398

:

:

:

•

Abstract

The orientalists had a major or noticeable role in developing the soul of translation and establishing relationships between the East and the West through the Saleebi wars. The orientalists reinforce the trade exchange through Seqelia and they help in the Islamic conquer to Al- Ndalus and the extension of the Ottoman State.

During the Saleebi Wars the greatest translation movement was known in the history and lasted for two hundred years. Through this translation movement most of the Arab heritage was transmitted to the west. This gave the chance to the Arabic culture to enter through a wide door to the western civilization. As a result, there was an important effect contributed to highlight the western culture and civilization.

The interest of the orientalists in the East Arab culture extended to the present time. This study sheds some light on the role of the French orientalists in transmission the Arabic culture to the West. The study doesn't analyze the negative sides or it doesn't handle the orientalists view to the East in the negative and positive sides.

This Survey study throws some light on the area which the French orientalists considered for the Arabic culture through three cores:

- 1. The translation of references and Arabic books,
- 2. Studies on the Arabic literature,
- 3. Translation of literature works.



•



3."

•

255 3 () : 76 1 1969 (385 4 .479 1978 :) 1996 5 : 5 1997

:

.164

(1280-1922)

7

.

1972	:		6
:			294-293
		5	1982
37	1937 :		7
1950	2		
			146

1949)	(1973)	· ·	. ¹⁰ (1892)	(1838)
	(1874)		. (1873)
		.17 – 6	_			8
			215			9
1995		:				10
					57	56

(1890) (1876)

:

(1801 - 1798)

9

(

•



¹¹.

213				11
	74		:	12
		:		13
:				
		233-232	1980	

ш

.14"

15							
18	्व		17		16	:	
			20			19	
(24))	:		:		14
			15	1984		:	
							15
	1985		:				
			. 5				
		:			41 2	002	
				101		:	16
:							17
						.50	1969
:					:		18
					38-	21 :	1980
	:				:		19
		,		13-11	1986		
	:	()		:		20
					89	(.)	

•

405

22 (1949 - 1920) .²³

:

:

:

1795

•

•

:

22					à	21
3				1003	7	
				311	1958	
151	1964	:	1			22
17	0					23

:

	PET	RUS VE	NERABILIS :(1156 - 1092)	•
			1141	:
				24
			.(1955 -1889) Leon Bercher :	•
)	(386) ²⁵ (456
	:		.(1667-1613) Fattier :	•
	-		(1292)
(650)	
	²⁶ (515)	
			(1715-1646) Antione Gallan :	•
	68	1984	:	24
	00	1707		24
	161	2004	:	
			173 172 1	26

.

(1740 – 1670) jear ²⁸ (• Gagnier : • 732)
	(1824 – 177	63) Langlès : •
) 1787	(1802)
	1813	(807
. ²⁹ 1	807 (930)
(1835 – 1759) Cau	ussin de Perceval	: •
)	
)	18	302 (733
1806		1806 (399
(516)	1818
)	(544)	1819
³⁰ 1820	1819	(486)
174 1	101	27
	164	
	164	28
169	176 178	1 29 1 30
107	1/0	1 50

•

(1838 – 1758) De Sacy :) (845 : • 1797 (1796) 1805 (1816) (696) 398 (1812 1816 (661) . 1810 (629)) (628 : . 1833 (672) ³¹ 1819 (1852 - 1782) Quatremere : (518) (1845) 1828) 1840 32 808 .((1854-1776) Marcel : : 232 - 226 182 - 179 1 31 171 222 169 185 1 32



(1855-1795) Fresnel : •

	(1867-1795)	Reinaud :		•
	:			
35.			(1837)	

(1858 – 179	0) Grangeret	t De La Ga	arnge :		٠
632)			
	1824			1822	(
				. ³⁶ 1828	
	3	63	186	1	33
			187	1	34
				189	35
				187	36

(1814-1869) Bresnier : • (723) ³⁷ 1846

: (1875-1808) Louis Sedillot : • ³⁸.1835 (376)

: (1876-1805) Perron : = • 1841 (. 43) (. 60)) 1854 (1847) 1854 (776. 1860 (731) (1870) ³⁹. 1861

(678 (1878 – 1794) De Tassy : • (678) 1821 1821

 56
 192
 1
 37

 238
 1
 172
 38

 195
 1
 39

 196
 40

40.

