

TRANSLATING THE EXILED SELF: REFLECTIONS ON TRANSLATION AND CENSORSHIP*

Samar Attar
Independent Researcher

Self-Translating and censorship

Translators tend to select foreign literary texts for translation into their mother-tongue for different reasons. Sometimes, their selection is based on the fame of a certain writer among his or her own people, or for the awarding of a prestigious international prize to a writer, or on the recommendation of an authoritative figure: a scholar, a critic, or a publisher. At other times, however, the opposite can be true. A writer who is not known among his or her own people is translated into another language, because his or her writing subverts the values of the national tradition, or destroys certain clichés about other nations, or simply because his or her work appeals to the translator.¹ But we should not entertain the illusion that literary translators are always free agents. Although their literary taste and ideology may play an important role in their selection of foreign texts they often have to consider the literary, political and economic climate of their time. They simply do not translate texts because they like them. They are very much aware of the fact that translation cannot be brought to a fruitful end unless other authoritative bodies support them, and unless a publisher is found at the end of the ordeal. In short, personal, literary, social, political and economic factors always play an important role in the selection and translation of a foreign text.

Normally the literary translator, who selects or is helped in selecting a foreign text, is expected to be a master of at least two languages including his or her own native tongue. Nevertheless, translation is usually done from the foreign language into the translator's mother-tongue. The rationale is obvious. The translator is normally more rooted in his or her native language and culture, while the foreign language is acquired. So it is usually safer to ascertain the identity of a translator and the linguistic and cultural heritage from which she or he comes. The accepted norm for a literary translator is that of a figure who moves from one

world to another, but is more knowledgeable about one of them: his or her own. For this reason alone translators are expected to mediate between two nations, to describe an alien culture to their own people and to communicate with them in a common language. The irony is that what is normally accepted, whether depicting the normal literary translator, or the task of selecting the foreign text, is not always true. Every rule has many exceptions, and every age has its own circumstances which defy generalization. Contradictory terms like natural and hybrid, native and foreign, home and the world, mother tongue and acquired tongue, national identity and cosmopolitan identity, writer and translator, visible and invisible, I and the Other, are always controversial and could easily, at times, be synonymous.

Samuel Beckett is a case in point: an Irishman who grew up in Dublin, he took a job teaching French at Trinity College. But he soon moved into self-imposed exile in London, and then in Paris. Some of his plays were written in French, some in English, but in each case Beckett has performed the role of writer/translator and has done his own translations into the other language. What is he? Irish? French? What is his mother tongue? What is his acquired tongue? Is his translation an original, or a copy?²

As a writer/translator myself, whose roots are deep in Arabic language and culture, but also in American and European cultures, I am one of those exceptions which do not fit any specific pattern drawn by translation theorists and practitioners. Although I grew up in Damascus, Syria, where Arabic was spoken, and Arabic culture was reinforced in school and society, I am equally at home with American English as a language, and American, French and German cultures. My family was cosmopolitan. We spoke Arabic, but we also learned English and French from childhood. Literary translations of Russian, German, English and French books were always available in our home. As a young woman I studied Comparative Literature in Syria, Canada and the United States. I was able to read books in Arabic, English and French. I worked in Syria, Canada, the United States, Algeria, West Germany, and, Australia. I married a German and traveled with him around the world. When my daughter was born in the eighties, she was introduced at an early age to a vast and rich German library. I benefited from her learning and found myself incorporating some of the books she read as a child in my Arabic novels. With such a background like mine, the borderline between native and foreign, national and cosmopolitan, writer and translator, visible or invisible, natural or hybrid, is blurred. When I am asked now: "Where are you from?", or "what is your native tongue?", I find it difficult to give a straight answer.³

Though I had read and taught James Joyce, it was not until the summer of 1968, while teaching Joyce in French Canada, that I realized some of my

experiences were similar to those of his. Joyce rebelled against his narrow Catholic environment, his home, his religion and his country. He left Ireland to return but once. Even though he spent most of his life abroad, all his work was about Dublin which, in the words of Harold Pinter “was the one great influence of his life - a great Catholic shadow that forever lay over him.”⁴ I too, rebelled against my family, religion and country and left Syria in 1965 to return only for short visits. But the past always haunted me: my childhood and my youthful experiences in the city of Damascus. So during that Canadian summer of 1968 I knew I would be writing a book sometime about my upbringing and education in Syria. But it took me six years before I actually started working on it. In 1975 I began writing my novel, *Lina: A Portrait Of A Damascene Girl* in Arabic, a language I had not used for ten years. The exercise did not prove difficult. In 1977 I completed the novel but then the saga of finding a publisher in the Middle East began: besides the civil war in Lebanon, my fiction/memoir had stirred controversies and objections from opposing quarters.

