ARTICLE

Translation-Based Rewriting of Orientalist Writings on Saudi History

Amal Rakan Alkhaldi

The Department of English Language, Jouf University, Sakaka 72388, Al-Jouf, Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT

This study contends that rewriting can be used to address flaws in the source text when ideological reasons take precedence. The study examines translation as rewriting using the Lefevere notion, which entails altering texts with cultural and ideological ramifications. The author examines two published Arabic versions of Johann Ludwig Burckhardt's *Travels in Arabia* 1829. A comparative descriptive approach was used to investigate the effect of the dominant ideology in a given society at a given time on the translator's choice of strategies in the translation process. Two translations of the same text were compared: one completed by Saudi translators and the other by a non-Saudi translator. We discovered that, most of the time, the Saudi translators adapted to the ideological power structures especially when the text is concerned with ideological, regional, religious and social structural facts.

Keywords: Self-Representation; Saudi History; Rewriting

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Amal Rakan Alkhaldi, The Department of English Language, Jouf University, Sakaka 72388, Al-Jouf, Saudi Arabia; Email: arkhaldi@ju.edu.sa

1. Introduction

Translation is a type of rewriting that entails changing, reinterpreting and modifying texts from one language/culture to another, identifying itself as an attempt to convey a certain text. However, as Lefevere[1] stated, rewriting might be done when there is a faux pas in the source text (ST) or when ideological considerations are predominated. Lefevere[1] also emphasises the importance of rewriting and the need for additional research into the phenomena, focusing on the four factors impacting translation. Ideology is one of the powerful factors that could affect translation and lead the translator to rewrite the text for their readers.

Western interest in central Arabia, which covers a significant portion of the Arabian Peninsula and is now known as Saudi Arabia, has grown for a variety of reasons. Westerns subsequent papers offer a substantial body of information about Arabia[2]. Orientalists were aware of their duty as interpreters of Eastern culture for both Western audiences and the people of the East themselves. However, Orientalists were expected to confirm a romanticised, sensual and dangerous image of the Middle East, 'The result of all this was a real distortion of non-Western societies in Western travel writing.'[3]. In fact 'The knowledge created by Orientalists was not only incomplete and generalised but also prejudiced and negative.'[4] (p. 28).

One of the most difficult types of translation is that of Orientals and their writings on the Orient. This is especially the case if the translator is translating about their hometown and people because it places them between two poles of faithfulness to the text and representing their home and people. Saudi translators will not merely translate in this scenario, so considerations about what form of translator interference will occur are essential. Will they translate or rewrite? What elements influence their translation strategies? Al-Jaseer[2] contends that, while certain Orientalists' writings are highly instructive and descriptive, and help us to look at our past, Saudi readers must study Orientalists' works carefully. This highlights how crucial it is to examine the translations of the Orientalists' works about Saudi Arabia. Hence, this study seeks to identify any evidence of rewriting as a part of translation, as stated by Lefevere[1] and to forecast the causes for such translational behaviour.

2. Literature Review

Rewriting refers to the process of adapting literary texts from one culture to another. André Lefevere views 'rewriting' as the driving force behind the evolution of literature. The concept of rewriting entered translation studies during the so-called 'cultural turn' in the field, with Lefevere as its main proponent. He claimed that rewriting is both innovation and manipulation; it is literature's way of shaping society. In his view, the process of translation is much more than a linguistic exercise; it is interconnected with literary, cultural, social and political factors[1].

Lefevere developed his ideas about 'rewriting' over a period of about fifteen years. The first detailed presentation appears in *Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites* (1985), which was further elaborated in *The Dynamics of the System: Convention and Innovation in Literary History* (1989). He summarised his ideas and demonstrated their potential to guide research in *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992a).

Lefevere insists on viewing translation as a specific mode of a broader practice, which he initially termed 're-fraction'[5] (pp. 125–126). In 1981, Lefevere introduced the concept of the 'refracted text', meaning 'texts that have been processed for a certain audience (children, for example), or adapted to a certain poetics or a certain ideology'[6] (p. 137). A refraction – whether it is translation, criticism or historiography – aims to transfer a work of literature from one system to another. This transfer represents a compromise between the two systems and serves as an indicator of the dominant constraints in both. The gap between these two hierarchies of constraints explains why certain works do not succeed or only achieve an ambiguous status in the new system. The degree of compromise in a refraction depends on the reputation of the writer being translated within the source system[7].

In 1985, 'refraction' gave way to 'rewriting'. By 'rewriting', Lefevere meant any text produced based on another text, with the intention of adapting it to a particular ideology or poetics, and usually to both[5] (p. 127). According to Lefevere[1], translation is inherently a rewriting of an original text. Every rewriting, regardless of its intention, embodies a certain ideology and poetics, thereby manipulating literature to serve specific societal functions. Rewriting,

as an act of manipulation, serves power and can positively contribute to the development of literature and society. It can introduce new concepts, genres and techniques, making the history of translation also a history of literary innovation and cultural influence. However, rewriting can also suppress innovation, distort meaning and constrain expression. In an age of increasing manipulation, studying the processes of literary manipulation through translation can enhance our understanding of the world we live in[8].

