of authentic representation of a foreign culture and respect of authorial intention. For short, it is to be said that foreign cultures are as important in their contribution to world linguistic, literary, and cultural values as they are important in world economic and political affairs. Translation should continue to play its role in bridging these global spaces. Policies of neglect and inequality should stop at least ethically if not practically. Translation methods, techniques and strategies should remain as human as possible to include rather than exclude, to recognize the differences more than to assimilate, to respect more than to overlook or degrade. Stereotyping should be justified ethically and should be free from politics of propagation; preconceptions should not affect reception; and publication should not be guided by commercialism or political interests. Globalization is yet a Western ploy in a large measure; and if a treasure, it is not so far exploited well by the Arabs and the whole East for the sake of their peoples so that they should start to be respected (if not politically and economically) linguistically, literally and culturally. Finally it is to be emphasised that translation should be reoriented toward the ethics of understanding differences and the abolition of politics of homogenisation and assimilation and

Since the question of translation has become a politically and culturally crucial question, one can argue that translation can be regarded as a central metaphor for some of the most pressing tasks confronting us at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Translation points at how different languages, different cultures, different political contexts, can be
put together in such a way as to provide for mutual intelligibility but without having at the same time to sacrifice difference in the interest of a blind assimilation. Translation, in this sense, is about the creation of new cultural and political maps, the establishment of shared territories and of points of articulation, the development of a border reason, as opposed to the simple acceptance of the reason of the borders. It is about the right to be different, where homogenization would mean an offence, and the right to be equal, where the dwelling upon difference would be synonymous with oppression or with the prevalence of power politics ("Politics of Translation").