

## Article

# A Critical Discourse Analysis of Translators' Narratives Affecting Two Translations of the Same Text: A Case Study of Orientalism

Amal Abu Zaghlan , Zahra Mustafa-Awad  and Areej Allawzi 

Department of English language & Literature, University of Jordan, Amman 11942, Jordan; z.awad@ju.edu.jo (Z.M.-A.); a.allawzi@ju.edu.jo (A.A.)

\* Correspondence: a.abuzaghlan@ju.edu.jo

**Abstract:** The present study set out to examine the translations of Edward Said's *Orientalism* in light of narrative theory. The paper uses critical discourse analysis to examine the different narratives produced by two different Arabic translations of *Orientalism*, written originally in English. The first translation was produced by Kamal Abu Deeb in 1980, and a later one was carried out by Mohammad Enani in 2006. Our findings demonstrate two competing narratives of two cultures standing in opposition to one another, with each translation implying that one of these civilizations is unique and inherently competitive with "the other" culture.

**Keywords:** narrative theory; critical discourse analysis (CDA); translation studies; orientalism studies; otherness



**Citation:** Abu Zaghlan, Amal, Zahra Mustafa-Awad, and Areej Allawzi. 2023. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Translators' Narratives Affecting Two Translations of the Same Text: A Case Study of *Orientalism*. *Languages* 8: 152. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8020152>

Academic Editors: Paola Giorgis, Ivanka Mavrodieva, Bilyana Todorova and Andrea C. Valente

Received: 24 March 2023

Revised: 7 June 2023

Accepted: 9 June 2023

Published: 19 June 2023



**Copyright:** © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

According to Lefevere (1992b) "translation is a rewriting of an original text which reflects a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way" (Lefevere 1992b, p. 7). In addition to the translator's interpretation, a translation is also governed by the cultural and social norms of the society that the translation is intended for. A translator should take into consideration what is acceptable and what is not within a society, the general political atmosphere, society's cultural and political directions, and other factors that involve the reader. According to Lefevere, translations are just like any other text: they cannot exist in a vacuum, and we cannot look at them without considering the cultural practices that govern the text (Lefevere 1992a, p. 14). "Translation is always shaped by a certain force, power and so on, and the choice of the works to be translated, and goals of the translation activity are also set by certain forces. Therefore, a translation takes the form of rewriting, since it is performed under certain constraints and for certain purposes" (Ren 2013, p. 56). By mediating, a translator interferes in the processing of the text. Accordingly, an intimate relationship exists between translation and excretion of power; a translator has access to the original text, and in that they have the power and dominance of what is being transferred to the reader and how the text is interpreted. As a consequence, the main plot of the original text is under the translators' authority and discretion. "Narratives both reproduce existing power structures and provides means of contesting them" Baker (2006, p. 8). These newly created narratives provide a different interpretation of the one intended in the original text.

In this paper, we investigate two translations of *Orientalism*; the first translation was carried out by Kamal Abu Deeb (1980), a well-known writer and critic in the Arab world and around the world. He studied and worked in the West, specializing in Arabic language and literature, and has written many scholarly articles and books about comparative literature. He has also translated multiple works, including Edward Said's *Orientalism*, *Culture and Imperialism*, and 53 Shakespearian Sonnets.

The second translation was done by Muhammad Enani (2003), a translator, fiction writer, dramatist, and critic from Egypt who has studied in both Egypt and the West. He has spent his life working and teaching in Egypt and writing books about translation studies, literature, and writing.

The focus of this analysis is to determine how a narrative of ‘us vs. them’ has been depicted in each of the translations. There will be no extensive comparisons of how they deviate from the original narrative that Said created in *Orientalism*, but occasionally, we will point out these differences when necessary. What we are doing in this paper is focusing mainly on using both Discourse analysis and narrative analysis to answer our question, How has Said’s *Orientalism* been portrayed as a narrative of opposing worldviews in the two Arabic translations? To be more precise, each translation shows the world as a binary opposition of “us vs. them”, where one side represents *them* or *the other*, and the other side represents *us*. How, however, has this binarity been portrayed in each of the two Arabic translations and to what end?

Below we provide a brief account of otherness, narrative theory, and critical discourse analysis (CDA).

### 1.1. Narrative Theory and Otherness

By using narrative in translation studies, Baker (2006) shows how, in accordance with social theory, narrative is the only way that people may experience the world and is not just a means of communication. Every event is seen as a part of a wider picture and a larger configuration and cannot be viewed as an isolated incident. Translators generate new arrangements of the events to establish a new perception of these events. These new arrangements would provide us a different approach on what happened and help explain “why” certain events occurred. The order in which these various events occur has an impact on how we perceive what is happening. The narrative of events may or may not incorporate particular presented “facts” about an event. The ongoing adoption of these stories would eventually change reality and shape culture, tradition, and even history. For the aforementioned to occur, the person narrating must engage in a significant amount of discursive labor (Baker 2007). This type of labor is accomplished through *framing*, which can be interpreted as “understandings” or as discursive efforts intended to affect how people respond to a certain event using linguistic and non-linguistic resources.

According to Baker, it is generally acknowledged that narratives contain an intrinsic interaction between dominance and resistance. Although narratives often serve to reinforce the existing power systems, they also offer ways to challenge them (Baker 2006, p. 23). The narratives that we are attempting to analyze in this paper revolve around the idea of the *other* or *otherness*, an idea established by Said in his book *Orientalism*, which we are ironically evaluating for the same reason. In *Orientalism*, Said argues that every civilization necessitates the existence of a unique and inevitably competitive *other*. The Occident/Orient, us/them, and the West/the rest can all be translated as the Self and the other. The other is a foreign and an “other” reality to and of the self, and is the inferior reflection of Europe in all these instances, according to the Western literary and cultural canon. The Orient, as the cultural contestant of the occidental Western cultural, has been repeatedly defined and shaped through discourse. This Orient as it has been portrayed in Western discourse is imaginary, and only exists within the discourse. This imaginary Orient eventually helped define and shape Western culture (Said 1978, p. 20). By waging a hidden, even subversive, campaign on the Orient, European culture strengthened and solidified its own identity. Orientalism must establish its own other in order to strengthen its own identity and sense of superiority and to engage in combat with the Orient as “a type of surrogate and even underground self.” (Said 1978, p. 3). These dichotomies are all biased in nature, are neither accurate nor realistic, and they have all been established and reinforced through discourse. The reader is forced to view the world in terms of binary oppositions through these images. In this way, the reader is faced with a distorted version of reality or a completely new reality that may not even exist in the world. The reader has

to accept the new "facts" that has been enforced within the text. An opposing narrative, on the other hand, might offer means to resist the narratives enforced by one side.

### 1.2. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), according to Fairclough and Wodak, is looking at language and its use as a form of social practice; in other words, language should be studied within its social and cultural setting. CDA puts more emphasis on the fact that language use is not free of any ideological perspectives (Fairclough and Wodak 1997, p. 258). In Van Dijk's words, "ideology, power, hierarchy and gender together with sociological variables were all seen as relevant for an interpretation or explanation of text" (Van Dijk 1993, p. 283). Keeping in mind that CDA does not hold a single method for studying the relationship between language and power, it is an approach of investigating these relationships, and it looks at the way words hold ideologies that might not have been expressed explicitly, and this is why it has been applied mainly in political discourse.