Translation is then one form of rewriting, similar to editing, criticism, anthologisation, historiography and other 'manipulative' literary practices. Lefevere[1] attempted to trace the origins of the term 'rewriting'. He wrote:

> Rewriters have always been with us, from the Greek slave who put together anthologies of the Greek classics to teach the children of his Roman masters to the Renaissance scholar who collated various manuscripts and scraps of manuscripts to publish a more or less reliable edition of a Greek or Roman classic; from the seventeenth-century compilers of the first histories of Greek and Latin literature not to be written in either Greek or Latin to the nineteenth-century critic expounding the sweetness and the light contained in works of classical or modern literature to an increasingly uninterested audience; from the twentieth-century translator trying to 'bring the original across' cultures, as so many generations of translators tried before, to the twentieth-century compiler of 'Reader's Guides' that provide quick reference to the authors and books that should have been read as part of the education of the non-professional reader, but go increasingly unread'[1] (p. 2).

St Augustine is likely responsible for one of the earliest declarations of the 'doctrine' of rewriting in Western literature. When faced with the fact that many pages in the Bible did not align closely with the behaviour expected by the relatively young Christian church, he suggested that these passages be interpreted, or 'rewritten', until they could be made to correspond to the Church's teachings[1] (p. 7).

Rewriting then can be seen as a metaphor for translation, including transformation, displacement, change and creativity. It is a fundamental concept that reflects the paradigmatic shift associated with the cultural turn. In this context, rewriting represents a form of displacement rather than a mere transfer or repetition of meaning. This suggests that what undergoes rewriting can assume diverse forms and adaptations across varying times and contexts. Both translation in general and rewriting in particular serve as modes through which specific discourses are propagated and disseminated over time[9].

Lefevere[1] refers to translation as 'the most obvious instance of rewriting' because it operates under the same four constraints as all writing: patronage, ideology, poetics and the universe of discourse The crucial aspect is not how words are matched on the page but why they are matched that way. It involves understanding the social, literary and ideological considerations that guided the translators' choices, what they aimed to achieve with their translations, whether they succeeded and why[1] (p. 81).

Lefevere described ideology as 'the conceptual grid that consists of opinions and attitudes deemed acceptable in a certain society at a certain time, and through which readers and translators approach text'[5] (p. 127). He further posited that ideology is 'always enforced by patronage'[1] (p. 14).

According to Lefevere[1] (p. 15), patronage refers to 'something like the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing and rewriting of literature'. Patronage typically prioritises the ideology of literature over its poetics. Lefevere underscores that power should be understood in the broad Foucauldian sense, emphasising its pervasive influence.

Patronage can be exerted by individuals, groups, institutions, social classes, political parties, publishers and media entities, such as newspapers, magazines and large television corporations. Its role is to ensure that the literary system remains aligned with the broader societal norms. Patrons aim to regulate the interaction between the literary system and other societal components, collectively shaping culture. They often rely on professionals to align the literary system with their ideological agendas.

According to Lefevere[1] (p. 14), poetics can be defined as the ideal form that literature should embody. It

consists of two main aspects: one is a catalogue of literary devices, genres, motifs, typical characters and situations, and symbols; the other is a conception of literature's role within the broader social system. The latter aspect influences the selection of themes that must resonate with societal norms for a work of literature to gain recognition[1]. During its development, poetics reflects both the literary techniques and the prevailing 'functional view' of literary production in the literary system when its poetics were originally codified[1].

The functional aspect of poetics is 'obviously closely tied to ideological influences from outside the sphere of the poetics as such and generated by ideological forces in the environment of the literary system'[1] (p. 27). Once the formative stage of a literary system has passed, the inventory aspect of its poetics is less directly influenced by external factors[1]. The functional aspect of poetics plays an innovative role within the literary system, while the inventory aspect tends to be more conservative. This conservative influence is evidenced by genres being able to exist as 'theoretical possibilities' when not actively practiced and their potential for revival in the future[1] (pp. 34–35).

According to Lefevere, the universe of discourse refers to certain objects, customs and beliefs that are deemed unacceptable within their own culture[1]. Due to the distinctiveness of each nation's cultures, customs and beliefs, much of what is found within this context includes humour and jokes that vary across languages, making a straightforward, word-for-word translation impossible. In such instances, translation becomes a complex process requiring translators to make nuanced decisions involving ideology, poetics and the universe of discourse.

In most cases, translators must find a balance between the universe of discourse, including the system of concepts, ideologies, persons and objects specific to a particular culture, as deemed acceptable by the original author, and the universe of discourse that is acceptable and familiar to the translator and their audience[1]. The importance of power and ideology issues has been emphasised by most theorists whose insights have been introduced to translation studies. So, as part of the hermeneutic process of translation, within the interpretation of the ST, translators will perform a certain form of critical discourse analysis (CDA) in order to take stock of these issues[10] (p. 41).

Translators typically opt not to outright reject but instead choose to rewrite both content and style accordingly. When rewriting, translators' perceptions of the discourse universe are shaped by various factors: the status of the original text, the cultural identity of the receiving culture, the types of texts that are deemed appropriate, accepted language and expression levels, the intended audience, and the cultural norms or 'cultural scripts' familiar to or accepted by that audience[11].

Lefevere's idea of rewriting has been studied in a variety of texts and genres, but as far as I am aware, no one has looked at rewriting while translating Orientalists' accounts of the East, much less Saudi Arabia. Therefore, examining translations or rewritings of the Orientalists' narratives will highlight any prejudices and misunderstandings in Orientalist narratives. Such studies will help us to recognise and evaluate misconceptions about the East that have dominated Western discourses, media representations and scholarly research by looking at these translations. It aids in dismantling the power structures present in Orientalist discourse. Through a critical analysis of these translations, we can gain a deeper understanding of the production and dissemination of knowledge about the East, frequently seen within the framework of colonial and post-colonial power structures, and can understand the role that translation plays in the matter. Translation will act as a kind of cultural diplomacy because Saudi translators may recover their narrative and self-representation and promote more cross-cultural understanding by presenting their national identity and cultural values to a worldwide audience through translation and commentary.