Lina describes the growing up of a young girl in Damascus under the shadow of military governments during the fifties and early sixties, up to her decision to leave Syria. The novel depicts an artist’s struggle against her environment, ending with her rejection of family, religion and country. The violence and repression that *Lina* leaves behind still exist in the Middle East today. Perhaps, this is why the book is relevant even now, forty years after the events it describes, and why it has not been allowed to be distributed in Syria and in other Arab countries.⁵ At the end of 1977 *Lina* was submitted to the Arab Writers Union in Damascus for a publication clearance. The union kept the manuscript for more than a year despite frequent enquiries. Finally, the manuscript was returned, and I was informed orally via a third party that the novel might be reconsidered if substantial cuts were made. After many failed attempts, *Lina* was eventually accepted for publication by *daar al-'aafaaq al-Jadiida* in Beirut. The novel finally appeared in 1982, but I only knew about it in 1983 when a friend saw it displayed at al-Saqi Books in London.

Of course, I could have written *Lina* in English right from the start and avoided all the problems and hurdles of censorship in Syria and elsewhere. But I wished to address Arab readers and tell them stories. Yet, given the continuing repression and lack of freedom which I have endured, I have come to the conclusion that my future as a writer probably lies in producing books in translation, both to a readership of expatriate Arabs living in the West as well as to Western readers. In this sense, I have chosen to translate my own literary work from a language which I do not often use - except when sporadically writing in it

- but which is imprinted in the deepest recess of my psyche into a language I have acquired and long ago adopted. Translation in this instance is one of the strategies to assert a voice that has been suppressed.

If it were not for the Rockefeller Foundation Residency Fellowship in the Humanities, granted by the Center for Near Eastern and North African Studies at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor during the academic year 1990-91, my translation project would not have been realized.⁶ To select a foreign text for translation is one thing; and actually to start working on it, another. Nevertheless, I plunged into my task of translating a literary text I had written thirteen years before in Arabic. The political and social surroundings were different because of the imminent war in the Middle East. I kept asking myself: How could I translate a work like *Lina* at that particular time? A book which may be read as a scathing criticism of Arabs and Arab culture? Do I want to harm further the Arab image in the West?⁷

Then there were other questions such as the strategies of translation I might use: domesticating or foreignizing strategies?⁸ Moving the text to the reader, or the reader to the text?⁹ Turning Arabic into English, or English into Arabic? What methods would I develop? What metaphors would I use? How could I transform cultural, philosophical and political concepts as the text passes from Arabic into a foreign language: English?¹⁰ How could I confront the semantic, imaginative and lyrical poverty of one language in relation to the other when I translate myself? What do I gain? What do I lose? And in the final analysis how important am I anyway, as an author/translator?

My attention was drawn to a review that appeared in the Arabic Syrian official paper, *ath-thawra*, where the reviewer praised *Lina* because “it was able to represent not only the biography of a single woman, but also an entire historical era.”¹¹ It was only then I realized that the translation project was the reason, or perhaps one of the reasons, that helped a forgotten text to be brought back to life and a suppressed voice to be heard. This was confirmed later. After the translation appeared in 1994 in the United States, the original Arabic text appeared in the 1997 Book Fair in Damascus. If I have produced a good translation, then my sincere thanks are due to the censor. I have translated my novels, first *Lina*, then *The House On Arnus Square*, not as an act of vanity, nor as an exercise of bilingualism and biculturalism à la Samuel Beckett, but in response to continuous attempts to stifle and silence my voice as a novelist. The act of self-translation has made me visible and has given me a voice which I was denied as a writer in Arabic.¹²

Identity and the mixture of fiction and memoir

In *Les Faux-Monnayeurs*, Gide writes:

