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The idea behind this research is motivated primarily by pronouncements made by (co)producers of English translations of modern Arabic fiction concerning the untranslatability of 'Arabic' and its status as a 'controversial' language, which presents a 'hurdle' in the way of the cultural and literary transfer of modern Arabic works of fiction to English. Is it the Arabic language alone that conditions or circumscribes the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English, or are there other socio-cultural and historico-political factors that influence the volume of such activity? In an attempt to answer questions such as the above and to understand and evaluate the extent to which such polemic comments are true, this thesis traces the socio-historical trajectory of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation throughout its phases of development. It sets out to identify and investigate the determinants that condition or circumscribe the translation activity in this field of cultural production. Drawing on Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of social practice and its heuristic concepts, to include field, capital, homology and (dis)position, the English translation activity of modern Arabic fiction is examined as a socially constructed and constructing practice and the related individuals and institutions are investigated as socially regulated and regulating agents. To guide the analysis of this thesis, English translations of modern Arabic fiction, published between 1908 and 2014, are compiled and analysed both statistically and sociologically. They are combined with historical and archival materials, including several exchanges between various translatorial agents that have not been previously examined. In the process of mapping out the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, the thesis redraws the boundaries of the field and suggests alternative dates to, as well as a different structure from, the phases identified by Altoma (2005). It also investigates several socio-cultural and historico-political factors that are not mentioned in Khalifa and Elgindy (2014) or other related studies.

The retraductions of Naguib Mahfouz’s most controversial novel, ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā, are thoroughly examined as a case study in order to provide further insights into how socio-cultural and historico-political forces function in concert within the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. Particular focus is given to how these forces impact the field and its activities—fostering or subverting its outlook—and how they mediate the relationships between its agents and other intersecting fields. Through an in-depth analysis of paratextual elements, the thesis illuminates how (re)translations can be used as a tool to claim distinction in the field of translation and exposes the struggle between its agents.

The findings have implications for the fields of translation studies in general, and modern Arabic literature/fiction translation and its publishing trends in particular. They demonstrate that a progression in the production and publishing of translations has taken place since 1908. This is in opposition to the prevailing belief that the flow of English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction has been primarily hindered by the Arabic language. However, there have been fluctuations in the velocity and volume of the translation flow. These fluctuations correspond to various internal and external socio-cultural and historico-political forces that affected the translation production and consumption and, consequently, the structure of the field and its agents’ practices. The evidence presented suggests that, instead of focusing on the literary value of a work, several modern Arabic works of fiction were translated because of their sociological/anthropological significance. This mediated and framed, to a great extent, the way the Arab world was perceived by and promoted in the Anglophone world. Given this finding, translations of modern Arabic fiction should always be perceived within, and not in isolation from, the larger context of their production, circulation and reception, especially in the case of English translations.
A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

For the transliteration of Arabic, this study adopts a modified version of The International Journal of Middle East Studies system. For Arabic personal names, names of places and publishers, I have adopted the commonly used English forms. Transliterated names and titles were kept as found in their original source. For everything else, the symbols used to transliterate Arabic sounds are as follows:

### Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ّ</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>ẓ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>ʿ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j/g</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>w/ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>ي</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>ال</td>
<td>al-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d̲</td>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ah/t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vowels

Short vowels: a, i, u.

Doubled vowel: iyy (in final position).

Long vowels: ā, ī, ū.

Diphthongs: aw, ay.

A NOTE ON CITATIONS

All citations labelled ‘HEB’ are from Heinemann’s archives in the University of Reading Special Collections. All citations labelled ‘3CP’ are from Three Continents Press’s archives in the Harry Ransom Centre Collections, University of Texas at Austin.
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CHAPTER ONE: RESEARCH CONTEXT AND QUESTIONS

1.1. Initial remarks

English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction remain largely unexplored from a sociological perspective. Research on the translations of modern Arabic fiction into English has focused primarily on the linguistic and cultural aspects of translation. However, the network of socio-cultural and historico-political factors that may have conditioned the production, circulation and reception of these translations, as well as agents’ practices and their social (dis)positions, appear to have been largely under-researched within scholarly discourse.

This idea behind this research is motivated primarily by two popular yet contentious pronouncements. The first statement is that of the British novelist John Fowles (1978, viii), who, in his introduction to the English translation of Naguib Mahfouz’s novel *Miramar*, refers to the Arabic language as an ‘obvious hurdle’ in the case of cultural and literary transfer from Arabic into English. He blames this ‘linguistic iron curtain’ for the long delay in releasing Mahfouz’s works of fiction in English translation and for keeping much of modern Arabic literary writing away from the Anglophone world (Fowles, 1978, viii). The second statement is the comment Edward Said received from a mainstream New York Publisher in 1980 in response to his query as to why his suggestion of publishing some modern Arabic works of fiction in English translation, particularly those of the Egyptian writer Naguib Mahfouz, was turned down: ‘Arabic is a controversial language’, he was told (Said, 1989, xi).

Investigations into English translations of modern Arabic fiction indicate that they enjoyed a different status, represented by the rise in the number of reprints and translations, after Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize in 1988 and such geo-political events as 9/11 and its aftermath. What was it that made ‘Arabic’ less of a ‘hurdle’ for translators and editors, and less ‘controversial’ for publishers in 1988 and of such great interest to the Anglophone world after 2001? Has

---

1 Naguib Mahfouz is the Arab world’s most famous writer, being the only Arab to have ever won the Nobel Prize in Literature.

2 Although this study takes the remark made to Edward Said as its starting point, it does not investigate English translations of modern Arabic fiction through the lens of a postcolonial paradigm but instead investigates them through the lens of the sociological approaches to translation. That lens is justified based on the evidence that examining translations from a sociological viewpoint helps to transcend the ‘neglect of the sociopolitical background’ in postcolonial paradigms, as Shamma (2009, p.191) argues. However, as there is a great deal of overlap between the two approaches (i.e. postcolonial and sociological approaches to translation), in certain cases where incidents that could be described as postcolonial in nature cannot be discarded as irrelevant to the field’s socio-cultural characteristics, these will be discussed from a sociological viewpoint.
it always been the Arabic language alone that conditions or circumscribes the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English, or are there other socio-cultural and historico-political factors that perhaps contribute to influencing the volume of such activity? Questions like these drove my curiosity to map out the socio-historical trajectory of translating modern Arabic fiction into English in an attempt to understand and evaluate the extent to which such polemic comments presented above held true, both when they were first made and now.