3. Relevant Studies

Al-Harahsheh and Al-Omari[12] examine the concept of self-translation using Heikal's *Autumn of Fury* as a case study. The article explores discrepancies and omissions between the original English text and its Arabic translation, delving into the motivations behind self-translation and emphasising the influence of bilingualism and cultural context. Employing CDA, the study evaluates linguistic, political and ideological perspectives in the translations. It highlights the complexities involved, discussing how the process involves modifications, manipulations and rewriting of the ST into Arabic. The article underscores that self-translation poses challenges in distinguishing between a faithful rendition and a transformative

process. Heikal's self-translation of *Autumn of Fury* reflects his intentions and ideologies through alterations in the Arabic version. The study suggests that Heikal's political leanings shaped his linguistic choices, framing self-translation as an act of rewriting. Furthermore, it hypothesises that Heikal's self-translation aimed to convey the intended meaning of the original text while navigating criticism, particularly concerning his disagreements with Anwar Sadat. The research also reveals the impact of Heikal's bilingualism and biculturalism on his approach to self-translation.

Alharthi[13] examines the role of Saudi translators in reshaping the portrayal of Saudi Arabia by translating Orientalists' accounts into Arabic. The study aims to address two main objectives: presenting Saudi identity from an indigenous perspective and exploring the agency of Saudi translators. Using Bourdieu's concept of doxa and Genette's notion of paratext, the paper analyses the contextual elements surrounding translations of Orientalist writings on Saudi history by three prominent Saudi academics/translators. Employing a critical analytical approach in their translations, Saudi translators uncover the underlying implications of how Orientalists conceptualise and depict Arabia. They strategically use paratextual elements like footnotes to reinforce established beliefs (doxa) within the field and demonstrate their alignment with it. This deliberate approach aims to reconstruct Saudi Arabia's image and counter Orientalist narratives effectively. Overall, the agency of Saudi translators in initiating and reinforcing doxic practices within the paratextual realm of their translations is pivotal in shaping how Saudi Arabia is perceived and interpreted within the domain of translation studies. It's important to note that, while Alharthi's study[13] and this study share the same objectives, Alharthi's study only considers the paratext elements of the translation. In contrast, this study delves into the text itself and investigates the rewriting methods used by the translators to adapt the text for the intended readers.

More recently, in her study, Mauro[14] explores translation as a form of rewriting, highlighting how social and cultural factors influence the adaptation of foreign texts to fit local norms. She contrasts two prominent translation methods from the turn of the twentieth century: the Victorian approach and Ezra Pound's method, specifically focusing on his collection *Cathay*. Mauro's analysis examines Pound's approach to translating classical Chinese poems, illustrating its departure from traditional Victorian practices and its aim to offer Western readers a clearer understanding of Chinese culture. By studying Pound's translations in *Cathay*, Mauro reveals their significant contribution to portraying Chinese culture. She argues that Pound's versions, characterised as products of a rewriting process rather than literal translations, have played a crucial role in shaping a specific, manipulated, and historically contextualised view of Chinese cultural identity.

4. Western Perspectives on Najd through History and Exploration

According to AlOboudi[15] the earliest Western records of Arabia originate from Greek and Roman writers, who categorised the region into Petraea (stony) in the north, Felix (happy) in the south and Deserta (desert) in the middle. AlOboudi[15] indicates that scholars like Herodotus, Strabo, Dio Cassius and Procopius focused on Arabia Petraea due to its bustling commercial settlements and strategic access from the Levant and Egypt. Arabia Felix, encompassing the Red Sea coastal areas known for their wealth and trade with the Levant under Roman rule, also garnered attention. In contrast, Arabia Deserta, comprising much of central Arabia, received scant mention from these Western historians, despite their significant influence on early perceptions of the region. The geographic and historical texts authored by Arab and Muslim scholars provide glimpses into the heritage of Najd's inhabitants, often quoting poetry from both Islamic and pre-Islamic eras dating back to the third century AD.

Around the mid-eighteenth century, Western interest in Najd surged due to a resurgence of political activity in the region. Prior to that time, Najd was a vast territory with minimal resources and lacked centralised power extending beyond its borders.

Another significant factor driving Western interest in central Arabia, which comprises a substantial portion of the Arabian Peninsula, emerged around the time of the French Revolution. This coincided with the growing influence of Emirates in Najd. Western powers formulated strategies and political agendas aimed at weakening Ottoman control over the Middle East, leading to efforts to gather intelligence and understanding of this largely unfamiliar region.

It Is widely acknowledged that not all explorers of Najd documented their journeys and, until relatively recently, little

was understood about their covert objectives and motivations. Nevertheless, it can be inferred that the underlying covert motive for nearly all of them was to assess the strength and potential of the two primary powers in Najd. The reasons openly stated by explorers of Najd varied widely: some were intrigued by Arabian horses, some by the region's geography and sociology, while others focused on historical inscriptions, archaeology and language[15].

Many explorers documented their adventures and observations in Najd, producing valuable texts such as Johann Ludwig Burckhardt's *Travels in Arabia* (1829)[16]. These works have served as crucial records about Najd for approximately two centuries, particularly in the Western world, providing entirely new insights into Najd's geography, topography, people, resources and global relationships.