My novel hasn't got a subject. . . Let's say, if you prefer it, it hasn't got *one* subject ... Please understand; I should like to put everything into my novel. I don't want any cut of the scissors to limit its substance at one point rather than at another. For more than a year now that I have been working at it, nothing happens to me that I don't put into it - everything, I see, everything I know, everything that other people's lives and my own teach me....¹³

Similarly, *Lina* records everything that the main character has seen, heard, touched, felt, tasted, smelled, or thought of in Damascus of the fifties and sixties. In the three distinct stages of her life, childhood, adolescence and early adulthood, which correspond to the main divisions of the novel, the reader witnesses the breakdown and increasing chaos and confusion in Lina's external environment as her family, religion, and nation lose their authority over her emotions and mind.

The novel also describes the ascendance to power of left-wing radicals after the British-French-Israeli invasion of Sinai in late 1956, and the euphoria leading to the unity between Syria and Egypt in 1958 under the leadership of Gamal Abdel-Nasser, followed by the ultimate breakdown and dissolution of the United Arab Republic and by the people succumbing to despair. The dream of liberation and Arab unity had become a nightmare. At this point Lina, now a university graduate and a sensitive artist, decides to leave her country for ever.

Lina is based on biographical experiences but also on substantial historical research. It could thus be considered as a socio-political literary treatise about Syria of the fifties and early sixties, although it remains primarily fiction. Part of the relevance of the book stems from the fact that the issues that plagued the country then are not much different from today; moreover they are not unique to that particular country. On the social level, relationships among the different classes have not greatly changed in spite of attempts at agrarian and other reform. Syria is still a patriarchal authoritarian and antidemocratic society. The Palestinian problem that continues to affect Syria's politics remains unsolved. Consequently, the military that took power in the late forties is still running the country today, preventing any effective breakthrough towards democratic modernization.

Though the work treats many issues, the central theme is that of childhood. Childhood does not exist in Syria as a stage of development comparable with that

of Western countries. Syrian children are born women and men. They are indoctrinated from an early age, either by the various political factions or by the ruling party, and they are burdened with fears of real or imagined enemies. Born in a country troubled by poverty, political division and oppression, Lina's mind turns inward on itself to seek order and cohesion. The technique of the interior monologue, as Lina uses it, reflects her extreme spiritual isolation. The Damascene society of the fifties and sixties has failed to give her security and meaningful values. It is only in the loneliness of her individual mind that she can find the meanings and values that will allow her to construct an identity and a vision of life that is her own.

During a visit to Damascus in the late 1980s, an official from the Arab Writers Union said, pretending to joke: "Well, how can anyone forget that scene with the little girl putting a pillow between her legs?" He was too embarrassed to say "masturbating." "Is that all you remember about Lina?" I asked bitterly. "Frankly, everyone here remembers that," he answered, eyes glittering. The question of sexuality is indispensable to the novel which deals, after all, with the central issue of a young girl passing through puberty, but there is very little in the book that deals exclusively with this aspect. I am sure the rejection of the book by the Arab Writers Union has more to do with overtly political reasons concerning the description of repression and lack of democratic rights in the country. On the other hand, the particular relationship between men and women in the Middle East, the oppression of women and the question of sexuality are, of course, tied up and linked to the general socio-cultural value system of particular societies of the area, in Syria as elsewhere. The concentration of the Syrian official on this aspect is a sign of the prevalent uneasiness and preoccupation with feminist concerns confronted with a rising fundamentalism in religious and social matters.

A critic once observed that "Stephen Dedalus, as a surrogate for Joyce the youthful artist and thinker, may not be Joyce in every factual detail of his experience, but he epitomizes the embittered artist-exile as straight auto-biography perhaps never could."¹⁴ Similarly, *Lina* embodies my deep longing for freedom and never-ending struggle to throw off the restriction imposed by family, religion, culture and nation.