Against this background, this thesis explores the English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction as a historically constructed, ‘socially regulated activity’ (Hermans, 1997, p.10). The sociological perspective on translation adopted by this study required investigating different sociological approaches to translation (for a critical account of these approaches, see chapter two). However, Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of social practice was selected to guide the analysis of this study because of its ability to provide valuable socio-cultural insights into the dynamics and historico-political conditions of translation production and the multiple discursive practices arising at every stage of the translation process (for an in-depth analysis of Bourdieu’s sociology, see chapter three). The core concepts of Bourdieu’s sociological model—or his ‘thinking tools’, as he refers to them—are used in this thesis to aid in the development of a methodology for analysing and interpreting the diverse range of practices in a field of cultural activity that could be called ‘modern Arabic fiction in English translation’. That is, this thesis aims to identify and investigate the socio-cultural and geo-political determinants that inform the translation activity in this field of cultural production. To that end, it examines the act of translation of modern Arabic fiction into English as a social practice and the (co)producers of translations as social agents. It also explores and analyses the dynamics of the field as well as its characteristics and investigates the mechanisms of practice underlying its translation and agents’ activities, primarily through examining the English (re)translations of Naguib Mahfouz’s أُولَدَ هَارَتْنا [‘Awlād Ḥāratinā] (‘Children of Our Alley’) as a case study.

This chapter presents the main research questions that guide this study and provides an overview of the structure of the thesis. It also presents an overview of the data that inform, and research tools that are used in, the analysis of this thesis. Prior to that, a brief discussion of the background and definition of modern Arabic fiction in English translation is in order both to focus the scope of the study and to guide its analysis.
1.2 Framing the key terminology: Modern Arabic fiction in English translation

The descriptor “modern Arabic fiction in English translation” is not as self-explanatory as it may first appear, particularly when used in reference to diverse works that may not have been originally written in Arabic, that were written prior to the “modern” epoch or that ignore certain genres by reducing fiction to one of its sub-genres. The four terms in the expression (“modern”, “Arabic”, “fiction” and “in English translation”) will be deconstructed and then reconstructed below by means of proposing a definition that outlines the scope of this study.

In defining the term “modern”, a brief introduction to the history of Arabic literature is necessary. It is indubitable that Arabic literature has a long and continuous literary history spanning some sixteen centuries (Gibb, 1962, p.246; see also Hussein, 1958, pp.11–12). The Arabic literary tradition also has numerous forebears and has always had narrative literature of some sort. Prior to the twentieth century, it contained a rich assortment of prose forms ranging from maqāmah (assembly), sīrah (biography), ḥadīth (report/tradition) and khabar (sketch) to ḥikayah (tale), khurāfa (myth), ’ustūrah (legend), nādirah (anecdote) and qiṣṣah (story) (Said, 1974, xiii; for detailed definitions of each of these forms, see Abdel-Meguid, 1956, pp.11–27). The most famous example of the Arabic narrative tradition in the West is, for instance, the Arabian Nights.

Although forms of modern Arabic fiction are rooted in classical Arabic literature, there is a relatively general consensus among scholars that these forms have drawn most of their inspiration, at least in terms of structure and thematic function, from Western literary traditions (on this point, see, for example, Haywood, 1971, p.15; Allen, 1982, pp.15–18). The Arab encounter with Europe following the French invasion of Egypt in 1789 introduced new literary genres to Arabic literature that were rather unfamiliar, primarily drama and fiction (this period is commonly known as nahdah, see for instance Selim, 2004, passim). The year 1789 is generally assumed to mark the transformation of Arabic literature to its modern state (see, for example, Badawi, 1992, p.2; Starkey, 2006, iv; Tresilian, 2008, p.45). Eager to explore new literary writing genres, bridge the gap between the classical and the modern, and raise the standard of literary taste in the region, Arab writers began to experiment with

---

3 A pertinent example is the International Prize for Arabic Fiction (IPAF), which is rewarded only to novels and not other fiction sub-genres such as short stories and novellas.

4 Translation: awakening or renaissance.
these new European literary models in their writings (for an in-depth account of the
development of fiction genres in Arabic, see, for example, Moosa, 1997, passim).

The word “Arabic” in “modern Arabic fiction in English translation” is no less problematic
than the word “modern”. One might think that Arabic fiction surely refers to prose
works written in Arabic; however, this is not straightforward and two points are worth
noting. The first is that although all Arab countries now use modern standard Arabic (MSA)
as their official language, each country speaks a different form of Arabic; that is, a specific
vernacular. In recent years, some Arab writers have written in their local dialects. This is in
addition to the Arabic oral literary tradition, which began centuries ago across the Arabian
Peninsula and continues to exist on a smaller scale than in the past (for an account on the
oral tradition in the Arab world, see, for instance, Toprak, 2008, passim). For this study,
works of fiction written in MSA or in any Arabic vernacular are considered as part of the
Arabic literary tradition and are included in the analysis.

The second point is that there has recently been a growing number of Arab writers,
predominantly from previously colonised countries, who are writing in European languages
(mainly French and English) either as a symbolic act of violence with political significance or
as a way to seek wider circulation and visibility in the international literary market. Because
the names of these diaspora writers, as they are often called (see, for example, Naguib,
2011, p.11), are unmistakeably Arabic, there is a tendency to attribute their works to the
modern Arabic literary canon. Whether or not this is true is not the concern of the present
study and these writers are excluded from this analysis, even though it is an important
phenomenon that deserves to be studied separately. Similarly, while translated Arabic oral
literatures, i.e. folktales, into English are an integral and traditional part of the Arabic literary
canon, they have been excluded from this study for the following reasons. Besides the fact
that they merit a study all to themselves, they are usually recorded on tapes and, generally
speaking, these recordings are unavailable (on this point, see, for instance, Altoma, 2012,
passim). In this study, “Arabic fiction” refers solely to the fictional output originally written\(^5\)
in MSA or in any Arabic vernacular.