### 1.3. CDA, Narrative Theory, and Translation Studies

Only a small number of linguists with a particular interest in translation studies have made contributions to using CDA and narrative theory in translation studies, e.g., (Schäffner and Adab 1997; Schäffner 2002), Jeremy Munday (2001), Maria Calzade Pérez (2003) and Bongie (2005). The majority of narrative analysis work focuses on examining expansive narratives that are present in organizations and in the media. Harding wrote an interesting piece on applying narrative theory to translations called "How do I apply narrative theory?" (Harding 2012). In her work, she investigates how narrative theory has been incorporated into translation studies and she summarizes several studies that have been conducted in the field. Harding goes into greater detail about how she has personally used and developed narrative theory through a sustained textual analysis and a detailed case study that serves as a testing ground for both the applicability of narrative theory to, and investigation of, a sample of online media reportage. However, like the others, the research she included in her paper is mostly concerned with political media. Her narrative analysis suggests a rethink of narrative typology by combining narratological and sociological perspectives. She suggests an intratextual mode of analysis and focuses on the narrator in narrative configuration and reconfiguration. In his narrative analysis of Victor Hugo's *Bug-Jargal* (1862) translation of *The Slave King* (1833), Bongie (2005) shows how the translated text was altered to match an abolitionist viewpoint rather than the original book's ambiguous attitude toward slavery. Because the book under investigation completely altered the events described in the original text and because translators often only have limited discretion to make minor modifications to the original text, Bongie did not investigate the options in great detail. He focuses on examining certain passages of the novel in which they were altered completely by adding or omitting to the material. His analysis attempts to show how a translator might change the narrative of the source text to align with the dominant societal views.

There has been some research comparing two translations of the same source text; Sichani and Hadian (2017) analyzed two Persian translations of George Orwell's novel "Coming up for Air". According to their findings, there are no ideological distinctions between the source and target texts. They investigated translators' tactics using Fairclough's CDA framework and Halliday's systematic functional grammar list in their study. The study looked into differences in sentence structure choices, such as passivation, the usage of clefting and pseudo-clefting, and preposing. This study focused primarily on the frequency of usage of the three sentence patterns, with a change in frequency indicating an ideological difference. In his paper *A comparative study on two translations of the Holy Quran: A critical discourse analysis approach* (Bazargani 2015), Bazargani came to the conclusion that the two Quran translations he examined showed linguistic disparities that had ideological ramifications for how the Quran is interpreted in each of the translations. In examining two English translations of the Quran, using Fairclough's CDA model as a framework,

Bazargani found that the translation that was done by Arberry, who is a Christian, was much more interpretive and less ideological. Arberry used neutral lexical choices, rarely changed grammatical structures, and was as faithful as possible to the source text. The second translation was done by Saffarzadeh, who is a Muslim. Bazargani found that Saffarzadeh's translation of the Quran was much more ideological than Arberry's; his translation was full of discursive structures and his lexical choices reflected strong ideological attitudes toward Islam. Bazargani aim was to critically analyze the existing translations and try to enhance the quality of future translations. The study focuses mainly on investigating the linguistic choices that were used in the translations, but it does not provide an explanation of any of these choices or the ramifications of translators' choices. The study mainly focused on pointing out the differences in lexical, grammatical, and other linguistic choices the translators have made.

There have been studies that set out to analyze Abu Deeb and Enani's Arabic translations of *Orientalism*. Ersheidat and Tahir (2019) authored a study titled "The Two Translations of Edward Said's *Orientalism* by Kamal Abu-Deeb and Muhammad Enani: A Comparative Study". Ersheidat and Tahir's study sought to identify structural and stylistic differences and similarities in each of the Arabic translations as well as to examine the translation processes employed by each translator. Ersheidat and Tahir employed a descriptive method based on translation theories and tactics. The study concluded that the variations observed in each translation are the result of utilizing different translation procedures; Abu Deeb's strategy was based on foreignizing the text, whereas Enani domesticated the text. Ersheidat and Tahir explain that these variations are also the result of the translators' understanding the text differently. Areej Allawzi (2015) dissertation, "*The Visible Translator: Identifying Norms in Translations of Edward Said's Orientalism*", shows the influence of the standards driven by the prevalent ideological and religious landscape, on the two Arabic versions of *Orientalism*. It accomplishes this by expanding on Toury's model and providing a framework for identifying norms in Arabic translations. To track the changes in meaning between the source and target texts, this method employs the pragmatic concept of implicature and Grice's maxims of dialogue. Her dissertation concluded that the disparities between the two translations were continuous, and the translations were influenced by cultural or religious norms. Enani made certain that his translation was domesticated, and he continually changed the source material to conform to his culture, while Abu Deeb attempted to foreignize his translation in order to correspond to the Western perspectives offered in the source text. Nonetheless, Abu Deeb made adjustments to the source text that were inspired by norms.

More studies have been conducted on these two Arabic translations of *Orientalism*, yet they aimed at evaluating the quality of the translations rather than looking at the impact of translators' choices and exploring the justifications behind any of the choices. Other studies including the two that we have mentioned earlier aimed at looking at the translators' strategic stance toward translation. In this study, we aim at exploring the narratives in the two Arabic renditions of *Orientalism*, using CDA as an analysis tool for narrative theory. This method would help the exploration of the two translations by providing a structure to the ideological perspectives the translators tried to achieve in each of the translations. In addition, this paper aims at exploring the translation of otherness into other languages. This puts the translator in a bind; the translator must choose between being a gatekeeper and a gateway to cross-cultural understanding.

## 2. Methodology

Since we believe that translators' ability to renarrate a text is constrained and that the translators' "interpretation" influences their translation decisions, we are interested in how translators interpret the original text. Their decisions are integrated into the text's overall narrative to influence the reader in their own "understanding". Having said that, we are going to use CDA as a technique to provide a textual analysis of narratives in translations.

Critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 1989, p. 109) is a three-step analysis that includes textual analysis, interaction (the production, consumption, and distribution of the text), and contextual analysis (the interpretation of the text in its social context). During analysis, the discourse under examination is studied broadly in order to obtain answers to questions relating to vocabulary, grammar, and textual structure (Fairclough 1989, pp. 110–11). To uncover distinct degrees of connectedness from the same collection of questions, micro-, meso-, and macro-level analyses are used. According to Fairclough, who uses the term discourse to refer to the complete process of social interaction, the text is only a component of it.

Fairclough benefited from Halliday's *systematic functional linguistics* while developing the analytical framework of his method (Fairclough 1989). He eventually came up with a list of questions about vocabulary, grammar, and textual structure, which we used as a guideline for this analysis, along with Halliday's list that he provided in his book *Introduction to functional grammar* (Halliday 1985), and we tried to identify changes at the linguistic level. The categories that the examples fall under are determined by the method utilized to express each example's particular meaning, after contrasting the source and target texts. We selected ideological linguistic indicators from Fairclough's questions and Halliday's list that would help us examine translators' choices and how these choices have impacted the interpretation of the source text. Since there is no defined model or approach that we can rely on to analyze two translations of one text, the inquiry primarily focuses on lexical choices. Grammatical decisions present a difficulty given that English and Arabic do not share the same syntactic structures, and thematic relationships inevitably shift when they are translated. We concentrated on four textual features in our analysis: naming and lexical choices, euphemisms, overcompleteness and additions, and thematization.

Our data primarily derived from two Arabic translations of a non-fiction book titled *Orientalism* (Said 1978) written by Edward W. Said. The first translation, by Kamal Abu Deeb, appeared under the title "*Orientalism: Knowledge, Power, Creation*" in 1980. Muhammad Enani published the second translation, titled "*Orientalism: Western Concepts about the East*", in 2006. The book's discussion of political and cultural issues, as well as Edward Said's explanation of the ideologies that the West holds about the East, make *Orientalism* an excellent choice for testing the reframing of narratives and determining whether the ideas in the text were changed to reflect the translators' own interpretation rather than the book's original one. Another reason for the decision is that the book's initial publication created a stir that inspired the globe to initiate a post-colonial movement and conduct re-evaluations, but not in the Arab world. The initial translation, which was blamed as being the reason for this failure in 1980, is still seen as problematic and was rejected by readers as being unintelligible. By comparing the two translations, we may be able to determine why one is more divisive than the original and why the book's intended message of transformation was not successfully conveyed. Said's *Orientalism* has three chapters and four sections per chapter. For our analysis, we concentrated on one area, in this instance section three of chapter one: Projects. The translators' introductions to their translations were also considered because they provide insight into how the translators approached the translation process and how they personally view *Orientalism*.