Lina is part of a trilogy of novels covering the heroine's family history and experiences since leaving Syria and living in the West; the third book is yet to be written. *The House on Arnus Square* (the first part of the trilogy) was written in Arabic in West Berlin in 1984 and was published in Sydney in 1988 by a Lebanese émigré poet and publisher. The novel describes the history of a house and its neighbourhood in which Lina grew up. It focuses on the life-stories of the three

women (two sisters, one housemaid) who have lived there all their lives. Although primarily fictional, the book uses documentary information to portray the history of the urban and social environment in which the three stories unfold. The house in question was the first to be built in what is today Arnus Square, a major traffic intersection and thoroughfare in the new city of Damascus. At the time of its building in the 1940s the area was entirely rural (fields, orchards, brooks). It is this change in the city or landscape that the novel describes by relating it to the life experiences of the women who have continuously lived in the one place over a period of some fifty years.

In his book *The Poetics of Space*, Gaston Bachelard argues that

For a phenomenologist, a psychoanalyst, or a psychologist . . . , it is not a question of describing houses, or enumerating their picturesque features and analyzing for which reasons they are comfortable. On the contrary, we must go beyond the problems of description - whether this description be objective or subjective, that is, whether it gives facts or impressions - in order to attain to the primary virtues, those that reveal an attachment that is native in some way to the primary function of inhabiting.”¹⁵

The narrator of *The House* assumes the role of an ethnographer by supplying the reader with detailed descriptions of the dwelling, its inhabitants, and surroundings, but goes beyond this to discover the reality of the hidden shadings of her attachment to and rejection of her birth place. She probes the contradictory meanings of house/home, i.e. the dwelling where one lives, the country to which one belongs, the shelter where one hides, but also the prison in which one could be locked up.

Although the first person is used in the narrative, it does not in any way reinforce the sense of the privileged status of the self, or its independence of all others. Indeed, it gives others ample space to express their thoughts and desires and define their own positions vis-à-vis the narrator and the world. Experimenting in this way with autobiography, memoir, documentary and fiction results in a new definition of selfhood. The self recalls the past, arranges the events, presents its history as something verifiable, claims responsibility for the creation and arrangement of the text and is not sure whether it is itself an essence or a socially created construction. Others come along. They refute the authoritative self and assert that it is not unique, or integral, or independent, that its supposed history is nothing but fiction, its supposed documentary nothing but fantasy. They question

the autobiographical records and the reliability of memory and its ability to retrieve the original events.

The reader becomes confused and is not sure where the truth lies. Of course, one is free to check on certain events and characters, but ultimately one cannot check everything, because fiction and memoir are intertwined and the text appears like the witches' boiling cauldron in *MacBeth*. The weird sisters put in this pot many things to work their charms. Before being able to read and understand their prophecies, the critic has to clear the various objects from the cauldron and make their chant: "Double, double, toil and trouble", the main tool to unearth the elusive truth. The critic will eventually discover that the self is an essence but at the same time it is also a socially created construction - a cultural artifact fashioned collaboratively. It is this tension between the independent autonomous self and the dependent subordinate self that makes all selves highly problematic but extremely interesting.

The exiled self and translation strategies

Censored texts require specific sensitivity on the part of their translator. What is seen outrageous in one culture, specifically among certain groups of people, is considered normal in another culture. One of the tasks of the translator is to convey this sense of outrage which may be experienced in the source text by enabling the reader in the target text to differentiate between various attitudes and voices and to participate in witnessing dissenting speakers who may raise the spectre of censorship in society. There are several possible strategies to adopt. One strategy is to use the exiled self as a frame of reference and to inscribe modernist paradigms of exile and marginality within the framework. The cycle of flight from home/homecoming, then the ultimate flight from home without the hope of ever returning, could capture the spirit of both source and target texts and allow for a narrator/observer to be distant from human squabbles, trivialities, and cruelties. But the metaphor of the exiled self has been associated with male writers and consistently defined in terms of gender, power and sexuality. However, for such a metaphor to be used as a frame of reference by a woman novelist and translator means to subvert the dominant discourses of cultural authority and to participate in shaping the politics of writing/translating in modern times. The metaphor is likely to evoke the memory of exiled artists who confronted authority in all its forms, dabbled with different genres and media, and babbled in confused tongues.

Although the metaphor of the exiled self as a frame of reference for both texts is used, literary translators always face difficulties. The words of Walter Benjamin haunt them, that translation fails when it limits itself to a transmitting

function, since all one can transmit is information and information is the least essential aspect of a literary work of art.¹⁶ Self translators cannot reproduce in one language what they have created in another. Ultimately, what they produce through self translation is a complementary literary text which does not simply echo the original, but has its own echo and effect in the target language and culture. Unlike conventional translation contexts, self translators do not usually engage in the two-stage process of reading-writing activity (their reading activity is of a different nature), but rather in a double writing process. Thus, their translated text becomes a version or a variant of the original text, indeed an original work in its own right.