\(^5\)This study and compiled bibliography exclude English translations of Arabic children literary texts, except
in the few cases where their discussion is relevant to the activities of the field of modern Arabic fiction in
English translation. Examples discussed in this study are, however, excluded from all statistical analyses.
A similar clarification is required for the word “fiction”. Fiction is a literary genre that is, arguably, defined differently in each world literary tradition. Cuddon (2013, p.279) defines fiction as:

A vague and general term for an imaginative work, usually in prose. (...) Fiction is now used in general of [sic] the novel, the short story, the novella (...) and related genres.

The Arabs’ encounter with European fiction and writers came with Europe’s colonial presence in the Arab world and the translation movement that followed. They started to experiment with European literary models, adopting them and applying them to topics that were almost always informed by Arab culture, while invoking certain traditional Arabic prose forms. The outcome was the emergence of modern Arabic fiction, a genre that bears a resemblance and owes much to the European model but differs from it in many respects. There is relative agreement among scholars that the modern Arabic fiction tradition emerged in the late nineteenth century (Jayyusi, 2005, p.11) and developed into a mature genre and superseded poetry as the most dominant literary form in the Arab world during the early twentieth century (see Allen, 2003, p.1; Said, 1975, p.81).

The last term, “in English translation”, is self-explanatory. The study focuses on works translated into the English language, irrespective of the dialect of English, nationality of the translator or place of publication, which may be outside the Anglophone world.

For the purpose of this study, modern Arabic fiction in English translation can thus be defined as the narrative prose from the modern Arab world, works primarily written from the end of the nineteenth century to the present in Arabic, translated into English and published in book form. The scope and content of this study are guided by this definition.

1.3 Research questions

Drawing on Pierre Bourdieu’s sociology, this thesis will be steered throughout by the following central research question:

*What are the socio-cultural and historico-political determinants governing the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English, and how have the various translation processes been influenced by such forces?*

This strategic research question can be broken down into three context-specific procedural sub-questions as follows:
1- What are the implications of the sociological turn for translation studies? What are the main sociological approaches to translation, and which of them can best guide the analysis of this study?

Answering these questions is the concern of chapters two and three of this thesis. Chapter two, on the one hand, traces the shift in the field of translation studies towards conceptualising translations as a social phenomenon and the individuals or institutions involved in producing them as social agents. The chapter also discusses the implications of this ‘social turn’ in translation studies and the various research strands available within the framework of the sociology of translation. In addition, it offers a critical account of the most influential sociological theories used in the field of translation (Inghilleri, 2009, p.280), based on their chronological introduction to it. These are Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of social practice, Niklas Luhmann’s social systems theory and Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory. Chapter two concludes by arguing that Bourdieu’s sociology holds greater potential than the other sociological frameworks—despite the advantages and disadvantages of each, which will be discussed in chapter two—for guiding the examination of the socio-cultural components of translation activities in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, which have hitherto largely been under-researched.

Chapter three, on the other hand, critically discusses Bourdieu’s theory of social practice and explores its core notions. It starts by outlining the foundation of Bourdieu’s sociology and exploring the development of his theory to address the gap left by the sociological paradigms that enjoyed great popularity in post-war France. It then examines how Bourdieu’s work filtered through to the field of translation, investigates the validity of his theory’s application to translation studies generally and to the study of modern Arabic fiction in English translation specifically. It also evaluates the different critiques pertinent to the theory and presents counterarguments to those criticisms. I argue that the relational nature of Bourdieu’s theory and the dynamic quality of its concepts make it capable of enhancing our understanding of the structure of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, the practices and (dis)positions of agents operating in it and how they interact with one another, and the socio-cultural and historico-political forces that have influenced its activities.
Motivated by this question, chapters four and five of this study trace the socio-historical trajectory and structure of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. By so doing, the chapters aim to identify and investigate the various factors that have conditioned the formation and transformation of the field under study, and to examine its characteristics, the interactions between its agents and the types of capital they strive to accumulate. Moreover, the chapters trace and outline the diachronic mechanisms that occurred in the field and that helped—or possibly conspired—to shape it. This will help to provide a deeper insight into what is happening in the field synchronously during the data analysis.

In his chronological bibliography of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, Altoma (2005) argues that there are three identifiable phases within the history of translating modern Arabic fiction into English: the initial phase, the expansion phase and the post-Nobel phase. Informed by a bibliography of English translations of modern Arabic fiction from 1908 to 2014 which I have compiled, and building on Khalifa and Elgindy’s (2014, passim) study, chapters four and five challenge and reconstruct this argument, proposing alternative dates for the processes of development identified by Altoma and providing a thorough Bourdieusian analysis of the dynamics of translation in the phases he suggested. The chapters also argue for the recognition of a fourth phase—which could be referred to as the post-9/11 phase—and investigate its agents and dynamics. That is to say, in contrast to a linear understanding of the history of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, these chapters draw on Bourdieu’s heuristic concepts to describe and interpret the complexity of the translation activity within it. They also identify the different changing modes of production and reception taking place in this field of cultural production, examine the dominant discursive practices of the agents operating therein and demonstrate the dynamics of translation production taking place within it too.

Guided by a variety of examples, these chapters culminate by critically discussing the various positions available in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation from 1908 to 2014. Since the field is subject to both internal and external factors—including geo-political and socio-cultural events—that form, condition and transform its structure and dynamics,
chapters four and five attempt to provide insights into overlooked aspects of the four distinct, though overlapping, phases identified above, insofar as they have affected the field’s structure, the capital at stake, the agents involved, the modes of production used and the amount of activity within the field.

3- What can the retranslation of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḫāratinā reveal about the socio-cultural dynamics of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and the mechanisms by which agents operating within it interact with each other?