### 3. Discussion and Analysis

The below analysis reveals a consistent behavior in both of the translators' linguistic choices. By reiterating the language employed by the orientalists cited in Said's *Orientalism* as well as by altering thematic structure, Abu Deeb's translation tried to stress the idea of the other. On the other hand, Enani's efforts attempted to diminish the part that was given to the East, as he persisted in changing the language used in orientalists' statements cited in *Orientalism*. Among other techniques he employed in his translation, Enani chose to eliminate offensive terms rather than retranslating them. In doing so, Enani made an effort to temper and downplay the stereotypes that Orientalist discourse had attached to Arabs and Muslims.

The orientalist worldview has demonstrated that there is “us”, which stands for the civilized side, and that in order to affirm this superiority, a counter image, known as “the other” or “them”, had to be created. The other would stand in for the barbaric, insane, and uncivilized antithesis of the West. These images were imported to the people who played the role of the other and instilled in them the belief that they were inferior to the Western civilized people in addition to being used in the West to reinforce their superiority. The aim of Abu Deeb’s translation was to support these orientalist ideas so that the Arab and Muslim readers would continue to internalize the negative stereotypes that the West had established for them. Enani, on the other hand, sought to weaken and soften those images in his translation so that the reader may have the opportunity to view themselves not as the inferior but as the equal adversary. By portraying the Arabs and Muslims in a fresh light and the West in the position of the morally deficient, Enani hopes to weaken or even reverse the image of the other. On the other side, Abu Deeb attempts to uphold the image of the other and even offers defenses for the colonial era’s orientalists in his introduction.

We can tell from Abu Deeb’s introduction that, in general, he was aware of the fundamental themes and narrative of Said’s *Orientalism*. However, he presents it in a different way, stating that Said’s goal is to conduct a thorough examination of the knowledge, power, and oppression that a text might produce by employing “certain western groups” as the object of his investigation (Said 1978, 1980, p. 2). He claims that Said’s book is not about how accurately the West portrays the East; rather, it asserts that the East does not exist. However, the book is most importantly about the West, its intellectual blunders, and the paradoxical parallels it draws between itself and other cultures. When the West views other cultures while under the effect of power, prejudice, and authority, this does not represent the basic tenets of Western civilization but rather another known as “textual orientalism”, which was developed in a framework distinct from the original one. He labels the phenomenon known as “orientalism” in the West, which occurs when the West studies the East but not the other way around, as one that he has never heard of in the East. He believes that the essence of Said’s *Orientalism* is that it demonstrates the West’s capacity for self-criticism and that, like many other crises that they have been able to resolve, it will be able to resolve and absorb the criticism “from within itself” and will then be able to flourish and adapt in order to continue existing. Additionally, he stresses that orientalism is not the “East” condemning the “West” but rather an “internal creative explosion” from inside that would produce a new “orientalism” of a different kind (Said 1978, 1980, p. 9).

Enani explains that he “took the trouble” of retranslating Said’s book because he thinks that Said is one of the few who has responded to the West using their own modern scientific approaches in that Said has revealed what is hidden “underneath their masks” of culture and knowledge that aim purely for political and material gains (Said 2003, 2006, p. 18). For Enani, this is the reason why Said has developed his method of analysis and criticism which links writing and literature together. He also explains that the “degrading” human impulses that the West denounce are something that is visible in their actions, such as racism and imperialistic ambitions (Said 2003, 2006). He sees that what the West calls knowledge and science is based on racism and imperial impulses. He sees that Said is attempting to show the Western fear and feeling of inferiority toward the East, by “faking” and creating an image that does not exist (Said 2003, 2006, pp. 19–20). It seems that Enani sees *Orientalism* as an act of resistance and activism toward the West and Western representation of the East.

### 3.1. Contextual Analysis

We must examine the discourse’s production environment, which may contain details about the participants and the social events that influenced it, in order to explain the text and comprehend the circumstances that led to its creation. This section will provide some insight into the translators’ worldview and how they perceived *Orientalism*.

### 3.1.1. Kamal Abu Deeb (TT1)

Abu-Deeb expresses his thoughts about Said's *Orientalism* in the preface to his translation, and, according to him (Said 1978, 1980, p. 9), *Orientalism* was a challenging book to read and translate. He attributed this difficulty to two factors: the first is the sophisticated way Said analyzes and discusses what appears to be a straightforward subject. The second is the status of the Arabic language at the time (Said 1978, 1980, p. 9); he asserts that Arabic is incapable of communicating contemporary issues and modern culture in its current state. He blames the decline of the Arab culture's intellectual and civilized status in relation to the rest of the world for the inadequacy of Arabic in representing the modern world. He emphasizes that while the evolution of the language and culture are related, the polar opposite is also possible. According to him, the first prerequisite for the growth of a culture is the development of its language, or what he called the necessity for an Arabic language "linguistic explosion" and "linguistic revolution" (Said 1978, 1980, pp. 9–10). He claims that until we take the risk of linguistic expansion on all levels—phonology, morphology, and syntax—this explosion cannot be achieved (Said 1978, 1980, p. 10). The words "democracy—ʔal dʕi:muqratʕija", "imperialism—ʔal ʔimbi:rja:li:ja", "dictatorship—ʔal diktatu:ri:ja", and words that have become part of the Arabic language such as "classic—klasi:ki:" and "romantic—romansi:" were also criticized by him (Said 1978, 1980, p. 11). He claimed that Arabic had failed to develop its own terms that truly capture the essence of these words and provides ones that are smoother, easier to pronounce, and easier to understand.

Abu Deeb goes on to say that the problem with translating a text lies not only in the terms and words that do not capture the true essence or connotations of the original word but also with other levels of the language, including syntax and text structure, which cannot be translated. According to Abu Deeb, "There is this issue of language ability to present the translated text accurately, briefly, and consistently, i.e., providing a word for word equivalent, a sentence for sentence, not only the sense of it, but also the structure, and in a way that is brief, consistent, dense in explanation- meaning the language ability to deal with the original text without becoming an explanation or a simplification of the original text" (Said 1978, 1980, pp. 11–12). Therefore, instead of using an Arabic phrase to explain it or a foreign word that cannot match it, he tries to express the concept or word using one word in a foreign language that completely captures its core.

Another issue that Abu Deeb presents is the inability to derive new categories of the Arabic terms used to translate the English ones. "We need to realize that words are part of the language too, and they play a semantic, syntactic and symbolic place. We have to embody these positions in the sentence, is it possible to use the choices provided by the Arabic dictionary" (Said 1978, 1980, p. 12). For example, we can derive other words of different categories from the word *irony*; ironically, ironic, and ironical. Abu Deeb finds it impossible to accomplish this with the Arabic word *suxri:ja*. The accuracy of the terms is another issue, he cites; if we are able to perfect the term into *mufaraqa fukahi:ja*; still, we cannot derive any new words from it, and thus it is not a straightforward counterpart of the original term (Said 1978, 1980, p. 12).

Abu Deeb argues that authenticity is the justification for his use of uncommon syntactic constructions and the unusual translation of some phrases. He considers his use of such structures and phrases an improvement and an attempt to be true to Said's thoughts and text as well as an attempt to be true to the original language, in this case English. "The source text is an embodiment of a person's way of thinking, it is a view of the world, and the way language is used to represent that . . . In my view, it is the translator's duty to embody the outcome of this fusion between the human mind and language" (Said 1978, 1980, p. 14). This is apparent in his translation, as he translates "1980s" as "1830(ʔat)" (Said 1978, 1980, p. 16), for example, ١٨٣٠/٢٠٠٠ mi:m) ʕala: sabi:l ʔal mi:ʕal). He does not stop there, as he additionally replicates punctuation marks from the original text, positioning them in accordance with English rather than Arabic conventions. For instance:

**ST (p. 73)**

"This is patently true of the British experience in India, the Portuguese experience in the East Indies, China, and Japan, and the French and Italian experiences in various regions of the orient" (Said 2003, p. 73).

**TT1 (p. 101)**

"ويصدق هذا بجلاء على التجربة البريطانية في الهند، وعلى التجربة البرتغالية في جزر الهند الشرقية، والصين، واليابان، وعلى التجريبتين الفرنسية والإيطالية في أقاليم مختلفة من الشرق"

"and this is patently true in the British experience in India, and the Portuguese experience in East India, and China, and Japan, and on the two French and Italian experiences in various regions of the Orient".