The task of translators/creators goes far beyond the formalist linguistic approach, i.e. the emphasis on equivalence, or comparison between the original text and the rewritten translated one.¹⁷ As self translators, they have to pay special attention to the larger issues of context and textuality, history and literary conventions. They need to be sure that the structure of the work, the imagery and metaphors, the themes and ideas, the point of view and characters, the tone and style, the rhythm and stream of consciousness, the foreign proverbs and idioms, the visible, or hidden literary and historical references, the dialogues and various patterns of speech, all contribute in one way or another to the frame of the exiled self and to the overall effect of tyranny on people's minds and souls as in the case of *Lina* and *the House*. Consequently, the imaginary readers in the target language would be able to see, hear, touch, taste, smell and feel tyranny in every part of the rewritten text, but above all, they will be able to distant themselves from the scene in order to question history, ponder the problems facing mankind and possibly reach some limited judgment on the events and their significance to the world at large. When the text, whether original or rewritten, is read, it will bring forth new images, new interpretations, new memories and new speculations. In short, an original, or a rewritten literary text is never static. It is always changing and renewing itself.

In "A Conversation with John E. Woods" by Mark Harman in 1994, the translator Woods observes: "Every translator knows that he or she has two obligations. One is accuracy and the other is felicity. And the tightrope walk is to accomplish both, and sometimes one gets sacrificed to the other despite your best efforts."¹⁸ Denys Johnson-Davies, the translator of Arabic short stories into English, expresses similar concerns by stressing that the first priority in translation should be accuracy. But then he refers to the problematic of idiomatic expressions which are immense when translating from and into two languages whose cultural backgrounds and ways of thought have so little in common.¹⁹ In commenting on

the central question of the creative process in Beckett, Raymond Federman argues that language is an obstacle, and that throughout his work Beckett has suggested that “language both gets us where we want to go and prevents us from getting there.” Federman differentiates between the act of writing and the act of translating in Beckett’s work.

The original creative act (whether in French or in English) always proceeds in the *dark* ... and in *ignorance* and *error*. Though the act of translating, and especially of self-translating, is also a creative act, it is performed in the *light* (in the light of the existing original text), it is performed in *knowledge* (in the knowledge of the existing text), and therefore it is performed without error - at least at the start. In other words, the translation of a text reassures, reasserts knowledge, the knowledge already present in the original text. But perhaps it also corrects the initial errors of that text. As a result, the translation is no longer ... an approximation of the original, or a duplication, or a substitute, but a continuation of the work, of the workings of the text.²⁰

(emphasis in the original)

Similarly, the Arabic and English texts of *Lina* and *the House* may differ in tone, in textuality, even in meaning at times, and in cultural and literary references which are constantly evoked. Words or phrases have been omitted or added, and the Damascene dialogues and dialect have been disregarded in the English versions. One only has to consider the time that has lapsed between the creation of the original and its translation, the different landscapes in which the text and the rewritten text were composed, the changes occurring inside and outside the writer and self translator.²¹

But whether written in Arabic or English, whether original or version, the two texts ultimately suggest that birth, family, blood ties, language, history and religion are necessary ingredients neither for the construction of identity nor for the attainment of happiness. What constitutes personal identity for the protagonists in *Lina* and *the House* is what Ibn Tufayl, the Arab Andalusian philosopher of the 12th century, calls the proper usage of reason and inner light by human beings. It is also clear the two protagonists have been shaped by what they reject; and that they will always feel the pain and anguish of the deep, open wound caused by birth, family, blood ties, language, religion and history.