Moving from the general field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, this question, the basis of chapter six, narrows the focus of the thesis to a more specific object of inquiry: the (re)translations of Naguib Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḫāratinā into English. Through this case study, the chapter aims to investigate how the socio-cultural and historico-political forces identified in chapters four and five operate in concert in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, how they affect the field and its activities, fostering or subverting its outlook, and how they mediate the relationships between its agents and other intersecting fields. Unravelling the complexity of agents’ practices and their interactions in such a dynamic field as modern Arabic fiction in English translation is only possible when examined through the lens of a case study and not in reference to the whole field. I argue that examining the (re)translations of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḫāratinā into English as a socially regulated and regulating phenomenon will facilitate a better understanding of how and why the larger field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation functions as it does. That is, attempting to explain the significant shift in the modes of production, circulation and consumption of Mahfouz’s (re)translations into English will aid in interpreting how forces existing in the field operate, as well as the dynamics and agents’ logic of practice in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a whole.

There are two translations of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḫāratinā into English. Philip Stewart first rendered it in 1981 as Children of Gabalawi; his revised augmented edition of 1995 and extended revised augmented edition of 1997 were entitled Children of Gabalagwi. Peter Theroux’s translation appeared in 1996 as Children of the Alley. The chapter critically examines the existence of such phenomenon as the retranslation of some Arabic works of fiction into English and non-translation of others. It also discusses the traditional views on the retranslation hypothesis and provides an alternative understanding of and perspective on the study of retranslation, based on Bourdieu’s sociology, especially in relation to the
retranslations of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā into English. In other words, it explores the traditional hermeneutic and logocentric views on the ‘ageing’ of translations against the recent scholarship that posits retranslation as a relational and sociological phenomenon. Through a thorough analysis of the paratextual elements of the available (re)translations and editions of ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā into English, the chapter aims to investigate how the various socio-cultural determinants that conditioned their production and consumption operate. It also aims to question the motivations behind the investment in this particular work of fiction for retranslation at specific times and to examine if these motivations match with, and respond to, any socio-cultural, political or ideological contingencies in the larger field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

Finally, the conclusion of this thesis, which appears in chapter seven, revisits the research questions, highlights any limitations of this thesis, discusses its findings and contributions and maps out a number of possible directions for future research paths.

1.4 Research tools, data and rationale

Given the socio-analytical nature of this thesis, its analysis prioritises the socio-cultural and historico-political contexts governing the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English, rather than textual or linguistic contexts. The thesis relies on multiple sources, employs various data-collection techniques and uses both qualitative and quantitative approaches in a complementary manner. The resources utilised include media resources such as videos, newspapers and periodicals, and, specifically, existing interviews with, and exchanges between, publishers, translators, editors and other co-producers of translations. This is in addition to critical reviews and commentaries on the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, its agents, its products and their reception. It also includes bibliographical data that I have collected and analysed both statistically and from a sociological viewpoint to provide information on translation flows and the socio-historical trajectory of translation production and consumption in the field. Finally, this thesis consults historical and archival sources and makes use of a case study.

Although interviews would have been useful to substantiate the findings of this study, all efforts to interview translators and publishers have been unsuccessful. However, the thesis has benefited from a large number of already existing interviews with these agents. In addition, given that this thesis covers a period of more than 100 years (from 1908 to 2014), historical and archival data on the history of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English
translation, and on the modes of production and reception available in it, are of paramount importance to this study. Therefore, a number of archival sources containing exchanges between producers and co-producers of English translations of modern Arabic fiction have been consulted and analysed.

In addition to a number of online databases, I was able to access—either by myself or via proxy researchers—several archival and historical sources in the Arab world, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Notable among these are the University of Reading Special Collections, where the archives of Heinemann Educational Books are located; the Harry Ransom Centre of the University of Texas at Austin, where the archives of Three Continents Press are situated; and the Egyptian National Library and Archives, where many of the books and newspapers in which the original Arabic works of fiction were first published. It is noteworthy that consulting these archives has been very time-consuming, as they are largely uncatalogued, in a highly disorganised state and/or follow inconsistent cataloguing techniques, with files and papers, etc. randomly placed into boxes and folders.

In the absence of a complete and systematic collection of data or statistical analysis of English translations of modern Arabic fiction, the importance of having an up-to-date bibliography became apparent. Such data is essential to examining the socio-historical trajectory of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. It is also an essential component in sketching out the geo-politics of translation flows and assessing the publishing trends and tendencies in this field of cultural production. That is to say, due to the lack of up-to-date bibliographical and statistical information about what has (and has not) been translated from modern Arabic fiction into English, as well as when, where and by whom, and in order to map out the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English as accurately as possible, I resorted to compiling my own bibliography. This proved to be a long and arduous process.

In compiling this bibliography, I have consulted a number of sources, both online and in print. All existing bibliographies, though useful, are outdated, incomplete or confine themselves to translations published in certain countries and/or to translations of works of fiction from particular Arab countries. Notable amongst the sources consulted in print are Allen’s (1969) “A List of Works of Modern Arabic Literature Translated into English”, Le Gassick’s (1971) “Literature in Translation – Modern Arabic”, which includes a critical bibliography of modern Arabic fiction in translation (pp.28–32), Alwan’s (1972) “A
In addition, there are the catalogues of major publishers and libraries, as well as online sources, such as WorldCat, Copac, The Index Translationum, The British National Bibliography, MLA International Bibliography, Juma Al-Majid Centre Library, the Arab British Centre Library, Three Percent Translation Database, the Roger Allen Bibliography and the AUC’s Nagib Mahfuz [sic]: Selected Bibliography.

Every effort has been made to physically consult all translations listed in the compiled bibliography. This was facilitated by visits to the Egyptian National Library and Archives in Cairo, various university libraries in Egypt and the interlibrary loan system in the UK. When translations were not available in these places, I located the nearest library in Europe that held them through WorldCat and attempted to consult these translations. In cases where translations were not available through any of those means, I resorted to buying the available ones from online sources. As for the translations that I could not physically consult because of their unavailability, their being out of print or due to lack of financial resources, I crosschecked and relied on the information available in the above bibliographies and WorldCat as well as other sources.