- (1882-1813) Cherbonneau : 1845 (1822)) ⁴¹.1852 1846
- (1883-1822) Charles Dèfremè : •

⁴². 1858

- : (1883-1811) Sanguinetti : (1854) (650) (1854) (764) (1866 (**745**) ⁴³
-) : (1884-1824) Guyard : 1872 (728 1877 1873 (255) ⁴⁴ 1883

	198	41
	162	42
199 1	171	43
132	200 1	44

(. 30)		(1886-184	3) Boucher :	٠
(114)		1867	
	,		⁴⁵ . 1875	
			. 1075	
		(1905) Pinto :	٠
	46	o. 1904	(1889)
				,
	(1)	893-1846) Leo	elerc :	•
	186	51		
(311)	187	78
(511		1	⁴⁷ . 186	
			. 100	00
)		(1894-18	324) Dugat :	•
			((1795
1861	(1041)	
(1883)			,	
(1885)			⁴⁸ 185	50
:		(1896-1849)	Sauvaire :	•
(821		. ,)	
(021			/	
		201	1	45

413	

	·		49.	
: (462		(1907))	Salmon :	•
⁵⁰ 1904	(449)		1904
	(1908	-1827) De M	eynard :	•
	1872	(346)
(538)	1865	(385)
	1871	186	7	
)	188	8 (6	65)	
		.51		
	(1844-1908) I	Derenbourg :		•
(. 18)	:	
) 18	68 (476)	
)		1875 (539)	(
1881-1	889			(180
	1892	(584)	
⁵² . 1895		•	(1913)	
			· · ·	
			207	49
			211	50
	1907 1	215		51
2	13 1	186	8 2	52
			162	2

(764

: (1840-1916) Houdas : • 1864 1893 (287) 1889 (1155)

- (367) 1901 ⁵³. 1902 (256)
- (1855-1924) René Basset : (1894) : 1915

54.

(1854-1927) Huart : •

(322) 1901

1919

429	218	1	53
			1964
1921	225	1	54
1907	(1914		1912

	1913	55	1903
	(1931-1846	·) Edmond Fagnan : :	•
1915	(525) 1904		912
		1893	
			1895 ⁵⁶ . 1921
(1517)	(1935-1864) Ferrar	ıd : •
			1913
	57	. (1935 – 1911)	
		(1937-1870) Bloche	t: •
)	⁵⁸ . 1908	1900	(660
	1926 1922 1917 1914	1910 1881.1909 :	55
)	1915	(1880)	
		231 1	(1953
	163	237 1	56
	241	1	57
		246 1	58

⁵⁹. 1907

(1945-1873) Bel : •

1904

:

⁶⁰. 1918

- (1950) Sauvaget : •
- :
- 61
- (1950) leon Gauther :
- 1909

:			()	
1908	(1881)		1899	59
				264	
256			1903	1918	60
				250	61

62	1	925
----	---	-----

(1889-1955) Leon Bercher : • 1947 1945

1922

1953

⁶³. 1955

- (1874-1056) Marçais :
 - (1899-1956) Cantineau :

4 1933 65

1937

1934

:

		240	1			118			62
					1929			19	28
		27	3	1			56		63
:	(1894)		1930	1927			1	61
							1923	1930	1922
		274	1			380			64
									1900
	(1932)				193	7		65
		283 1				1938			1935



(1883-1962) Louis Massignon : •



:

68.

		285	1				182		66
									1933
		287	1				363		67
1932				1943	1931 :			168	
		1934			3	06	1		68
	1955 / 99	1950 /	94			39	36 35	1934	





73

1928 •

74

(1964)

:

(1187)

:	(1954)	327-326	1		73
.1952	10			1955		1954
		:				74
					18	1997

•

•

() ⁷⁵.

1881 1832

(354) (22) (80) (1859) ⁷⁶ (309)).⁷⁷ (1882) 694) (1846) ⁷⁸.(596) (

> 75 136 990 : 189 - 187 1 76 188 77 1921 78

)	79	
, ()	. ⁸⁰	(1945 () ⁸¹
) (749	(513	.82
).()).	(26)	()
(1932) = 1345 1270)	: (1932)) ⁸⁴	⁸³ (1906) " (1927 1854
3	257 194 282 1934 4	47 81
: 91	2005	1910 84



п

п

		1966			II
	.8	³⁸ 1946			
				(1957)
			1940		
()			1942	
19	937			1922	

182	1	85
	253	86
	274	87
	282	88



1922

II

425

II

1951 89. () . 1937 1939) . . (1345

1952

1952 . 1956 1 "

•

:

:

:

•

11

II

п

.

()

п

90

II

•

п



II



:

п



	:			93
				1967
	507	1982	:	94
4				95
			106 1990	:
			136	96

•

•



•

•

. 1988

.99

	:							97
					48	46	(.)
:								98
266	1977 :			172		1980		
84 -63	1965		:					
	145	1954 :						99
		93	1979 :					

429



.100

88 - 12





lLa Technigue "

:

" Du roman , Chez Neguib Mahfouz

141	104	
139	105	
140	106	
		107
-----	-----	------
	147	1997
158		108
148		109

.109

п

п

п

.107

•

II

.