5. Data and Methodology

The study examines two translations of *Travels in Arabia* (1829) by Burckhardt, a Swiss traveller, geographer and Orientalist who travelled through Arabia and visited Mecca. Burckhardt, who adopted a Muslim name and often dressed in Muslim attire, left his extensive collection of Arabic manuscripts to Cambridge University. His writings also include *Travels in Nubia* (1819) and *Travels in Syria and the Holy Land* (1822).

Travels in Arabia (1829) was originally written in English and was translated into Arabic twice: first by two Saudi academic historians, Dr Abdullaziz Alhalabi and Dr Abdulrahman Alshaikh, and published by Alresallah as يزة العرب رحلات في شبة جز in 1992 [17], and second by a non-Saudi translator, published by Alentisahr Alarabi as الجزيرة العربية رحلات الي شبه in 2005 [18]

To investigate the translation, a comparative descriptive method will be utilised to compare the two translations of the same text. Lefevere's [2, 11] concept of rewriting informs the discussion, evaluating examples through linguistic, political and ideological lenses. The approach involves scrutinising the social, historical, cultural and linguistic facets of texts to uncover hidden ideologies within the meanings of the source text (ST) and target text (TT). Thus, this study analyses the ST and TT with a focus on these elements to explain any changes, rewriting or modifications in the TT.

6. Line of Argument

As mentioned in the previous section, Lefevere proposed a comprehensive view of rewriting that encompasses the remodelling of the literary system, the factors influencing the translation/rewriting processes, and the strategies employed. Rewriting is a common practice in premodern translation, historiography and hagiography, involving textual transformation. Whether producing translations, literary histories, reference works, anthologies, criticism or editions, 'rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time' [1] (p. 8).

This study focuses on translators as rewriters, the strategies they used, their choices when rendering the text, and their motivations for doing so. The study also considers both the textual and paratextual elements.

The discussion will centre on the rewriting strategies employed by two Saudi translators and historians of an Orientalist book. According to Said[19] (p. 13), 'Orientalism [is] a Western style for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the Orient.' In other words, Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between 'the Orient' and, most of the time, 'the Occident' [19] (p. 2),

Generally, the professional translation of Orientalist books about Arabia in Saudi Arabia began in 1985 with Al Uthaymin's translation of Burckhardt's *Notes on the History of the Bedouins and Wahhabis* (1831), as stated by Alharthi[13] (p. 117). Subsequently, Saudi academics/translators such as 'Abd Allah Al 'Askar, 'Abd Allah Al-'Uthaymīn and 'Uwaīdah Al Juhany contributed to the translation of Orientalist books about Arabia in Saudi History. Dr Abdullaziz Alhalabi and Dr Abdulrahman Alshaikh co-translated *Travels in Arabia* (1829) by Burckhardt as جزيرة العرب رحلات في شبة in 1992, which is analysed in this paper.

The extracts are categorised based on content as rewriting ideological/political facts, rewriting historical/religious facts, rewriting geographical facts and rewriting social structure facts. The social structure in the Gulf is still determined by the affiliation of each family and individual to an association of a tribe or qabilas.

Again, the discussion will compare the translation of

the same text by Saudi translators and a non-Saudi translator and will start with the English text followed by the non-Saudi translation and then by the translation made by the Saudi translators.

The following examples demonstrate how rewriting was utilised to render the target text:

6.1. Rewriting Ideological/Political Facts

In the following excerpts, Burckhardt describes the situation in Jeddah and Mecca. The author uses the term *Wahhabis* when referring to the conflict between the local inhabitants and the Ottomans. The second excerpt discusses the rewriting and the translation of *The Persian Gulf* :

ST. Burckhardt

1. He had arrived in the Hedjaz at the close of the spring of 1813 and was now resident at Tayf, where he had established the headquarters of the army, with which he intended to attack the strongholds of *the Wahhabis*.

2. In 1811, Mohammed Aly Pasha commanded his operations against *the Wahhabis*, by sending a body of troops under the command of his son Tousoun Bey.

Non-Saudi translation

١. كان الباشا قد وصل الى الحجاز مع نهاية فصل الربيع من سنة ١٨١٣، وهو يقيم الآن في مدينة الطائف حيث أسس مركز الجيش الرئيسي الذي ينوي به مهاجمة معاقل **الوهابيين** وخصومهم

٢. في سنة ١٨١١، بدأ محمد علي باشا حملاته ضد **الوهابيين** بإرسال فرقة من الجنود بقيادة نجله طوسون بك

Saudi translation

١.وكان قد وصل الحجاز في نهاية ربيه سنة ١٨١٣م وهو يقيم الان في الطائف التي جعله مقراً لقيادة جيشه الذي يعده لمهاجمة معاقل **السلفيين**.

٢.وفي سنة ١٨١١م بدأ محمد على عملياته الحربية ضد **السعوديين** بإرسال جيش تحت قيادة ابنة طوسون بك.

ST. Burckhardt

1. The tobacco smoked in the two former of these pipes comes from the *Persian Gulf*; the best is from Shiraz.

Non-Saudi translation

١.ويأتي التبغ المستعمل في الصنفين الأولين **الخليج الفارسي**، والنوع الأفضل مصدره مدينة شيراز.

Saudi translation

٢.ان التبغ الذي يستخدم في الكدرة والشيشة يأتي من **الخليج العربي**، وأفضل انواعه يأتي من شيراز.