In arranging the bibliography, I followed Altoma’s (2005) example and organised the entries chronologically since this appeared to be the most practical approach to guiding the analysis of this study. Dates given are of first publication. Entries without an asterisk are translations of novels and novellas, those marked with one asterisk are of short story collections and anthologies, and those with two asterisks are of reprinted translations. All reprints are excluded from this study’s statistical analysis. Although this bibliography attempted to be as comprehensive as possible, and is arguably the most exhaustive bibliography available of modern Arabic fiction works in English translation published in book format from 1908 to 2014, it has a number of limitations. It does not, for instance, include children’s literature translations or translations from the oral tradition. It also lists translations published in book format only. Hence, translations published online or in literary periodicals or magazines, etc., are generally excluded—except in the case of Naguib Mahfouz. Translations of all Arab authors’ works of fiction written into English and published in mediums other than book
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6 As many of the early translations of modern Arabic fiction into English are currently out of print and their publishing houses are long defunct, several of these translations, if at all available, were very expensive to obtain.

7 For the purpose of this study, theses and dissertations that comprise English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction are included (and clearly marked) in the compiled bibliography and in all statistical analyses presented in this thesis.
form are far too many to be listed in full in one volume. Moreover, they are not readily accessible, with the exception of translations published online. As this thesis takes the (re)translations of Mahfouz’s fiction works, especially those of his novel ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā, as its case study, it made sense to list all available English translations of his fiction works published in any medium and not just in book form. It is argued that Mahfouz’s itinerary in the Anglophone world would help elucidate the way in which socio-cultural and geo-political forces function in conjunction within the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. It would also reveal how they intermediate interactions between its agents and other interrelated fields.⁸

Although the primary data that inform the theoretical arguments of this study draw mainly, though not entirely, on English translations of modern Arabic fiction, the thesis also makes use of a case study: the (re)translations of Naguib Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā. Mahfouz has been selected because he occupies a dominant and remarkable position in the field of modern Arabic literature in general, and modern Arabic fiction in particular. Sometimes referred to as the ‘Shakespeare of the Arabs’ (Ajami, 2014, p.216), Mahfouz is the only Arab to have won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1988. He is celebrated as ‘the most important Arabic fiction writer’ of the twentieth century (El-Enany, 1993, i), and a man whose works represent ‘a breakthrough in [the] modern Arabic fiction’ tradition (Allen, 2006). Moreover, Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize not only increased interest in the English translations of his works but also in the works of other Arab fiction writers. As the compiled bibliography and its statistical analysis indicate, Mahfouz is the most widely translated into English among the writers of the Arab world and is, therefore, arguably one of the main gatekeepers of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

Written against the backdrop of many prodigious socio-cultural changes and intense political and ideological ferment in the Arab world, and being one of the very few allegorical works of fiction written in Arabic, ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā has received a significant critical reception. It was praised in the 1988 Nobel Prize in Literature award ceremony speech as one of the milestones of modern Arabic literature. The socio-cultural and historico-political factors surrounding the (re)translation process(es) of the novel into English and the existence of a number of different editions demonstrate that it is not a static text but a

⁸ The names of Mahfouz’s short stories and novel/novella excerpts published in literary periodicals, anthologies, etc. are enclosed within single quotation marks in the appended bibliography of his fiction in English translation.
dynamic one. It transforms on the basis of the tensions and in response to the forces both within the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and its intersecting fields. Therefore, I argue that the translations of ʿAwlād Ḥāratinā comprise not only a unique case in the canon of modern Arabic fiction translated into English, but also an iconic case in world literature in English translation generally. The selection of this case study is, thus, viable. Its retranslations will serve as the testing ground for investigating how the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and its agents function and interact, as well as how the socio-cultural and geo-political contexts governing the translation production, circulation and consumption interplay and affect the field and its activities.

Lastly, the importance of this thesis lies in the following considerations. There is a real shortage of studies that examine the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a historically constituted, socially situated area of activity. Only a limited number of studies investigate the existence and significance of such phenomenon as the retranslation of some Arabic works of fiction into English and non-translation of others. Moreover, there is a lack of studies that draw on Bourdieu’s sociology to investigate English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction within the socio-cultural and historico-political contexts of their production, and in relation to the agents who commissioned and produced them. While various studies in the field of translation have made use of the socio-analytical framework developed by Bourdieu (for an overview of such studies, see section 3.6.1), there is a lack of in-depth research that utilises that framework to explore the genesis, dynamics and social history of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and its agents. Unlike the existing studies, this thesis bases its analyses on, arguably, the most exhaustive bibliography of English translations of modern Arabic fiction published from 1908 to 2014. This is complemented by historical and archival documents, some of which have not been previously examined, and other relevant sources. Thus, this is the first empirical, extended study to employ Bourdieu’s sociology to thoroughly investigate this field of cultural production, its practitioners and products in a more nuanced, theoretically informed way. This is done with the aim of addressing and contributing to the dearth of research into the sociology of literary translation from Arabic into English.
CHAPTER TWO: TOWARDS A SOCIOTOLOGY OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

2.1 Initial remarks

Translation studies has grown to be a well-established interdisciplinary field of research, whose boundaries extend beyond linguistic considerations. Since its emergence as a field in its own right, translation studies has branched out to encompass a multitude of research trends and interests, including translation sociology, a subfield which has gained momentum since the mid-1990s and aims to study translation as a socially situated activity. Proponents of this view argue that translations always reflect the socio-cultural and historical conditions within which they have been produced and received. This understanding, in turn, invites the perception of every act of translation as a social practice, with translatorial agents and institutions as gatekeepers and active social players, involved in all translation processes.

Translation scholars have adopted a number of sociological theories to conceptualise the social nature of translation practices and to examine the role of translatorial agents and institutions in the various stages of the translation process. These include Pierre Bourdieu’s sociology of cultural production, Niklas Luhmann’s social system theory, Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory, Anthony Giddens’ theory of structuration, and Bernard Lahire’s theory of the plural actor. Notable among these, however, are the theories of Bourdieu, Luhmann and Latour as they ‘have so far been the most influential in approaches that originate in the social sciences’ (Inghilleri, 2009, p.280) and have ‘most inspired sociological research in translation studies’ (Buzelin, 2013, p.196; see also Wolf, 2006b, p.12).