108

:













:



.112

149	110
152	111
152	112

153 113

п

•

•

•

.113

II

II

II

II

II

п

п

()

•

114.

II

115.

157	114
158	115

•

II

158	116
159	117

•

•

.117

•

•

437

116.

A Comparative Study between Abu-Dib's and Anani's Translations of *Orientalism*

In my thesis "Abu-Dib's Translation of Orientalism: A Critical Study", too many defects and inaccuracies were recorded in that translation; a recommendation was also given of retranslating the book. A new translation of Orientalism by M. Anani was issued in 2006. This paper aims to prove, through comparison instances of the two translations, that the criticism and recommendations of the thesis are justified and also that the translation of Anani meets most of the requirements of its recommendations.

Anani defines his method of translation by stating that it is more similar to "domestication", in the Venuttian sense, than to "foriegnization" i.e. his way of translation attempts to endow thoughts and images of the text with familiarity so as to become easily acceptable to the readership. (p.p. 16-17).

What distinguishes Edward Said from other English-writing authors of Arabic origin is that, whilst they used western tools of analysis to understanding problems of the Arab world, Edward Said used those tools for analyzing and understanding the western thought itself, which makes the task of translating certain texts of Edward Said, foremost of which is *Orientalism*, doubly difficult, and in need of many interventions of the translators including additions to the text like comments, footnotes, etc.

Orientalism was translated in no less than 35 languages, including Arabic. The only Arabic translation of the book between 1981-2006 was that of the well-known critic and writer Kamal Abu-Dīb. Today we have a new version of Arabic translation by Anani 2006 which is not yet available to most readers. Undoubtedly, the Arabic translation of Abu-Dib is more faithful than some other translations,

but it was criticized for not being eloquent (, 1991) and for

being inexact (, 2004); moreover, no revised edition of the translation has been issued until 2006; the sixth impression (2003) is identical with the original edition (1981), with the same errata and misprints!

This paper aims to prove, through comparison instances of the two translations, that the criticism and recommendations of the thesis are justified and also that the translation of Anani meets most of the requirements of its recommendations.

The inclination of Abu-Dīb to the literal approach in translation, underpinned by his structural convictions, and his over-ambitious goals in that direction are expected to be at the expense of the eloquence () and easiness of comprehension by Arab readership. Such a state of affairs is expected to affect negatively the various linguistic dimensions; the thesis was meant to validate this proposition, by manifesting cases of translation inappropriateness on different levels, interpreting the results and providing alternative forms whenever possible.

The paper cites typical instances of the difficulties in the TT different linguistic dimensions in Abu-Dib's translation comparing it with Annani's translation, that make Arabic readers' efforts in understanding the text or the message it was written to convey neither efficient nor effective; these dimensions are:

- The graphic dimension.
- The word dimension and inconsistency dimension
- The syntactic dimension.
- The semantic dimension.
- The pragmatic dimension.

The Graphic Dimension

Chief among the errors and inaccuracies in the graphic dimension, from which Abu-Dib's translation suffers and from which Anani's translation is almost free, we have the following:

^{* * * * *}

a) Use of *hamzat ul-katç* instead of *hamzat ul-waşl* in nouns, verbs and articles;

- b) Inconsistency in transliteration and rendering of proper names;
- c) Negligence of punctuation marks and

d) High frequency of misprints

Table 1			
Said's Words (P.L)	Abu-Dib's Translation (P.L)	Annani's translation (P.L)	Suggested Form
Look 32/37	64/24	86/16	
occupation 35/35	67/12	15/90	
, he said, 31/5	63/4	4/83	
Edgar Quinet	106/13	6/100	
42/26-27, 79/21	73/14		
		10/151	
Xerxes 56/7	86/4	4/119	
	00/4	4/117	
		()	
"subject	67/34	п п	II
races" 36/22		14/91	u
Raj 42/20	73/9	25/99	/

Table 1

The Word Dimension

The most serious problems in the Word dimension in Abu-Dib's translation are:

a) His use of regional (Syrian) words and words he invented by himself;

b) Non-standard words i.e. words whose use is not accepted by classical Arabic due to lexical, morphological or collocational considerations.