The translation of the word 'Wahhabis' was rewritten when translated into Arabic by the Saudi translators as Salafists or Saudis and this was adopted throughout the whole translated book. The Saudi translators explain that:

في النص: الوهابيين. وقد آثرنا ترجمتها للسلفيين بدلاً من السعوديين في معظم الحالات، لأن المؤلف قد يسمي أشخاصاً أو قبائل الوهابيين لأنهم يؤمنون أو يتعاطفون مع مبادىء الدعوة الإصلاحية التي دعا إليها الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب بينما هم لا يخضعون للنفوذ السياسي للدولة السعودية التي أسسها الإمام محمد بن سعود (المترجمان).

In the text: Wahhabis. We chose to translate it to Salafists instead of Saudis in most cases, because the author may name people or tribes Wahhabis because they believe in or sympathise with the principles of the reformist call called for by Sheikh Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhab, while they are not subject to the political influence of the Saudi state founded by Imam Muhammad bin Saud (my translation of the Arabic).

The Saudi translators chose not to have Burckhardt represent them. Instead, they rewrote the text when they encountered ideological or political facts. They explained that Burckhardt might, at times, make mistakes or misunderstand the difference between the Salafists and Wahhabis. In other instances, they chose to translate Wahhabis as Saudis when the text referred to the conflict with the Ottomans.

While the Saudi translators decided to rewrite the facts based on their beliefs and knowledge of their history rather than focusing on translation fidelity, the non-Saudi translator retained the term *Wahhabis* throughout the text.

Similarly, the Saudi translators here rewrite the Persian Gulf to be the Arabian Gulf الخليج العربي, for the same ideological and political reasons; their ideology was incompatible with the one expressed by Burckhardt, so, they used الخليج العربي, the Arabian Gulf, every time they encountered Persian Gulf. In contrast, the non-Saudi translator renders it as the Persian Gulf, الخليج الفارسي.

As can be seen, 'Ideology and poetics particularly shape the translator's strategy in solving problems raised by elements in the universe of discourse of the original and the linguistic expression of that original'[1] (p. 48). The Saudi translators tend to express themselves and critique the orientalist assumptions about their people and land. This, as Lefevere[1] expresses, is a common technique used by translators when they encounter text that does not fit their ideology.

6.2. Rewriting Geographical Facts

In the following examples, Burckhardt describes the Omrah as an Islamic ritual that Muslims perform, detailing the places they must pass by *Safa*. In the second example, the author describes another place, *Jabal Shammar*, in Najd.

ST. Burckhardt

1. He then descends, to begin the walk, along a level street about six hundred paces in length, which the Arabian historians call *Wady Szafa*, leading towards Meroua

2. Its inhabitants are the powerful Beni Shammar. They are said to muster seven thousand matchlocks; and, *like their neighbours in Nedjed*, they cultivate palm trees by means of water drawn up from wells in leather buckets by camels.

Non-Saudi translation

١. ثم ينزل ليباشر السير على طول شارع منبسط يبلغ طوله نحو ست مائة قدم ويدعوه المؤرخون العرب **وادي الصفاه** وهو يقود إلى المروة

٢. وسكانها هم بنو شمر الأقوياء، ويُقال أنهم قادرون على جمع سبعة آلاف بندقية. **وهم مثل جيرانهم في نجد** يزرعون أشجار النخيل مع مياه يجرونها من الابار عبر قربات جلدية على الجمال.

Saudi translation

١.ثم ينزل ليبدأ السعي على مستوى الشارع، وطوبه حوالي ستمائة خطوة، ويسميه المؤرخون العرب **""واد الصفا""** ويؤدي الي المروة.

٢.وسكانها من قبيلة شمر القوية ،ويقال انهم قادرون على حشد سبعة الالاف بندقيه من ذوات الفتائل ، **وهم مثل جيرانهم من اهل نجد** يزرعون النخيل باستخراج الماء من الابار عن طريق سحبه في قرب جلديه بواسطه الجمال.

The Saudi translators here also opted to rewrite the geographical fact relying on their knowledge of their country and land. In the first example, Burckhardt describes the Omrah

يظهر أنه التبس الأمر على المؤلف بين الصفا وهو جبل أو جبيل، وبين شعب الصفي (المترجمان)

The author was probably confused between Al-Safa, which is a mountain or Byblos, and Shu'ab Al-Safi (my translation of the Saudi translators' Arabic comment).

Similarly, Burckhardt wrote about Jabal Shammar, describing Beni Shammar and their power. He said that they

بوركهارت يخرج جبل شمر عن نجد، وهذا تحديد جغرافي غير صحيح. (المترجمان)

Burckhardt puts Jabal Shammar outside Najd, and this is an incorrect geographical identification (my translation of the Saudi translators' Arabic comment).

Again here, the Saudi translators did not want Burckhardt to represent them, and while they interfered and rewrote the target text, the non-Saudi translator did not comment on

when he mistakenly refers to Assfa as Wadi Safa, the Saudi translators although they render it as expressed by Burckhardt they mentioned the author's mistake and added that:

resemble their neighbours in Nedjd, assuming that Jabal Shammar is not in Najd. The Saudi translators, once again, did not want Burckhardt to represent their land and commented on this:

or change these facts

6.3. Rewriting Historical and Religious Facts

In the following examples, Burckhardt describes the shops in Mecca and the residents of Mecca.

ST. Burckhardt

1. The reader will be surprised to learn, that in two shops *intoxicating liquors are publicly sold* during the night, though not in the daytime; one liquor is prepared from fermented raisins, and although usually mixed with a good deal of water, is still so strong that a few glasses of it produce intoxication.