The aim of this chapter is to draw on a sociological theory, with a view to developing a methodology for the examination of the socio-cultural dynamics and complex practices governing the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English. To this effect, the various sociological approaches that could potentially serve this aim will be explored and evaluated. The structure of the chapter will be as follows: it will first provide a brief review

1 For a detailed analysis of Bourdieu’s sociology, see sections 2.4.1 and 3.2–3.6.
2 For an overview of Luhmann’s theory and its application in translation studies, see section 2.4.2.
3 For a review of Latour’s actor-network theory and its application in the field of translation, see section 2.4.3.
4 For an application of Giddens’ theory in the translation field, see for instance Lawrence Venuti (1996) and Marlie van Rooyen (2013).
5 For a brief account of these approaches as well as other sociological approaches used in translation studies, see for example Wolf (2009).
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of the shift towards sociology in translation studies, as well as looking at the existing sociological research strands. It will then offer a critical overview of the main sociological theories propounded in the field (based on their chronological introduction and application within the research area of translation studies), to determine which of them is most suited to guide the analysis of this study and the investigation of its research questions. The discussion will first tackle Pierre Bourdieu’s sociology and then move to the larger framework of other sociological contributions that have been espoused and have proven useful in the analysis of translation as a social practice. These are Luhmann’s social systems theory and Latour’s actor-network theory.

Hence, the section that follows will provide an overview of the background, against which translation studies has made a ‘social turn’.

2.2 Towards as a ‘social turn’ in translation studies: A background

The twentieth century, especially its second half, has witnessed the emergence of a significant number of theoretical/methodological contributions within translation studies, which have lain the foundations of the field. Prior to that, translation research has mainly been concerned with assessing the ‘fidelity’ or ‘faithfulness’ of the translated text to the source text in addition to making general judgments about what is ‘right’ or ‘wrong’, thus overlooking ‘all kinds of other aspects connected with the phenomenon of translation, a circumstance that could teach us many things about how cultures and literatures function’ (Lefevere, 1992, p.6).

Motivated by the cultural notion of ‘interdiscipline’ and its call for the confluence and exchange of ideas across disciplinary boundaries, by the 1990s ‘interdisciplinarity’ became ‘the hallmark and guiding principle of translation studies’ (Hanna, 2006, p.12, Hanna, 2016, p.2). Against this backdrop, it was during the 1990s that the concern of research in translation studies moved from the ‘textual’ to the ‘cultural’—a paradigmatic shift described by Lefevere and Bassnett (1990, p.1) as the ‘cultural turn’ in translation studies. This shift marks a significant break from the traditional paradigms that had long dominated the field of translation, and was reflected in challenges to their mechanisms and key methods of analysis as well as their objects of study. That is, reaching the understanding that the translation process is not only about the text and that translation is not an isolated
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For a definition of interdisciplinarity, see Wolf (2007a, p.2).
discipline, but, rather, an interdisciplinary field with a ‘chameleon quality’ that is ‘able to change its colour and shape, to translate itself into many different things’ (Bassnett, 1998, p.26), marks the paradigmatic shift from the textual to the cultural in translation studies.

Cultural approaches to translation have managed to extend the disciplinary perspective to accommodate the historical and cultural contexts, beside the text itself, by accepting the idea that nothing exists in isolation and that the meaning of anything is always determined by its context (Asad, 1986, p.148). By the same token, Lefevere and Bassnett (1990, p.11) state that ‘[t]here is always a context in which the translation takes place, always a history from which a text emerges and into which a text is transposed’. Similarly, Venuti (1995, p.18) emphasises that ‘the viability of a translation is established by its relationship to the cultural and social conditions under which it is produced and read’. Wolf (2002a, p.34) also argues that any translation is by default bound up with social contexts. All this seems to have helped open up new means of evaluating the process(es) of translation which focuses on power relations inherent in any translation activity (Wolf, 2006b, p.9). However, the main weakness in the cultural approaches to translation is that rather than delving into the extra-textual social contexts in which the translation process takes place, they tend to remain confined to the ‘hermeneutics of the text’ (Inghilleri, 2005a, p.134). The need to surpass the purely culturally-oriented ‘hermeneutic’ understanding of translation has shifted the attention of research in translation studies to the socio-oriented approaches.

Although James Holmes (1972/2000) called for a ‘function-oriented’ descriptive understanding of translation and recommended placing more emphasis on the social contextualisation of translation or ‘translation sociology’ (Holmes, 2000, p.177)—a field which examines ‘how a translated text functions in the society into which it comes’ (Holmes, 1988, p.95), or how texts ‘function communicatively in a given socio-cultural setting’ (Holmes, 1988, p.100)—his call went unheeded, until fairly recently. A significant number of recent contributions to translation studies have shifted the foci of the field to what Wolf (2006a) describes as the ‘social turn’ in translation studies. As such, recognising that the social implications constituting the translation process have been scarcely, if at all, taken

7 Charting the ‘future of translation theory’ Peter Newmark argues that there is still much to be done in several translatorial fields. Among these he mentions ‘comparative cultural studies’, ‘the sociology of translation’ and ‘the translating process’ (Newmark, 1993, p.159).

8 The volume edited by Wolf in (2006a) is subtitled: ‘Towards a “Social Turn”?’—see also Wolf (2005) where she detects a ‘sociological turn’ in the making in the field of translation studies.
into consideration and that the ‘social’ intrinsically encompasses the ‘cultural’, ‘textual’ and even what is beyond that, seems to have been the stimulus behind the (re)emergence of the social trend in translation studies.

2.3 Sociology of translation: Research strands

While perceiving translation as a socially situated activity, a number of scholars have attempted to classify the framework of the sociology of translation into different categories. Although translation studies had not officially taken a sociological turn by then, Holmes called in his seminal (2000, p.177) article for focusing on translation process, function and product. This could be taken to be the earliest classification of a sociology of translation. In a similar vein, Simeoni ended his 1998 article by arguing in favour of opting for ‘a sociocognitive approach to cultural process and outcome’ (p.34). Simeoni called this approach a ‘socio-translational framework’ (Simeoni, 1998, p.21). Simeoni’s argument could be interpreted to mean that scholars should focus on (a) the cultural process of producing translations; that is, how translators produce translations; and (b) the translation outcome; that being the final translation products.