We can reasonably claim that Abu-Deeb is fully aware of the influence a translator has over a text and that he is conscious of the significance of his decisions.

Although the major reason for a book to be translated in the first place is the consumer or reader, they are absent almost completely from Abu Deeb's introduction, with the exception of one occasion where he takes the reader into account when defending the decision to translate the book references that the original author had included in his text. His justification for doing so was that references in English would be useless to readers who do not speak the language, but he chose to keep them in English for those who do. He argues that he has left the references in English for the readers who know English, but it is unclear why these readers will not read the original book given that they are able to speak the language. It is also unclear whether he is being practical or does not value the readers.

Despite receiving a lot of criticism for the difficulty of understanding his translation, eight prints of the translated book had been released, unaltered, by 2010. A second edition of *Orientalism* with an additional chapter was even published in 2003, in which Said addresses the criticism his book has received. Mariam Said, Edward Said's widow, was able to have the translation and publication rights retracted from the Institute of Arab study, the publishing house that was in charge of Abu Deeb's translation. Until 2006, his translation was the only Arabic version available for *Orientalism*. Said made this choice because he was dissatisfied by his book not generating the same commotion and reassessment motion in the Arab world as it did in other regions of the world.

**3.1.2. Mohammad Enani (TT2)**

The 2006 translation of Enani has generated less controversy; some evaluations by readers have expressed relief at a new translation. After Abu Deeb's translation from 1980, this is the first legal translation that has been completed. Enani asserts that he has not read any earlier translations of *Orientalism* because he does not want his interpretation to be influenced by those of others, since any translation usually reflects the translator's grasp of the text and their interpretation style. It is obviously wrong; at the absolute least, Enani might have merely read the introduction, as he makes an effort to refute every assertion Abu Deeb has made. It is hard to believe that Enani, a translation expert who has authored numerous books on the subject of translation, has never heard of the controversy surrounding the 1980 translation.

Enani justifies the need for a new translation of *Orientalism*, 25 years after its release, by pointing to the second edition's new printing and Edward Said's addition of a new section to address his critics. Another reason he provides is that the Arabic language has advanced over the past 25 years (Said 2003, 2006, p. 12). He argues that this development is the result of new terminology and vocabulary that have been created or appropriated, as well as to the unexpected interest in the Arabic language after it was designated as one of the global languages in 1973. He continues that neologism is not an easy process and that it often takes years for a word to be created, introduced to the public, and eventually adopted into the language, presuming that the public has accepted it. Enani further argues that this process is universal and not unique to Arabic. Despite Enani's assertions to the contrary and his generalized speech, it is clear that he is reacting to Abu-Deeb's previous claims.

Enani makes sure to address the readership in the introduction, noting that it is the right of the younger generation to read and comprehend the writings of their ancestors in a language that they can understand. He also notes that the term “ancestors” need not necessarily refer to the distant past but could also mean writings from 25 years ago (Said 2003, 2006, pp. 13–14). He adds that it is in the nature of translations to “interpret” the text into a language that the reader can understand. The same applies to translations; the translator develops his or her own interpretation of the material, and then the readers develop their own conclusions as they read it. This is the way things work naturally when reading a book, where various readers will derive different interpretations from the same text. A translator can only interpret a text for the reader to the best of their ability because it is impossible to produce an identical translation of the original.

Enani also points out that a translator must be sincere, true to the original material, and consistent with the author’s style. A translator’s task is to make the material more accessible to the audience, not to “foreignize” it, as this cannot be achieved completely. A translator must also be faithful to the language he is translating into and must write within the restrictions that language allows. He indirectly accuses Abu Deeb of having a Western bias, which might have affected his translation (Said 2003, 2006, pp. 17–18).

Enani explains that languages are unique and that it is impossible to compare contemporary European languages with the Arabic language, which has a rich cultural and historical legacy (Said 2003, 2006, p. 18). Due to its rich background, Arabic has a wide range of terminology and words that allow it to convey a wide range of complex meanings.

### 3.2. Text Analysis

In our text analysis, we tried to establish a connection between the translators’ personal ideologies and the patterns of translational framing and reframing using CDA. We used Fairclough’s lexical, grammatical and structural choices questions along with Halliday’s list, which has been used as a foundation for many CDA-based investigations, as a starting point for our analysis. We focused on four aspects of the translations of the book under investigation, namely lexical and naming choices, euphemisms, over-completeness and additions, and thematization. In our analysis of these aspects, we look at the reasoning behind them, how they might affect readers, understanding of the text, and how these choices relate to the translators’ personal ideology.

#### 3.2.1. Lexical and Naming Choices

Lexical choices undoubtedly imply ideological tendencies of translators. Van Dijk maintains “... the powerful position of the speaker may be emphasized by a very formal setting, attire, tone of voice, lexical choice, and so on” (Van Dijk 2006, p. 376). Lexical choices provide a clear example of how a single word might present a different reading of the text. It is always the first step to analyze the use of words within a text or a discourse analysis (Richardson 2007, p. 47).

An example of ideological lexical choices can be found in renditions of certain lexical items in both texts. For instance:

<b>ST. p. 88</b> <i>“The difference between the two is not only in manifest scale but also in quality of Orientalist conviction.”</i>	
<b>TT1. p. 114</b> الإيمان الإستشراقي (?al.ʔi.man ʔal.ʔes.tif.ra.qi:)	<b>TT2. p. 143</b> العقيدة الإستشراقية (?al.ʕa.qi:da ʔal.ʔes.tif.ra.qi:ja)

Conviction means “a firm belief” (Webster 1996, p. 214), and it holds neutral connotations in the original text, suggesting that these Orientalist beliefs are not shared by everyone, but it is something that orientalists hold as true; rendering it as *qa.na.ʕa* or *eʕ.ti.qad* would have sufficed. Both translators used terms that are linked to faith and are well

known to Muslims as part of Islam. Both terms refer to a firm belief in God, and both suggest that these beliefs are held on a massive scale similar to a religion, but they both differ in the connotation. *Iman* refers to a belief that changes over time, by increasing or decreasing, while *ʕa.qi:da* refers to a belief that is constant with time. The reader may get the sense from TT1 that the West is currently experiencing a temporary state and that orientalist’s beliefs are subject to change. This framing of the narrative provides the sense that the West has good intentions and that it might modify its behavior in reaction to a change in its views. Abu Deeb’s translation portrays a worldview in which the West acts in accordance with its beliefs at the moment. In this manner, Abu Deeb’s translation justifies Western colonial practices and makes an effort to provide a moral portrait of Western society. TT2 offers a story of persistent and current orientalist attitudes, and Enani frames the worldview in this passage as though Western attitudes are permanent. Enani does not excuse the actions of the West in this portion of the narrative, and he tries to utilize the text as a kind of resistance and offers an alternative account to how the West portrays their deeds. However, the narrative in both texts is that these orientalist notions are religious in origin.

Another example of lexical choices is as follows:

<p><b>ST. p. 74</b></p> <p><i>“The Islamic lands sit adjacent to and even on top of the biblical lands”</i></p>	
<p><b>TT1. p. 101</b></p> <p>الأصقاع التوراتية (ʔal.ʔasʕ.qa:ʕ ʔal.taw.ra.ti:ja)</p>	<p><b>TT2. p. 143</b></p> <p>الأماكن المذكورة في الكتاب المقدس (ʔal.ʔa.ma:ken ʔal.maḏ.ku:ra fi: ʔal.ki.tab ʔal.mu.qa.das)</p>

In the source text, Said attempts to explain the threat that Islam has imposed on the Christian West from the Western view. These lands are where biblical stories have taken place, so for the West these are what they consider as “biblical lands”. That phrase has been translated in a literal sense in Abu Deeb’s translation, in an attempt to preserve authenticity. Abu Deeb is providing the story with an alternative theological interpretation of Western behavior and policies toward the East. By designating these areas as biblical, it gives the activities a moral sanction and stakes a claim to both Christianity and the places where it first emerged from. Once more, the way the events are framed justifies Western behavior and makes an effort to portray Westerners as either victims of outdated Christian beliefs that predated modernity or as acting in accordance with religious principles.