2. Arab women expose to sale, upon small straw mats, corn and durra, which the pilgrims purchase, and throw to the pigeons. I have seen some *of the public women take this mode of exhibiting themselves,* and of bargaining with the pilgrims, under pretence of selling them corn for the sacred pigeons.

Non-Saudi translation

١.ولربما يفاجأ القارىء إذا ما علم أن **المشروبات المسكرة كانت تُباع علناً** خلال الليل في متجرين اثنين، وليس في النهار، يُحضّر الشراب من الزبيب المخمر؛ ورغم أنه عادة يمزج بكمية غير قليلة من الماء، فإنه يبقى قوياً إلى درجة أن بعض الكؤوس منه تؤدي إلى الشكر.

٢.وهنا أيضاً تعرض نساء عربيات الحنطة والذرة للبيع على حصر صغيرة من القش، يشتريها الحجاج ويرمون بها إلى الحمام. وقد رأيت بعض فتيات الهوى يتخذن هذه الطريقة**لعرض أنفسهن** ولمساومة الحجاج بحجة بيع الذرة للحمام ال بيع

الذرة للحمام المقدس.

Saudi translation

لقد حذفنا أربعة أسطر حيث لم نجد ما يؤيد ما ذكره المؤلف، وقد تبعث في نفس الوقت على الإساءة للبعض

Page 124 &113

Burckhardt describes the shops in Mecca. The Saudi translators chose not to include these passages and rejected every similar claim by Burckhardt. In a footnote, they informed readers that they deleted some lines which they deemed historically or locally inaccurate.

لقد حذفنا أربعة أسطر حيث لم نجد ما يؤيد ما ذكره المؤلف، وقد تبعث في نفس الوقت على الإساءة للبعض.

(المترجمان)

We have deleted four lines as we did not find anything to support what the author mentioned, and they may, at the same time, cause offense to some. (my translation of the Saudi translators' Arabic comment).

The Saudi translators here opted for rewriting to 'protect their own world against images that are too radically different, either by adapting them or by screening them out'[1] (p. 125). So, these lines were deleted as they were deemed to be making inappropriate claims about the behaviour of the people of Mecca, which is the most sacred place for Muslims.

The non-Saudi translator, however, translated them as Burckhardt stated, but she pointed out that these might be claims and not true by saying; يكرر المؤلف مثل هذه المزاعم, or 'the author repeats such claims' (my translation of the non-Saudi translator's Arabic comment).

6.4. Rewriting Social Facts

In this passage, Burckhardt describes the route of the Hajj for travellers coming from Baghdad.

ST. Burckhardt

1. This route is much frequented, especially by the *Ageyl Arabs* of Baghdad, of whom many are from Nedjed, which they often visit as pedlars. All the Arabian Bedouins settled in the suburbs of Baghdad are comprised under the name of *Ageyl*.

Non-Saudi translation

١.ويرتاد هذه الطريق كثيراً **عرب عجيل** خاصة من بغداد، ومن بينهم عديدون من نجد، يقومون بزيارة كتجار متجولين غالباً.

وتشمل تسمية **عجيل** كل بدو شبه الجزيرة المستوطنين في ضواحي بغداد.

Saudi translation

١.وهذا الطريق مرتاد بكثرة خاصة من قبل **عرب عقيل** في بغداد، فكثير منهم من نجد التي غالباً ما يزورونها طباعة متنقلين. وكل

بدو شبه الجزيرة المستقرون في ضواحي بغداد يجمعهم اسم **عقيل**.

Burckhardt describes the route of the Hajj from Baghdad. The author assumes that the Ageyl of Baghdad are those who came from Najd. However, the Saudi translators, using their local and historical knowledge, indicate that Burckhardt was mistaken, as the Ageyl did not live in Najd (Qassim) at that time.

<div dir="rtl">

وهم بوركهارت كما وهم كثيرون غيره بأن عقيلا الذين كانوا يتاجرون في العراق من أهل القصيم كانوا ينحدرون من قبيلة عقيل القديمة، والواقع أنهم حضر مستقرون يعودون في أصولهم القديمة إلى قبائل مختلفة لكن من المستبعد أن تكون قبيلة عقيل من بينها لأنها لم تكن تقيم في منطقة القصيم (المترجمان)

</div>

Burckhardt, like many others, believed that the Aqils who were trading in Iraq from the people of Qassim were descended from the ancient Aqil tribe. In fact, they were settled people who traced their ancient origins back to different tribes, but it is unlikely that the Aqil tribe was among them because they did not reside in the Qassim region (my translation of the Saudi translators' Arabic comment). However, the non-Saudi translator rendered it the same and spelt the word *Ageyl* as عجيل instead of عقيل and did not comment on the accuracy of the information.

7. Discussion

The translation of 'Oriental' literature often involves appropriating, simplifying, reducing and rewriting it to fit into the target culture/language. The Saudi translators and historians here make their voices heard by sometimes rewriting the text itself rather than solely relying on the paratextual elements to elaborate things for the targeted reader. This shows that they act instead of just stating their opinions. In fact, by doing so, they rejected the Orientalist representation of their land and history. Üstunsoz[20] argues that 'the depiction of former colonial and current post-colonial cultures has been shaped by the ideological perspectives of Western writers for Western audiences. This misrepresentation is not limited to post-colonial cultures; it also occurs in non-colonised countries'[20] (p. 103).