After the relatively recent shift of translation studies towards sociology, Chesterman (2006) and Wolf (2006b)9 were the first to identify three types of translation sociologies each. Chesterman (2006, p.12) divides translation sociology into three sub-categories. The first is the sociology of translations, i.e. as products in an international market. Another subdivision is the sociology of translators, and the last is the sociology of translating, i.e. the sociology of the translation process.

The first form of sociology identified by Wolf was ‘the sociology of agents’, which is concerned with active agents in translation production or ‘the translation activity under the perspective of its protagonists as both individual and members of specific networks’ (Wolf, 2006b, p.11). The second type of sociology she distinguishes is that of ‘the translation process’ which accentuates the constraints governing all stages of production of translation and focuses on the determinants which fashion the ‘invisibility’10 of translators, situating them within a much broader conceptual framework (Wolf, 2006b, p.11). The last type of
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9 For a more detailed explanation of the three types of sociology propounded by Michaela Wolf, see Wolf (2007a, pp.13–18).
10 For more information on and a thorough discussion of the term ‘invisibility’ (especially in relation to that of ‘visibility’ of the translator) see Venuti (1995). It is noteworthy that Venuti (1998, p.26) stresses the importance of the social implications of translations and calls for ‘a social theory of cultural value’.
sociology Wolf refers to is that of ‘the cultural product’ which deals with ‘the flow of translation product in its multifaceted aspects and particularly stresses the implications of the inter- and transnational transfer mechanisms on the shape of translation’ (Wolf, 2006b, p.11).

Buzelin (2013, p.191) criticises all agent/process/product categorisations, describing them as being ‘very general’ and ‘not specific to [translation] sociology’. In an attempt at moving ‘beyond’ the above classifications, she divides the field of translation sociology into four categories: ‘the sociology of work/professions’, the sociology of organisations, the sociology of culture (with a focus on literature) and the sociology of science’. In an endnote, she adds a fifth category, which she does not discuss in detail in her paper due to ‘space limitations’ (Buzelin, 2013, p.197), which is translation as social conflict/action. Buzelin’s sociology of professions concerns itself with ‘the socio-economic status of translation and the relative autonomy (or agency) of translators’ (Buzelin, 2013, p.192). Her sociology of organisations focuses on ‘studying translators at work in a given organisation involving other professionals’ and the impact of a work environment on a translator’s agency, as well as their translation practices and understanding of translation quality (Buzelin, 2013, p.192). Buzelin’s thesis is that each translation project/process could be perceived as an opportunity to reinforce or undermine relations of power between all agents involved and their potential collaborators (Buzelin, 2013, p.193). Buzelin’s third type of sociology of translation is the sociology of culture, which is interested in the translation of ‘cultural goods’ and the world book market, examining ‘how translation participates in the dynamics of international cultural (and more particularly literary) exchange’ (Buzelin, 2013, p.193).

Subtitled as a ‘sociology of translation studies’ (Buzelin, 2013, p.194), Buzelin’s fourth type of translation sociology is an invitation to reflect on how linguistic economy and power imbalances between languages inform the production, reception and international circulation of knowledge in translation studies as well as translation flows.

Although Buzelin’s classifications are different from those above and indubitably open new doors for tackling a closely related set of issues related to translation sociology, interestingly, there is a great deal of overlap between all these classifications. Buzelin’s first and second types of translation sociology could be said to concentrate on agents of

11 Interestingly, one of the sections of Wolf (2006b), in which she identified her three types of translation sociology, was entitled ‘Issues in the Sociology of Profession’.
translation: the first concentrates on translators and the second type extends to all agents engaged in the translation process, i.e. publishers, editors, revisers and subsidising agencies, as well as their collaborators. Her third type could be perceived as focusing on the actual process or dynamics of translation production. The last type, however, is a reflection on the various factors that inform all stages of the translation process: from production and distribution to consumption and critical meta-discourses. It is thus evident that, although the names are different, the basis for all classifications and what they aim to study are more or less the same.

Sapiro (2014) offers a classification not dissimilar, although she does not call it as such, to that of Buzelin’s outlined above. She argues that, as a ‘social activity’, translation can be addressed from various perspectives:

12 The sociology of professions; the sociology of culture; the study of international cultural exchanges; social functions and fields—namely the political field, the economic field (publishing and the literary field; the social conditions of circulation of ideas; and the epistemology of the human and social sciences. (Sapiro, 2014, pp.82–83)

Sapiro’s perspectives on the study of translation sociology are all interconnected: one leads to the other. As with Buzelin, Sapiro asserts that translation as a profession deals with the ‘study of translators and interpreters as an occupational group’ while laying particular focus on translators’ social trajectories, their professional self-image and identity, as well as their struggle for professional acclaim (Sapiro, 2014, p.83). The sociology of culture, however, perceives translation as a cultural practice where ‘individual agents operate within a persisting system of relations which determines and constrains their action, framing and limiting their possibilities and room for manoeuvre’ (Sapiro, 2014, p.84). By drawing a comparison between Becker’s (1982) interactionalism and Bourdieu’s (1993a) field, she reaches the conclusion that the sociology of culture could be better understood in light of Bourdieu’s theory, as its relational13 nature allows for a better understanding of how translators accumulate capital and can help account for the role both translation and some translators play in gaining international recognition for literary works. The unequal power

12 See footnote number 11.
13 Relationality is ‘the idea that cultural production and its products are situated and constituted in terms of a number of processes and social realities’ (Little, 2011).
relations between cultures leads Sapiro to discuss the asymmetrical flow of translations among languages using the centre-periphery model.