In Enani’s translation, he took the trouble to render it as *the places that are mentioned in the holy book*. Enani is more biased toward the Arab and Muslim world than Abu Deeb, and he strives to make sure that the rendition does not express the West’s right to such lands, despite the author’s attempts to explain how the West views the Islamic world as sitting on top of the lands that they perceive as biblical. Enani reclaims the lands by referring to them as the lands listed in the bible, which deprives the Western story of their claim. This shift in framing results in a rewriting of the narrative. Enani takes on the role of an activist by making an effort to rectify terminology and ideas that are widely used in the West. Although we can argue that Abu Deeb is neutral and primarily retaining the original text, Enani obviously alters the term to remove the West’s right to claim any Muslim or Arab area.

One more example of the lexical choices which the translators have made is in the rendition of Simon Ockley’s book *History of the Saracens*. The term *Saracens* was used by the West to refer to Arabs and Muslims during the times of the Roman Empire and later during the Crusades; it originates from the Arabic word *ʕarqi: - ʕسرقي* literally meaning *easterner* (Webster 1996, p. 886). In the source text, “*History of the Saracens*” is merely the title of Ockley’s book, and it holds no hidden ideologies for Said; it holds Ockley’s. The term holds an ethnic and religious marker to Muslims and Arabs (Daniel 1979, p. 53).

ST. p. 75 "History of the <i>Saracens</i> "	
TT1. p. 103 العرب (ʔal.ʕa.rab)	TT2. p. 146 المسلمين (ʔal.mu:s.li.mi:n)

Even while both translations capture what the term *Saracens* refers to, they fall short of capturing the original’s concept and purpose. One choice that both could have made is using *Arab and Muslims*—ʔal.ʕa.rab wa ʔal.mu.s.li.mu:n. Yet, once more, Abu Deeb betrays his own commitment to objectivity and authenticity. The fact that Abu Deeb used *Arab*—ʔal.ʕa.rab—might imply that he is trying to emphasize the ethnic identity and, in a way, isolate Arabs from their Islamic presence and identity. Enani, on the other hand, emphasizes the religious identity by using *Muslims*—ʔal.mu.s.li.mi:n—this could give the impression that the West is interested or targeting the Arabs for their religious identity, and this also could mean that Abu Deeb chose *Arab*—ʔal.ʕa.rab—because he wants to paint a less prejudiced picture of the West by focusing on ethnic identity, rather than the religious one. Abu Deeb seeks to characterize the conflict as Arab vs. West in contrast to Enani’s attempt to frame it as Muslim vs. Christian as part of a larger ontological narrative that seeks to define Arabs’ position in the world and their relationship to the West.

In Abu Deeb’s narratives, Abu Deeb makes an effort to overcome the “we vs. them” dichotomy by arguing that cultural differences rather than theological differences separate the East and the West. Enani, on the other hand, stresses the theological component of the gap, arguing that rather than cultural factors, this division is the result of religious convictions. Enani makes an effort to highlight the religious rather than technological or cultural distinctions between the East and the West.

### 3.2.2. Euphemisms

“A Euphemism refers to a word which is substituted for a more conventional or familiar one as a way of avoiding negative values” (Fairclough 1989). Euphemisms may provide evidence of the presence of ideology insertions in translations.

In a quote from Gibbon’s *Decline and fall*, which Said cited in his book, Gibbon discusses the achievements of Muslims since *the flight* of the Prophet Mohammad from Mecca. Gibbon uses a negative connotation to refer to the prophet’s action:

“One hundred years after his flight from mecca the arms and reign of his successors extended from India to the Atlantic ocean, over the various and distant provinces . . . ”  
(cited in Said 2003, p. 74)

Consider the translations after noticing that the Gibbon uses the word “flight”:

ST. p. 74 <i>One hundred years after his flight from mecca</i>	
TT1. p. 102 هريه (ha.ra.bi.hi)	TT2. p. 144 هجرته (hig.ra.ti.hi)

Again, following Abu Deeb’s translation methodology, he stayed true to the English text while seeking to uphold popular ideas, the West has about the prophet. As an example of Enani’s bias in his translation toward Arabs and Muslims, he utilized the term immigration—*hig.ra* that Muslims typically use. In this way, Enani is rectifying the West, as opposed to Abu Deeb, who is aiming to convey Western ideas about Islam. The narrative is presented in a way that paints the prophet in a negative light and characterizes Muslims’ actions as cowardly—an image that orientalist strive to represent and perpetuate in their discourse. Enani strives to establish the Muslim account in this context, attempting to frame the prophet’s move to Al-Madina in terms of the Islamic belief, that the move was

a divine inspiration from God. However, he runs the risk of giving the reader the impression that the Western viewpoint concurs with that of the Muslims. Enani portrays it as immigration, in which people often move when their current circumstances are not ideal, correcting the story in Abu Deeb’s work as well as the original text from which the quote from Said’s book was taken. Abu Deeb frames it as a cowardly decision in his endorsement of Gibbon’s comments. Additionally, he runs the risk of promoting ideas that are unpopular but could subsequently be accepted by the Muslim audience, or could expand the ever-expanding divide between the West and the East. While Enani tries to eliminate the “otherness” that has been ascribed to the East, Abu Deeb’s translation continues to portray the East as “the cowardly other”.

Another example can be seen in the rendition of the word *militant*:

<b>ST. p. 75</b> “the “ <i>militant</i> ” orient came to stand for what Henri Baudet has called . . . ”	
<b>TT1. p. 102</b> الهجومي الناشط (?al.hu.gu.:mi: ?al.na.fet <sup>h</sup> )	<b>TT2. p. 144</b> المقاتل (?al.mu.qa.tel)

The word “militant” holds aggressive and violent connotations (Webster 1996, p. 633), and this is the term used in the source text. Said uses the term in his text using quotation marks to emphasize that this is what the orientalist has prescribed to the East and it is not an opinion that he personally holds. Once more, the author is trying to convey the viewpoint of the West and orientalist about the East, specifically Islam and Arabs, by using these terms. Abu Deeb’s rendition captures the meaning of the original, even though he added the word *active*—*?al.na.fet<sup>h</sup>* (Baalbaki 1995, p. 1172)—which does not exist in the original text, and in doing so he goes against his own principles by overexplaining a word. Enani, on the other hand, used *warrior*—*mu.qa.tel* (Baalbaki 1995, p. 1085)—which holds a more positive meaning than the word “militant”, an apparent euphemism and another example of Enani’s bias toward Arabs and Muslims. By depicting Muslims and Arabs as heroic, Enani tries to frame the story in their favor and gives the Muslim conquests justification, aligning the narrative to the popular one among Muslims. On the other hand, Abu Deeb matches his story with the viewpoint of the West by depicting Muslims as radicalized and dangerous.

Abu Deeb uses this case to support the stereotype that the West has painted of the East as being uncivilized and irrationally barbarian, presenting it as the group standing in opposition to the advanced and logical West. By portraying Muslims and Arabs as combatants, Enani, on the other hand, aims to undermine the notions that orientalist are using to represent the East, another activist initiative that challenges the dominant Western narrative.

In the quote below, three adjectives are used to describe Egyptians, Chinese, and Indians consecutively: *scheming*, *perfidious*, and *half-naked*. In the source text, Said explains De Lesseps’ justification for building the Suez Canal. De Lesseps explains that even though the project might fail and it would cost a ridiculous amount of money, this Canal would become a European achievement that none of the *scheming* Egyptians, *naked* Indians and *perfidious* Chinese had managed (cited in Said 2003, p. 90). De Lesseps mentioned three ancient civilizations that are known for their achievements in the past, and by using *scheming*, *perfidious*, and *half-naked* to describe them, his intent is to downgrade and insult them. Two of these adjectives were rendered using words that captured the meaning of *perfidious*—*ma.kar/ya.dar* (Al-Maany 2022b)—and *half-naked*—*fib.hu ?a:.ren* (Al-Maany 2022a, 2022c). Each translation substantially changed the original description, as “*scheming*” which has a negative connotation (Webster 1996, p. 893). It refers to keeping secrets and planning in cunning and improper ways, and neither rendition accurately translates this:

“... to do what *scheming Egyptians, perfidious Chinese, and half-naked Indians could never have done for themselves*” (cited in Said 2003, p. 90).