Said's Words	Abu-Dib's	Annani's	Suggested	
(P.L)	Translation (P.L)	translation (P.L)	Form	
focus 2/27				
	38/12-13	26/44		
pattern 6/13	41/20	25/49		
credibility		18/56		
11/7	45/25			
validity 52/32	82/28	8/114	/	
resources 187/38	200/18	1/301		
broadly speaking 284/27	285/1	14/435		
analyses 14/39	49/5	21/61		
Together 41/41				
	27/72	6/99		
available 73/21	8/101	25/142		
instance 290/6	6/290	3/443		
answer to 134/3	16/154	19/226		

Table 2

The Syntactic Dimension

This dimension may be considered the main cause of the loss of eloquence in Abu-Dib's translation. The major problems here are:

a) Use of long complex sentences in the TT. For example; the first sentence of the book: "on a visit..... Nerval"

ш

was translated by Abu-Dib in a long whole sentence:

I

. . .

the same sentence was divided by Annani into two sentences owing to the fact that Arabic prefers using a series of simple coordinated sentences to long complex ones: " "

b) Unacceptable separation of grammatical dependencies,

c) Not following the familiar order of parts of speech in the sentence

d) Not following the grammatical rules of classical Arabic.

Table 3			
Said's Words (P.L)	Abu-Dib's Translation	Annani's translation	Suggested Form
	(P.L)	(P.L)	
So unequal are			
Oriental to			
European			
achievements			
152/33	169/28	20/251	
Of course	76/32		
46/22-24			
replaced with			
139/12	158/22	20/233	
	130/22	20/200	

younger 299/8			
	298/8	27/455	
the better 70/25			
	98/18	25/138	
might have had 7/23	21/42	18/51	
Is	27-		
continuously being 285/27	28/285	22/436	
and was as	6/160		
much a part 140/40		1-2/236	
an idea 231/4	5/239		
		3/359	

The Semantic Dimension

The most important problems in the semantic dimension in Abu-Dib's translation are:

a) Ellipses which may be whole phrases or even sentences ;

b) Inaccurate translation especially of foreign words and expressions;

c) Metaphorical expressions;

d) Redundancy realized by using two words of different meaning for the same word.

Table 4			
Said's Words (P.L)	Abu-Dib's Translation (P.L)	Annani's translation (P.L)	Suggested Form
Since he knows their history 34/37	66/16		

Table 4

	1	1	
		8/89	
Access 122/5	144/26		
		17/210	
Rent 215/4	225/7-8		
		13/336	
Meted out to him 68/22	96/26	4/136	/
Hold my peace			
	31/129	17/189	
australes 117/8	140/23		
		8/203	
"Mahometsgesa	11	4/181	/ "
ng" 101/40	124/28"		
			II
Rapporteur		21/265 " "	
162/28	178/23		
Qualify 72/18			/
	100/3		

The Pragmatic Dimension

The most important problems from which the translation of Abu-Dib suffers are:

a) Difference in intention;

b) Hedging and

c) Implicature, where knowledge of the reader of the context is not taken into consideration.

d) Stress

Table 5

Said's Words (P.L)	Abu-Dib's Translation (P.L)	Annani's translation (P.L)	Suggested Form
Legitimist 124/2	146/9	4/213	(+)
The new historical (as opposed to sacred) consciousness 126/28	148/15) (17/216)
More or less 4/12	39/28	7/47	
Can't possibly 301/15	300/3		
		6/459	
Scholiasts 262/5	265/27	403/21	() (Webster)
al-Iji 313/7	312/20	478/26	()
Prester John 63/22	92/23	129/13	(Encyclopedia Britannica)
Xerxes 56/7	86/4	119/8	Dittaititedy
away from 171/2	185/24	277/12	

Conclusions and Recommendations:

1) This paper adds evidence to the conclusions of my thesis "Abu-Dib's Translation of *Orientalism:* A Critical Study" regarding the failure of Abu-Dib's translation to convey the message of *Orientalism* by Edward Said effectively and appropriately.

2) The "Suggested forms" given in my thesis for replacing inaccurate words or expressions in Abu-Dib's translation of *Orientalism* are almost indentical to the corresponding expressions in Anani's translation, in the majority of cases in the sample of the study.

3) The paper strongly recommends adopting Anani's translation fpr purposes of reference and research.

4) Being true representatives of the foreignization and domestication schools in translation, the translations of *Orientalism* by Abu-Dib and Anani may be duly utilized in teaching translation courses in English Departments in Palestinian universities, which this study strongly recommends.

References:

			:	.(2006) .	.1
			:	.(2003) .	: .2
				:	.5 .
:	: .	-		.(1977) .	.3

.

.4

5. Said, E. (2003). Orientalism. London: Penguin Books.

6. Hamad, N. (2006). Abu-Dib's Translation of Orientalism:

A Critical Study. Master thesis.