In *Lina* and *the House*, I was writing in a language, Arabic, I am afraid to forget. At the same time I was constantly speaking to myself in different languages

and hearing the echoes of dialogues/monologues in different land-scapes and continents. Displaced, linguistically, geographically, and culturally, I moved in and out of languages with different systems and different literary and critical traditions and cultures. I performed the role of the self and the other, the writer and the translator. But censorship was and still is the reason that forced me to use translation as a strategy to assert my voice as a writer, and to avoid the fate of exiled artists who see themselves as “ghosts or memories.”²²

Notes

- * A longer version of this article appeared in *Translation Review* (special issue on Arabic), 56 (2003), 35-46.
1. Rosanna Warren presents an idealistic position vis-à-vis translation and the necessity to translate. She argues that “The Psychic Health of an individual resides in the capacity to recognize and welcome the ‘Other’. The same could be said of civilization. Our word ‘idiot’ comes from the Greek... whose primary sense is of privacy, peculiarity, isolation. A person or culture guarding its privacy to an extreme extent becomes ‘idiotic,’ even autistic, and such resistance to the foreign, such incapacity to translate, spells its doom, like the city of Thebes in its refusal to welcome the new yet ancient, foreign yet cognate god Dionysus... A civilization renews itself through contact not only with the geographically and linguistically foreign but also with its own forebears estranged by time”. See *The Art of Translation: Voices from the field*, ed. R. Warren (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1989), pp. 3-4.
 2. See Raymond Federman “The Writer as Self-Translator,” in *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*, ed. Alan Warren Friedman *et al.* (University Park & London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987), pp. 7-16.
 3. Also examine George Steiner’s case which is almost typical of all immigrant, colonial and postcolonial societies. Steiner tells us that “I have no recollection whatever of a first language. So far as I am aware, I possess equal currency in English, French, and German ... I dream with equal verbal density and linguistic-symbolic provocation in all three My natural condition was polyglot.” See *After Babel* 2nd ed. (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 120-121.

4. Quoted by William Baker and Stephen Ely Tabachnick, *Harold Pinter* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1973), p. 14. The two critics draw our attention to an essay on Joyce written by Pinter at the age of sixteen.
5. In his article "Embargoed Literature," Edward Said neither considers censorship, nor the many factors that make or break writers in the Arab countries. In his concluding remarks he wishes that cultural ministries promote Arab writers abroad. He observes that "It is fortunate that this relatively high number of recently translated Arabic works coincides with their importance and literary reputation in the Arab world. Nevertheless, it is also sadly the case that Arab writers themselves (as well as their publishing houses, ministries of culture, embassies in Western capitals) have done hardly anything to promote their works, and the discourse of Arab culture, in the West; the absence of an Arab cultural intervention in the world debate is thus depressing and tragic." See Anuradha Dingwaney & Carol Maier, eds. *Between Languages and Cultures* (Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995), p. 102. Perhaps it is much better that the Arab ministries of culture do not intervene in this matter! There is no guarantee that they will promote the writers mentioned by Said. Literary reputation in the Arab world is not only questionable at times, but also in a constant flux.
6. The Rockefeller fellowship in a sense serves as a commission to translate a specific work from Arabic into English for specific readers, i.e., American scholars who are interested in the Middle East and can't read Arabic. It does not guarantee a publisher for the translation. The translator must find his or her own publisher who might have a different intention and a specific type of reader in mind if the translation is accepted for publication. In her book *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988), Mary Snell-Hornby raises this issue of the function of literary translation and argues that "underlying the literary translator's work is the wish - or the publisher's commission - to recreate and hence to perpetuate a work of fiction or a work of art within a given target context, that is, for readers at a given time, in a given language and culture; in this sense the literary translation is as much an act of communication as any other translation," p. 114.
7. Kathleen Christison raises this issue in her article "The Arab in Recent Popular Fiction," *The Middle East Journal*, 41, No. 3 (Summer 1987), 397-411. Christison observes that "Novels by Arabs that criticize Arab cultures raise difficult questions of equity and propriety. Is it all right for an Arab country, or do such descriptions only more solidly confirm the

Western reader in his stereotypical notions of the Arab world? Should problems such as poverty and exploitation be ignored simply because revealing them to a Western audience will further harm the Arab image? Should an Arab author who exaggerates be criticized any less than a Westerner who exaggerates?" p. 407. Christison does not seem to be aware of the immense difficulties facing Arab writers for criticizing their own societies and the subsequent difficulties they face in finding publishers, not only in the Arab world, but ironically also in Western countries. Publishers of Arabic literature in the West have been lately very much in line with what the Arabs approve or don't approve of themselves!