<b>ST. p. 90</b> “... to do what <i>scheming Egyptians, ...</i> ”	
<b>TT1. p. 116</b>  المصري المخطط (?al.mas <sup>s</sup> .ri: ?al.mu.xa.t <sup>e</sup> et <sup>s</sup> )	<b>TT2. p. 166</b>  المصري الحائق (?al.mas <sup>s</sup> .ri: ?al.ħa:ðeq)

Notice that the Egyptians are referred to in the plural in the original text, while the two translations use the singular, but this is not the point of our discussion. What is important here is the positive implications of the translated words *planner—mu.xa.t<sup>e</sup>et<sup>s</sup>*—and *slick—?al.ħa:ðeq*—compared to the negative connotation of the original word. It should be mentioned that the translated adjective of Egyptians is the one with the most positive connotations compared to those describing the Chinese and Indians, which have almost perfectly captured those of the original. Both translators made an effort to portray Egyptians in a more favorable light than that in Said’s text, framing them in the role of the smart Arab. However, this could present a problem for the narrative presented to the readers. They may get the impression that the West views Egyptians favorably, which is contrary to their actual portrayal by the West in *Orientalism* as being cunning and deceitful. The stereotypical image that was employed in the original text has been toned down in both texts. The Egyptians are no longer portrayed as dishonest by either translators.

The following two instances are not euphemisms, but they are both noteworthy due to how drastically they differ from the originals:

“... an orientalist had to decide whether his loyalties and sympathies lay with the orient or with the conquering west”. (Said 2003, p. 80) Said explains that an orientalist had to choose between his loyalties to the conquering West or his sympathies toward the Orient, since Napoleon had considered the Orient a project and nothing more (Said 2003, p. 80). The use of the term “conquering west” reflects the authors own negative view of the Napoleon project, but it can also be seen as the view of a sympathetic orientalist who is only interested in studying the Orient but has no political interests.

The word “conquering” in this context refers to the West in a derogatory and accusatory manner; however, the translations paint a different picture: <b>ST. p. 80</b> “... with the <i>conquering west</i> ”	
<b>TT1. p. 107</b>  الغرب الفاتحين (?al.yarb ?al.fa.ti.ħi:n)	<b>TT2. p. 153</b>  الغرب الغازي (?al.yarb ?al.ya:zi:)

Abu Deeb uses the term *fa:teħ* that does not have an exact equivalent in English, but it refers to “opening a region to Islam”; it has a positive connotation to Muslims, and presents an air of holiness to the action. The narrative is told in Abu Deeb’s translation in the same way that orientalist portrayed their colonial endeavors—as attempts to modernize and civilize the old world, as opposed to an act of exploitation. The story here is an effort to defend the colonial project and cast the West in the role of the valiant knight in shining armor. On the other hand, Ennai uses the word *ya:zi:*, which has a less holy sense to it, and it more often has negative connotations. Even though Enani uses the word *fa.teħ* to translate “conquer” in other places of his translation, he here frames Western conquests as illegitimate, and in that he aligns the narrative to the Muslim viewpoints. By portraying the West as invaders, Enani devalues this depiction and eliminates any defense for the colonial missions. In contrast, Abu Deeb elevates the conquests of the West, which could be another indication of his prejudice in favor of the West, by framing the West in a favorable light implied in his use of *?al.fa:ti.ħi:n*. Contrary to the worldview narrative, which holds that

the West is selfish and that its conquests were made for economic gain, Abu Deeb portrays Western conquests as holy, carried out in the name of God, and that they share a similar goal to Muslims.

In the following instance, the word *supplants* in the second case refers to something that supersedes and replaces something, but notice how Enani rendered it:

*“Instead, history as recorded in the Description supplants Egyptian or oriental history by identifying itself directly and immediately with world history . . . ”* (Said 2003, p. 86)

Said is explaining Fourier’s *Description de l’Egypte*, in which he describes the oriental nature, temperament, mentality, and customs (Said 2003, p. 86). The extract comes from Said’s own comments on Fourier’s description by saying that what he wrote is not a “description” and what he did “supplants” Egyptian or Oriental history as whole. This reflects Said’s own negative view of what is called a description of Egypt.

ST. p. 86	
<i>the Description supplants Egyptian or oriental history</i>	
TT1. p. 112	TT2. p. 160
يقتلع التاريخ ... ويحل محله (jaq.ta.leʃ ʔal.ta:.rix ..... wa ja.hu.lu ma.ħa.lah)	يتغصب (jay.ta.sʕeb)

Enani uses the term “to rape/ to seize—*jay.ta.sʕeb*” (Baalbaki 1995, p. 135) instead of the more accurate term that Abu Deeb chose to use: “to uproot history . . . and replace it—*jaq.ta.leʃ ʔal.ta:.rix ..... wa ja.hu.lu ma.ħa.lah*”. The quote refers to Fourier’s book “*Description de l’Egypte*”, in which Fourier takes it upon himself to describe Egypt in an orientalist way, by replacing its original history with a made up one. Enani depicts the attempts to modify Egypt’s history as an act of rape, emphasizing that it was done against the will of Egyptians. In contrast to the typical narrative the West uses to justify colonization, both translators steered the narrative in a path that would portray the West as the aggressor. According to the Western version of events, the East is less developed than the West, and since the West is stronger and more civilized, it has a responsibility to cultivate and dominate the East.

In order to convey a gruesome picture of the act of rewriting oriental history and replacing it with one that fits the Western portrayal of the East, Enani intensifies the term “supplant” by adding the phrase “rapes history”. Abu Deeb’s interpretation of the phrase, which comes the closest to Said’s wording, is sufficient.

### 3.2.3. Overcompleteness, Additions, and Deletion

Overcompleteness according to Van Dijk (1980, p. 92) indicates, “If in a sequence of a certain degree of completeness we have a subsequence that specifies more facts than needed”. As noted earlier, Enani’s offers further information, primarily definitions for concepts that are absent from the original text. The original quote comes from Fourier, in his *Description de l’Egypte*, in which he precedes to downgrade the Orient by describing their present state as being plunged into barbarism.

ST. p. 85	
<i>“This country, which has transmitted its knowledge to so many nations, is today plunged into barbarism”</i> (p. 85)	
TT1. p. 111	TT2. p. 159
غارق الآن في البربرية (ya:.re.qun fi: ʔal.bar.ba:.ri:.jah)	غارق اليوم في لجة التهمجية (ya:.re.qun fi: lag.ga.ti ʔal.ha.ma.gi:.jah)

Enani adds the word *Lag.ga* which refers to the mixing of sounds in a commotion, an addition that does not exist in the ST, and it brings an extra meaning to the word *ha.ma.gi:.ja*. Thus, TT2 gives a narrative of what is happening to Muslims and Arabs in particular now;

it suggests that their deterioration is just the result of being trapped in a savage upheaval for which they bear no responsibility. On the other hand, TT1 retains the original text intended meaning, which would support the claim that Muslims and Arabs are trapped in their own savagery.

The standard picture of Arabs and Muslims as savages in nature is supported by Abu Deeb’s translation, which was common at the time due to their inferior rank. Enani tries to downplay the role that the West is trying to give to Muslims and Arabs while trying to recast the event as being caused by an outside force that is trapping them in this savagery.

There are instances where certain extracts of the original text are completely dropped from the translation. For example, Enani’s translation ignored some phrases and lexical items that dealt with the prophet. The next example is cited in Allawzi’s Dissertation (Allawzi 2015). Said explains how the image of the prophet Muhammad has changed since the middle ages toward a much more negative view. During the middle ages, the prophet was seen as a free spirit and a collector of followers; this changed as he became considered a false prophet and has been linked to sodomy, debauchery, and lechery (Said 2003, p. 62). Said is explaining the negative connotations that the orientalist have attached to the prophet.