The Orients 'were rarely seen or looked at; they were seen through, analysed not as citizens, or even people, but as problems to be solved or confined'[19] (p. 207). 'Orientals or Arabs are thereafter shown to be gullible, "devoid of energy and initiative" much given to "fulsome flattery", intrigue, cunning, and unkindness to animals [...] Orientals are inveterate liars, they are "lethargic and suspicious", and in everything oppose the clarity, directness, and mobility of the Anglo-Saxon race'[19] (pp. 38–39). On the other hand, Westerners, see themselves as, 'rational, peaceful, liberal, logical, capable of holding real values, without natural suspicion; [while the Orientals] are none of these things.'[19] (p. 49).

Therefore, the two Saudi translators/historians here have opted to re-represent themselves and correct any misconcep-

tions about their people and land. This re-representation emphasises the role of Saudi translators in shaping their identity and nationality. These findings are in line with Alharthi's study[13], which only examines the paratextual elements of the translation. The analysis here reveals that Saudi translators play a vital role in reshaping the image of Saudi Arabia through their translations by critically examining and interfering and rewriting (not only commenting on) Orientalists' assumptions and narratives about their people and land. Drawing on their deep knowledge of Saudi history, these translators meticulously compare historical sources and assess Orientalist assumptions to pinpoint and challenge misrepresentations of Saudi Arabia. They relied on various techniques such as rewriting the text, offering comments or corrections to the information presented by Burckhardt, or even omitting information that did not align with their beliefs. According to Fawcett[21], 'throughout the centuries, individuals and institutions applied their particular beliefs to the production of certain effect in translation.'[21] (pp. 106–107).

This demonstrates Lefevere's[1] view of translation as rewriting, which reflects the translator's ideological stance. In his explanation, Lefevere[1] (p. 44) mentioned that most translators of 'Lysistrata' over the past century and a half have felt the need to declare their own ideology due to the radical nature of Aristophanic comedy, which attacks certain ideologies and defends others. One of the translators stated in his introduction that, 'The Lysistrata bears such an evil character that we must make only passing mention of it.' In his translation, he simply omits the most essential part of the play. Moreover, he abruptly halts his translation at line 827 of the original text and declines to translate lines 828 to 1215, which account for a quarter of the play. The decision, according to Lefevere[1] (p. 44), was not due to a sudden lack of Greek language proficiency, but rather because his personal beliefs did not align with those expressed in the Greek text by Aristophanes.

For Hatim and Mason[22] ideology involves 'the tacit assumptions, beliefs, and value systems which are shared collectively by social group'. They further define *mediation* as 'the extent to which translators intervene in transfer process, feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into processing

the text' as cited in Hatim and Munday [23] (pp. 102–103). Accordingly, it can be inferred that ideology and translation are intertwined. Therefore, in most cases, the Saudi translators used the same rewriting techniques to modify the text to align it with their ideology and ensure its accuracy, so they omit, rewrite or comment on what they believe was wrong. Moreover, they also alter some geographical facts and, most notably, facts concerning Arab tribes and social structure; this confirms the fact that 'one cannot understand today's Saudi Arabia without appreciating the tribal society and Islamic roots that form the kingdom's core' [24] (p. 10). To one who knows their culture, these things and events are also signs signifying the cultural forms or models of which they are material representations. This is never more evident than in translation, where choices must be made at each stage regarding when to add more information and explanation and how much to deviate from the source. It is therefore absurd to translate without comprehending the text, and it is impossible to comprehend the text without comprehending its culture [25] (pp. 44–45). The examples mentioned above were just a few out of many. In many other instances, the Saudi translators indicated the omission of certain lines, such as on page 353 and others, for the same reasons mentioned earlier. In fact, power and ideology are two important aspects that have affected Saudi translation initiatives in the Kingdom itself. The Saudi school of translation focuses on the ideas of upholding Saudi national, cultural and religious values, making these norms and practices evident in the translation process and tactics employed from English to Arabic and vice versa [26].

8. Conclusions

This study examines the process of rewriting through the lens of translation studies. It compares the translation of Burckhardt's *Travels in Arabia* (1829) into Arabic by two Saudi translators with another Arabic version translated by a non-Saudi translator. It focuses on the rewriting techniques used by the Saudi translators to challenge Burckhardt's representation of their lands and people. The analysis supports Lefevere's view of translation as rewriting and demonstrates that translation and rewriting are closely related, showing that ideology influences the techniques employed by translators. The Saudi translators often rewrote parts that don't align

with their ideologies, sometimes omitting or altering content. This demonstrates their influence in shaping the historical narrative. In contrast, the non-Saudi translator prioritised fidelity, as the text did not conflict with her ideology.

It is crucial to emphasise, however, that this study's scope is intentionally limited and should not be used to draw broad generalisations about the field of Orientalism or translation studies as a whole. The research focuses solely on the translation of a single book authored by one Orientalist scholar, serving as a case study within the vast landscape of Orientalist literature and its translations.

This narrow focus allows for an in-depth analysis of the specific translation techniques, challenges, and potential biases present in this particular work. However, it also highlights the need for caution when interpreting the results. The findings, while valuable, represent only a small piece of a much larger puzzle in understanding the complex relationship between Orientalist writings and their translations. Thus, more research is needed in a few crucial areas to have a more thorough grasp of the topic:

1. Comparative studies: Examining several Orientalist translations to find trends and differences in translation methodologies.
2. Temporal considerations: Analysing how Orientalist writings have been translated over time, taking into account shifting scholarly viewpoints and societal attitudes.
3. Translator backgrounds: Examining how translators' intellectual, linguistic and cultural backgrounds affect how they understand and translate Orientalist literature.
4. Reception studies: Investigating how various cultural settings, both in the West and in the areas they represent, affect the reception and interpretation of translated Orientalist works.