8. Cf. Lawrence Venuti's comments on "Strategies of Translation" in *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, ed. Mona Baker (London and New York, 1998), pp. 240-244.
9. Cf. Marilyn Gaddis Rose's comments on "Speculative approaches", in *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation*, pp. 238-240. Also consult Friedrich Schleiermacher, "über die verschiedenen Methoden des übersetzungs" in Hans Joachim Störig, ed. *Das Problem des übersetzungs* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), pp. 38-70. Schleiermacher's article has been translated into English by André Lefevere as "On the Different Methods of Translating", in *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig* (Assen and Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1977), pp. 67-89. Schleiermacher's article is also included in Lefevere's *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992).
10. Cf. André Lefevere's "Translation of Literature: An Approach," *Babel*, 16, No. 2, (1970), 75-79.
11. Abdullah Abu Hayf. `alwa'yi al-qawmi waqaDiyat al-mar'a fi r-riwaaya n-nisa'iya. *Ath-thawra*. 16 February 1991.
12. In their 'Introduction' to *Translation, History and Culture* (London & New York: Pinter Publisher, 1990), Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere argue that translation "is one of the many forms in which works of literature are 'rewritten', one of many 'rewritings'. In our day and age, these 'rewritings' are at least as influential in ensuring the survival of a work of literature as the originals, the 'writings' themselves. One might even take the next step and say that if a work is not 'rewritten' in one way or another, it is not likely to survive its publication date by all that many years, or even months. Needless to say, this state of affairs invests a non-negligible power in the rewriters: translators, critics, historians, professors, journalists. They

- can make or break a writer” p. 10.
13. André Gide, *The Counterfeiters*, trans. Dorothy Bussy (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966; rpt. 1975), p. 168.
 14. Frederick R. Karl & Marvin Magalaner, *A Reader Guide To Great Twentieth-Century English Novels* (New York: The Noonday Press, Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1959; 9th printing, 1967), p. 205.
 15. Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, trans. Marion Jalos (New York, The Orion Press, 1964), pp. 3-4.
 16. Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator”, in *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn (1970; rpt. William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd. Glasgow, 1977), p. 69.
 17. Cf. the comments made by André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett on ‘equivalence’ and ‘tertium comparationis’ in their introduction to *Translation, History and Culture*, ed. (London & New York: Pinter Publishers, 1990), pp. 1-13. See also Mary Snell-Hornby’s article “Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer? A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany,” pp. 79-86. Hornby calls for an integrated approach to translation. She argues that “the linguistic and literary approaches to translation have up to now been mutually exclusive. In the linguistically oriented *übersetzungswissenschaft* literary translation was explicitly ruled out as being ‘deviant’, the ‘free play with creative and expressive elements in language’ (Wilss, 1077:181) and hence beyond all scientific objectivity. Conversely, scholars in literary translation reject the linguistic approach as useless for their purposes (Hermans, 1985:10). The culturally oriented approach to translation theory has some potential for bridging the gap, and indeed it implicitly embraces all kinds of translation. Furthermore, its orientation towards the target text as part of the target culture coincides exactly with the major tenet of literary translation studies as expounded in Hermans” (1985), p. 84. See also *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, ed. Theo Hermans (London & Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985).
 18. *Translation Review*, No. 44, 45 (1994), 6. Cf. The intricacies of the translator’s craft in John Biguenet’s and Rainer Schulte’s *The Craft Of Translation* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989. Rpt. 1998.
 19. Ferial Ghazoul, “On Translating Arabic Literature: An Interview with Denys Johnson-Davies. *Alif*, 3 (1983), 80-93.
 20. *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*, pp. 14-15. Cf. Jacqueline Risset’s comment on James Joyce’s own italianizing of two passages from

his *Work in Progress*. Risset observes that Joyce's texts are "no pursuit of hypothetical equivalents of the original text but as a later elaboration representing ... a kind of extension, a new stage, a more daring variation on the text in process." See "Joyce Translates Joyce," trans. Daniel Pick, *Comparative Criticism*, 6 (1984), 3-21. Compare also what Brian Fitch says about the self-translator. Fitch argues that "the writer-translator is no doubt felt to have been in a better position to recapture the intentions of the author of the original than any ordinary translator". See *Beckett and Babel. An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work* (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1988), p. 125.