<p><b>ST. p. 62</b>  <i>“Similarly, since Mohammed was viewed as the disseminator of a false Revelation, he became as well the epitome of lechery, debauchery, sodomy, and a whole battery of assorted treacheries, all of which derived “logically” from his doctrinal impostures”.</i></p>	
<p><b>TT1. pp. 91–92</b>                  وبطريقة مشابهة، فما دام محمد قد اعتبر ناشراً لوحي زائف، فقد أصبح هو كذلك تجسيداً للشبق، والفسق، والشذوذ الجنسي، وسلسلة كاملة من الخيانات المتنوعة التي اشتقت جميعاً بصورة (منطقية) من انحلاله المذهبية.</p>	<p><b>TT2. p. 128</b>                  و على غرار ذلك، فلما كان ينظر إلى محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم— باعتبار أنه نبيا ينشر تنزيلاً زائفاً، فقد أصبح أيضاً جماع صور الفساد، وهي النظرة المستفائة، منطقياً، من اعتباره دجالاً.</p>

Enani has changed the narrative to suit his own bias toward Arabs and Muslims by removing the derogatory terms that were present in the original text, such as “lechery, debauchery, sodomy, and a whole battery of assorted treacheries”, replacing them with what can be rendered as “he became an image of corruption”. By doing so, Enani has acted as a protector of the reader and the prophet, shielding both from the derogatory terms. This move could backfire, as he might run the risk of skewing the story to show that the attitudes of the West toward the prophet are not as bad as they truly are.

The (Peace be upon him — *s<sup>ʿ</sup>a.la: ʔal.la.hu ʕa.la.ji:hi wa sa.lam*) that Enani inserts after the prophet’s name in the same example does not appear in the original text. Enani is giving the passage a religious tone, which is completely absent from the original text; with his attempt to pay respect to his Muslim beliefs, he runs the risk of suggesting that the author of these words holds respect for Muslim beliefs. The word *prophet* — *na.bi:jan* — which is likewise absent from the original text, is another addition that Enani inserts here. The original author of these words did not in any way refer to Muhammad as a prophet, but Enani attempts to present the text in an Islamic way, and as a consequence he risks the interpretation that the West is on the Muslims’ and Arabs’ side.

Abu Deeb, on the other hand, preserves the original text in his rendering, and in doing so, he acts as a passive participant in the devaluing of Islamic symbols, siding in that way with the West. Abu Deeb supports the Western characterization of the prophet and Muslims as the height of depravity and wickedness, those who permit a man like this prophet to serve as their own Islamic leader. By doing so, he runs the risk of spreading unpopular ideas about the prophet, which might eventually become the norm for Muslims and Arabs or could widen the already expanding divide between the West and Muslims.

### 3.2.4. Thematization

“The clause as a message is a configuration of two thematic statuses, Theme + Rheme” (Halliday and Matthiessen 1997, p. 21). This position of the rheme and the theme can also indicate ideological implications. According to Van Dijk (2006), “it is possible to make some changes in the thematic structure to emphasize or deemphasize some phrases of the sentence and these changes can take place by the people who are in contact with the power resources”. Given that languages do not share the same syntactic structures, it may be challenging to identify this in translations.

In the translation provided Abu Deeb, he claims to be totally true to the original text and the author, yet he occasionally deviates from the original text’s paragraph structure and links two paragraphs that he may have assumed to have a common theme. For example: the translated paragraph below is divided into two in the original text because Said illustrates how Europe had complete power over the East, with the exception of the Islamic world, which posed a constant challenge to Europeans. The first paragraph’s theme is the general European supremacy in the East, while the second paragraph’s theme explains how the Islamic world was more difficult for Europe to entirely rule:

ST (Said 2003, pp. 73–74):

**Paragraph 1:** “Islam excepted, the orient for Europe was until the nineteenth century a domain with a continuous history of unchallenged Western dominance. This is patently true of the British experience in India, the Portuguese experience in the East Indies, China, and Japan, and the French and Italian experiences in various regions of the Orient. . . . for much of its history, then, Orientalism carries within it the stamp of a problematic European attitude towards Islam, and it is this acutely sensitive aspect of orientalism around which my interest in this study turn”.

**Paragraph 2:** “Doubtless Islam was a real provocation in many ways. It lay uneasily close to Christianity, geographically and culturally. It drew on the Judeo-Hellenic tradition, it borrowed creatively from Christianity, it could boast of unrivaled military and political successes . . . That Islam outstripped and outshone Rome cannot have been absent from the mind of any European past or present. Even Gibbon was no exception, as is evident in the following passage from the Decline and fall”.

By connecting the two paragraphs in Abu Deeb’s translation, he gets rid of the thematic progression that Said used in his text. The second theme has become the rheme of the first theme. The portion that is underlined denotes the transition between the two paragraphs.

(Said 1978, 1980, p. 101)

“بالنسبة لأوروبا كان الشرق، باستثناء الإسلام، حتى القرن التاسع عشر ميداناً ذا تاريخ مستمر من السيطرة الغربية التي لم تتحد. ويصدق هذا بجلاء على التجربة البريطانية في الهند، وعلى التجربة البرتغالية في جزر الهند الشرقية، والصين، واليابان، وعلى التجريبتين الفرنسية والإيطالية في أقاليم مختلفة من الشرق. فقد حمل الاستشراق في داخله، إذن، لمعظم تاريخه، سمة موقف أوروبي إشكالي بإزاء الإسلام؛ وحول هذا الجانب شديد الحساسية من الاستشراق سيتمحور اهتمامي في الدراسة الحاضرة. لقد كان الإسلام، دون شك، استقزازاً حقيقياً بطرق عديدة. فقد كان قريباً من المسيحية قريباً مطلقاً جغرافياً وثقافياً”

“For Europe the east was, with the exception to Islam, until the nineteenth century a domain with a continuous history of western control that was not challenged. And this is patently true on the British experience in India, and the Portuguese experience in the East Indies, and China, and Japan, and on the French and the Italian experiences in various regions of the Orient. Orientalism carried within it, so, for the majority of its history the stamp of a problematic European attitude towards Islam; and around this acutely sensitive aspect of the orientalism will revolve my interest in the present study. It was Islam, no doubt, a real provocation in many ways. It was close from the Christian lands a worrisome closeness both geographically and culturally.”

The framing of the text and the reader's inferences may be impacted by manipulating theme and rheme. In the first instance, the original text claims that despite the strong West's expansion of control over the East, Islamic territories continued to be the only steadfast foe of the West, portraying Muslims as a challenging and resolute foe and giving Muslims a special status. The reader is informed that Islam is the major focus of attention as a specific instance of defying the West by its presentation as the theme of the second paragraph; however, this status to the issue has been removed in the Arabic translation. Islam is being further pushed down the theme's priority list.

Abu Deeb plays his role in diminishing the importance of Islam as an opponent and as a defiant force to the Western forces. Islam and Muslims in the role of the defiant do not fall into the image of the other that the Western discourse wants to present, and by being pushed down as the theme of the paragraph, the topic loses its position of importance.

Abu Deeb frequently deviates from the paragraph divisions. For instance:

The theme of ST's first paragraph is the obstacle posed by Islamic regions to accessing Indian resources, while the second paragraph focuses on the effects of Napoleon's invasion of Egypt and Syria on *Orientalism*.