In conclusion, while this study offers valuable insights into the translation of a specific Orientalist text, it should be viewed as a starting point for further research rather than a definitive statement on the subject. The complex nature of Orientalism and its translations necessitates a broader, more diverse range of studies to develop a comprehensive understanding of this multifaceted field.

Funding

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

The data used in this study was obtained from three sources. the first one is the original source content of Burckhardt's *Travels in Arabia* (1829), reference number 16. The other two, reference numbers 17 and 18, are the translated (hard copy) copies of the original book.

Acknowledgements

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Lefevere, A., 1992a. Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame. Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA.

[2] Al-Jaseer, H., 1990. In: Bern, J. (Eds.). Iktishāf Jazīrat Al Arab [Exploring the Arabian Peninsula]. (Q. Qal'ajī, Trans.). Dār Al Kātib Al 'Arabī: Beirut, Lebanon. pp. 5–16.

[3] Simpson, M., 1989. Orientalist Travelers. Aramco World. 40(4), 16–8.

[4] Akbar, J., Mengal, S., Sarparah, J.M., 2020. Occidental Approach in the Historiography of Orientalists. Journal of Development and Social Sciences. 1(4), 27–32. DOI: http://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2020(1-IV)3

[5] Hermans, T., 2004. Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained.

[6] Gentzler, E., 2004. Contemporary Translation Theories. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press: Shanghai, China.

[7] Lefevere, A., 1985. Why Waste our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm. In: Hermans, T., (Ed.). The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation. Croom Helm: London, UK. pp. 215–243.

[8] Lefevere, A., 1989. The Dynamics of the System. Convention and Innovation in Literary History. In: D'haen, T., Grübel, R., Lethen, H. (Eds.). Convention and Innovation in Literature. John Benjamins: London, UK. pp. 37–56.

[9] Kıran, A., 2020. A Conceptual Discussion of Rewriting as a Tool for the Translation(al) Turn. Current Research in Social Sciences. 6(2), 83–91. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30613/curesosc.630543

[10] Kuzderová, H., Bednárová-Gibová, K., 2021. The Impact of Ideologies on the Translator's Work: A Conceptual Reflection and Application. Hermēneus. Revista de Traducción e Interpretación. 23, 31–67. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24197/her.23.2021.31-67

[11] Lefevere, A., (Ed.), 1992b. Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook. Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA.

[12] Al-Harahsheh, A.M., Al-Omari, M., 2019. Self-Translation: A Faithful Rendition or a Rewriting Process? Heikal's Autumn of Fury as an Example. 3L the Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies. 25(1), 144–157. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17576/3l-2019-2501-11

[13] Alharthi, D.H., 2020. Re-representing the Self: Saudi Translators' Doxic Peritextual Practice of Deconstructing Orientalists' Writings about Arabia. Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies. 4(4) 114–130. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol4no4.9

[14] Mauro, V., 2022. Translation as Rewriting in the Rendering of Classical Chinese Poetry: Pound's Cathay. TRANS-KATA Journal of Language Literature Culture and Education. 2(2), 109–118. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54923/transkata.v2i2.82

[15] AlOboudi, S.M., 2015. Najd, the Heart of Arabia. Arab Studies Quarterly. 37(3), 282–299. DOI: https://doi.org/10.13169/arabstudquar.37.3.0282

[16] Burckhardt, J.L., 1829. Travels in Arabia: Comprehending an Account of those Territories in Hedjaz which the Mohammedans Regard as Sacred. African Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Interior Parts of Africa: London, UK. Available from: https://www.loc.gov/item/2021666964/ (cited 24 March 2024).

[17] Burckhardt, J.L., 1992. Travels in Arabia (Alhalabi, A., & Alshaikh, A. Trans (1992) في شبة جزيرة العرب رحلات). Arresalah. (Original published 1829).

[18] Burckhardt, J.L., 1992. Travels in Arabia (Hutaf A. Trans (2005) العربية رحلات الى شبة الجزيرة). Alentishar. (Original published 1829).

[19] Said, E.W., 2003. Orientalism. Penguin Classics. Penguin: London, UK.

[20] Üstünsöz İ., 2010. The Notion of 'Translation as Rewriting' and its Implications for the Post-Colonial Approach to Translation. IU Journal of Translation Studies. 1(1),

89–106.

[21] Fawcett, P., 1998. Ideology and Translation. In: Baker, M. (Ed.). Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 106–111.

[22] Hatim, B., Mason, I., 2005. The Translator as Communicator. Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA.

[23] Hatim, B., Munday, J., 2004. Translation: An Advanced Resource Book. Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA.

[24] Wynbrandt, J., 2004. A Brief History of Saudi Arabia. Facts On File: New York, NY, USA.

[25] Awadalbari, M.M.A., 2016. The Role and Effect of Culture on The Translator's Performance. International Journal of Thesis Projects and Dissertations (IJTPD). 4(3), 43–52. July–September. Available from: www.researchpublish.com

[26] Mahasneh, A.A., Alshammari, E.M.A., 2024. Representations of Saudi Culture in the Translated Narratives of Abd al-Rahman Munif's 'Annihayat'-"Endings". Jordan Journal of Modern Languages & Literature. 16(3), 725–744. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47012/jjmll.16.3.9