21. The issue of 'dialect' has been raised by Henry G. Schogt in his book *Linguistics, Literary Analysis, and Literary Translation* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988). Schogt refers to some of the problems facing translators in chapter 8 and 9 when he discusses "some of the intricacies of dialect representation in writing and of the interpretation of dialect forms when used in alternation with standard language, or even as the main vehicle of expression," p. 112. He further argues that "Depending on the function of the dialect form it will be more or less important to look for an equivalent in the target language," p. 112. He concludes that "Translation theory and translation practice are worlds apart," p. 119. Cf. Also Chapter 6 "Register membership in literary translating," in *The Translator as Communicator*. Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 97-110.
22. The reference here is to the Viennese writer, Stefan Zweig who once said: "What is the sense of living on/as one's own shadow? We are/ ghosts or memories." In 1934 Zweig left Austria for England. But again in 1941 he fled to Brazil. His experience of exile, his sense of linguistic isolation, led to a crisis of identity and an overwhelming sense of rootlessness. "His work to which flight had always been possible, was not little more than a drug", as one observer noted. See "Stefan Zweig," trans. Kurt Prater, in *Exile: The Writer's Experience*, ed. John M. Spalek and Robert F. Bell. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982, p. 318.

References:

Abu Hayf, A. (1991). Al-wa'i al-qawmi waqadiyat al-mar'a fi riwaya nisa'iya.

- Athawra*, 16 February.
- Bachelard, G. (1964). *The Poetics of Space*, trans. Marion Jalos. New York: The Orion Press.
- Baker, W. & Tabachnick, S. E. (1973). *Harold Pinter*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- Benjamin, W. (1977). The Task of the Translator. In *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn (1970), 69-82. Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd.
- Biguenet, J. & Schulte, R. (1989). *The Craft Of Translation*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Christison, K. (1987). The Arab in Recent Popular Fiction. *The Middle East Journal*, 41, No. 3 , 397-411.
- Federman, R. (1987). The Writer as Self-Translator. In A. W. Friedman, *et al* (Eds.) *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*, 7-16. London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Fitch, B. (1988). *Beckett and Babel. An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work*: Toronto & London: University of Toronto Press.
- Gaddis Rose, M. (1998). Speculative approaches. In M. Baker (Ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 238-240. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ghazoul, F. (1983). On Translating Arabic Literature: An Interview with Denys Johnson-Davies. *Alif*, 3, 80-93.
- Gide, A. (1975). *The Counterfeiters*, trans. Dorothy Bussy. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (Ed.) (1985). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, London & Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Karl, F. R. & Magalaner, M. (1967). *A Reader Guide To Great Twentieth-Century English Novels*. New York: The Noonday Press
- Lefevere, A. (1970). Translation of Literature: An Approach. *Babel*, 16, No. 2, 75-79.
- Lefevere, A. & Bassnett, S. (1990). Introduction. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.) *Translation, History and Culture*, 1-13. London & New York: Pinter.
- Pick, D. (trans.) (1984). Joyce Translates Joyce. *Comparative Criticism*, 6, 3-21.
- Risset, J. (1984). Joyce Translates Joyce. Trans. Daniel Pick. *Comparative Criticism*, 6, 3-21.

- Said, E. (1995). Embargoed Literature. In A. Dingwaney & C. Maier (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures*, 97-102. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1963). über die verschiedenen Methoden des übersetzungs. In H. J. Stö orig (Ed.) *Das Problem des übersetzens*, 38-70. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schogt, H. G. (1988). *Linguistics, Literary Analysis, and Literary Translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1990). Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer? A Critique of Translation Theory in Germany. In A. Lefevere & S. Bassnett (Eds.) *Translation, History and Culture*, 79-86. London & New York: Pinter Publishers.
- Steiner, G. (1992). *After Babel*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Venuti, L. (1998). Strategies of Translation. In M. Baker (Ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 240-244. London & New York: Routledge.
- Warren, R. (Ed.) (1989). *The Art of Translation: Voices from the field*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Zweig, S. (1982). Stefan Zweig (trans. Donald Prater). In J. M. Spalek & R. F. Bell (Eds.) *Exile: The Writer's Experience*, 311-32. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