#### ST (p. 76)

*Paragraph 1: "Access to Indian (Oriental) riches had always to be made by first crossing the Islamic provinces and withstanding the dangerous effect of Islam as a system of quasi-Arian belief. . . . What was more inevitable than that Napoleon should choose to harass Britain's Oriental empire by first intercepting its Islamic through-way, Egypt?"*

*Paragraph 2: "Although it was almost immediately preceded by at least two major Orientalist projects, Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798 and his foray into Syria have had by far the greater consequence for the modern history of Orientalism."*

In Abu Deeb's translation (TT1) he eliminates the second theme as it becomes part of the rheme of the first theme, de-emphasizing the theme of the invasion of Egypt and Syria. This cannot be seen in Enani's translation (TT2):

#### TT1 (p. 103)

*قأي شيء كان أكثر حتمية من أن يختار نابليون الاستمرار في مضايقته للإمبراطورية البريطانية الشرقية بأن يعترض أولاً سبيلها الإسلامي، مصر؟ ورغم أن غزو نابليون لمصر عام 1798 كان قد سبقه، مباشرة تقريباً، مشروعان استشرافيان رئيسيان على الأقل، فإن هذا الغزو، ثم الاندفاع القصيرة إلى سورية، كان لهما دون منازع الأثر العظيم في تاريخ الاستشراق الحديث.*

*"Anything was more inevitable than Napoleon choosing to continue to harass the Eastern British Empire by first intercepting its Islamic through-way, Egypt? And although that Napoleon invasion of Egypt in the year 1798 was preceded, almost immediately, by two main orientalist's projects at least, so it is this invasion, and his short foray into Syria, had the unchallenged greater consequence in the history of modern orientalism."*

#### TT2 (p. 146)

*كان على كل من يريد أن يصل إلى كنوز الهند (الشرقية) أن يعبر أولاً، وفي كل الأحوال، البلدان الإسلامية وأن يقاوم تأثير الإسلام الخطر باعتباره مذهباً عقائدياً شبيهاً أريوسياً. . . . وكان من الحثوم ولا شك أن يختار نابليون "مضايقة" إمبراطورية بريطانيا الشرقية ابتداءً بقطع طريق مواصلاتها الإسلامي في مصر*

*كان قد سبق نابليون -مباشرة تقريباً- في غزوه لمصر عام 1798 وإغاراته على الشام، مشروعان استشرافيان كبيران على الأقل، ولكن عواقب حملة نابليون بالنسبة لتاريخ الاستشراق الحديث كانت أكبر من عواقب هذين المشروعين.*

*"For those who wanted to reach to riches of India (Eastern) they had to first cross, and in all cases, the Islamic countries and to resist the dangerous influence of Islam as a system of quasi-Arian belief. . . . And it was inevitable and doubtless for Napoleon to choose "to harass" the Eastern British Empire beginning with intercepting the Islamic through-way in Egypt."*

“Napoleon’s invasion to Egypt and invasion of Syria in the year 1798 was preceded—almost immediately—two great orientalist’s projects at least, but the consequences of Napoleon campaign for modern orientalist history was larger than the consequences of these two the projects.”

By doing this, the significance of the impacts of Napoleon’s campaigns on orientalism is once again downplayed, and it is hoped that the reader would be less affected by the event.

#### 4. Conclusions

This study explored the binary oppositions of “us” vs. “them” that each translator of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* has created in their Arabic translations. Using CDA to analyze the linguistic choices made in each of the translations, in combination with narrative theory which provided an explanation for these choices, we came to the conclusion that the aim of Abu Deeb’s translation was to support orientalist’s ideas so that the Arab and Muslim reader would continue to internalize the negative stereotypes that the West had established for him/her. Enani, on the other hand, sought to weaken and soften those images in his translation so that the reader may have the opportunity to view themselves not as an inferior but as an equal adversary. Neither of Abu Deeb and Enani has any known political affiliations, and other than their Muslim upbringing, they do not have any ties to any religious groups. Still, Abu Deeb seems to have taken the initiative to become a representative of the Western orientalist view toward Muslims and Arabs, representing the Western spirit of the translation, while Enani became an advocate for the Muslim and Arabs in his translation, representing their spirit in the translation. This can be seen in their introductions and in the choices they have made while translating *Orientalism*. In no way does this study attempt to evaluate the quality or to comment on the neutrality of any of the examined translations. Translators have to leave a part of themselves in every translation, and we do not think that a neutral translation that is stripped of any translator ideology is even possible. Thus, any new translation of *Orientalism* is going to be just another narrative of the original source text; the question is, what is the narrative going to be?

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, A.A.Z. and Z.M.-A.; methodology, A.A.Z. and A.A.; validation, Z.M.-A. and A.A.; formal analysis, A.A.Z. and A.A.; resources, Z.M.-A. and A.A.; data curation, A.A.Z. and A.A.; writing—original draft preparation, A.A.Z. and Z.M.-A.; writing—review and editing, A.A.Z., Z.M.-A. and A.A.; supervision, Z.M.-A. and A.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

#### References

- Allawzi, Areej. 2015. *The Visible Translator: Identifying Norms in the Translations of Edward Said’s Orientalism*. Doctoral dissertation, Durham University, Durham, UK.
- Al-Maany. 2022a. Half-Naked. Available online: <https://www.almaany.com/en/dict/ar-en/half-naked/> (accessed on 19 May 2022).
- Al-Maany. 2022b. Perfidious. Available online: <https://www.almaany.com/en/dict/ar-en/perfidious/> (accessed on 19 May 2022).
- Al-Maany. 2022c. لجة. Available online: <https://www.almaany.com/ar/dict/ar-ar/لجة/> (accessed on 19 October 2022).
- Baalbaki, Rohi. 1995. *Al-Mawrid: Amodern Arabic-English Dictionary*, 7th ed. Beirut: Dar El Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Baker, Mona. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A narrative Account: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, Mona. 2007. Reframing Conflict in Translation. *Social Semiotics* 17: 151–69. [CrossRef]
- Bazargani, Davood Taghipour. 2015. A Comparative Study on Two Translations of the Holy Qur’an: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach. *Translation Studies Quarterly* 13: 49–64.

- Bongie, Chris. 2005. Victor Hugo and “The Cause of Humanity”: Translating Bug-Jargal (1826) into The Slave-King (1833). *The Translator* 11: 1–24. [CrossRef]
- Daniel, Norman. 1979. *The Arabs and Mediaeval Europe*. London: Longman, p. 385. ISBN 0-582-78088-8.
- Ersheidat, Ghayeth, and Hafsa Tahir. 2019. The Two Translations of Edward Said’s Orientalism by Kamal Abu-Deeb and Muhammad Enani: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies* 7: 21–33.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman, and Ruth Wodak. 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Edited by Teun A. van Dijk. London: Sage, vol. 2, pp. 258–84.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood, and Christian Matthias Ingemar Martin Matthiessen. 1997. Systemic Functional Grammar: A First Step into the Theory. Macquarie University. Available online: [http://web.mac.com/cmatthie/iWeb/SMMG\\_resources/Sydney\\_2007\\_SFL\\_Library\\_files/SFG\\_FirstStep\\_1\\_1.pdf](http://web.mac.com/cmatthie/iWeb/SMMG_resources/Sydney_2007_SFL_Library_files/SFG_FirstStep_1_1.pdf) (accessed on 17 April 2022).
- Harding, Sue-Ann. 2012. “How do I apply narrative theory?”: Socio-narrative theory in translation studies. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies* 24: 286–309. [CrossRef]
- Lefevere, André. 1992a. Translation. In *History and Culture: A Source Book*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lefevere, André. 1992b. Translation. In *Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Pérez, María Calzada. 2003. *Apropos of Ideology*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Ren, Shuping. 2013. Translation as Rewriting. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 3: 56–66.
- Richardson, John. 2007. *Analyzing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Said, Edward. 1980. *Orientalism: Knowledge, Power, Creation*. Translated by Kamal Abu-Deeb. Beirut: Institute for Arab Research.
- Said, Edward. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Said, Edward. 2006. *Orientalism: Western Concepts about the East*. Translated by Mohamed Enani. Cairo: Roya for Publication and Distribution.
- Schäffner, Christina, and Beverly Adab. 1997. Translation as intercultural communication-contact as conflict. *Benjamins Translation Library* 20: 325–38.
- Schäffner, Christina, ed. 2002. *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Sichani, Shabnam Karimian, and Bahram Hadian. 2017. Translation and critical discourse analysis: Contribution of applying CDA in analysis of translated texts. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research* 4: 88–95.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1980. *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1993. Principles of Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4: 149–28.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2006. Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society* 17: 359–83.
- Webster. 1996. *The New Lexicon Webster’s Dictionary of the English Language: Encyclopedic Edition*, 1996th ed. London: Lexicon Pub.

**Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.