The study of international cultural exchanges concentrates on interpreting the asymmetrical flows of translation among languages and the factors affecting the volume of book production in given countries (Sapiro, 2014, pp.85–86). To be able to describe the flow of translation in relation to the factors conditioning translation production, one needs to consider the social functions that translation can serve in different fields. This leads Sapiro to discuss the ‘latent’ social functions of translation, i.e. the ‘political (or ideological), economic and cultural’, via examples on each, mainly from the literary field (Sapiro, 2014, p.86). In this respect she asserts that the relation between these functions and translation depends very much on the social agents and institutions engaged in the process of translation who decide what gets translated and published and what not, as well as according to what criteria. Sapiro then moves on to discuss the social conditions of the circulation of ideas, that being the study of the social determinants that govern the dissemination of translations being an important player in the international circulation of ideas. Lastly, in addressing the crucial importance of multilingualism and translation to human and social sciences, Sapiro contends that translation is ‘much more than a means of mediation between cultures’, for it is an intellectual practice with epistemic benefits that ought to be kept alive to preclude the routinisation or standardisation of critical thought (Sapiro, 2014, p.90). Overall, what Sapiro tries to demonstrate is that as sociology can enrich the domain of translation studies, translation can also offer a fresh outlook and raise broader beneficial questions in sociology regarding the processes of professionalisation and the legitimisation or hierarchisation of cultural practices and cultural products (including canon formation), as well as about the sociology of publishing and the chain of production of literary works, intercultural exchanges and the social conditions of circulation of symbolic goods and ideas, and finally about the epistemology of human and social sciences.

Different theoretical frameworks are mentioned in the above classifications. But what appears to be an evidently common name is that of Pierre Bourdieu, since his works advocate studying cultural products (i.e. outcome) within the context of their production (i.e. process), and in relation to the agents who produced them. Although criticism has been levelled against the theory (see section 3.6.2), Bourdieu’s intellectual enterprise is perceived in the field of translation as ‘a sociology of the text as a production in the process of being
carried out, of the product itself and of its consumption in the social fields, the whole seen in a relational manner’ (Gouanvic, 2005, p.148, my italics).

The analysis of this study will be at the intersection of all sociological research strands outlined above, as one cannot, for instance, study the processes of translation and/or the final translation product in isolation from the translatorial agents that produced the translation and vice versa. The sections that follow will provide a brief critical overview of the most popular sociological approaches used in translation studies based on their chronological introduction to the field.

2.4 Sociological approaches to translation studies
The purpose of this section is to introduce and determine which of the three main sociological approaches could potentially serve as the theoretical framework for the study of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a socially situated activity. These approaches, as stated earlier, are Bourdieu’s theory of social practice, Luhmann’s social systems theory and Latour’s actor-network theory. They will be briefly discussed below to conclude which of them would be best suited to guide the analysis of this study. Hence, it is in order here to give a brief introduction about Bourdieu’s theory and how it filtered through to translation studies before discussing the Luhmann’s and Latour’s sociologies.

2.4.1 Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of social practice
The study of the translation activity as a social phenomenon has stepped to the front against the backdrop of the polysystem theory and Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS). The DTS paradigm has provided insights on how translated literature functions within the historical and literary ‘systems’ of the target culture through the concepts it has introduced. This has indeed broadened the scope of research in translation studies. However, drawing mainly on the theoretical paradigms from literary studies, where the principal focus lies on the text, DTS seems to have overlooked the important role played by the social agents as well as some aspects of social reality during the process of translation. Gouanvic argues that the element lacking from the polysystem theory and DTS is ‘a social explanation of the role of institutions and practices in the emergence and reproduction of symbolic goods’ (Gouanvic, 1997, p.126). He also states that Bourdieu’s model is more capable than Toury’s of explaining the complexities of such cultural products as translation (Gouanvic, 1997, p.126). Similarly, Gentzler (1993, p.123) argues that these approaches to translation ‘seldom relates texts to the “real conditions” of their production’. That is further explicated by Wolf (2002a,
p.36; see also Wolf, 2007a, p.7) where she states that what seems to be ignored in the polysystem theory and DTS ‘are the conditions of the social interactions in question [and] the nature of the political and social relationships between the groups involved in these processes’ of translation, or the criteria underlying the creation of a product to be placed on a specific market. Hence, the element lacking from the polysystem theory and DTS appears to be the taking into account of the social agents involved in the translation process, the logic of their practices, their social positions and positioning, and the social functions of their cultural products. This led translation scholars to re-negotiate disciplinary boundaries and introduce new perspectives to the study of translation. Among these interdisciplinary perspectives was the sociological framework developed by Pierre Bourdieu (b.1930–d.2002; for a brief biography of Bourdieu, see section 3.2), which was primarily introduced to re-evaluate ‘descriptive and polysystems approaches’ in translation studies (Inghilleri, 2005a, p.126).

From a sociological viewpoint, translations are products of the social relations between different language and cultural groups (Heilbron, 1999, p.430). Bourdieu avers that language represents socio-cultural reality since ‘it is an intrinsic element of the competitive struggles over the use of culture and of the processes of cultural reproduction which make such an important contribution to the social reproduction of the established order’ (Jenkins, 1992, p.157). Hence, for Bourdieu, culture and language are inseparable; in the sense that culture is meaningless without language and vice versa. He states that ‘one cannot fully understand language without placing linguistic practices within the full universe of compossible practices: eating and drinking habits, cultural consumption, taste in matters of arts, sports, dress, furniture, politics, etc.’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.149). Since language is the primary tool through which cultures are communicated, preserved and transmitted, and since languages exist in social contexts, they are, therefore, essential for understanding the reality of any given culture. That is, according to Bourdieu, linguistic practices can only be analysed or understood in relation to the cultural context, discourse as well as the social conditions in which they are produced and received (Jenkins, 1992, p.152). Moreover, for Bourdieu, as Wacquant (1989, p.46) contends,

linguistic relations are always relations of power (rapports de force) and, consequently, cannot be elucidated within the compass of linguistic analysis alone. Even the simplest linguistic exchange brings into play a complex and ramifying web of historical power relations between the speaker, endowed with a specific social authority, and an audience which recognises this authority to
varying degrees, as well as between the groups to which they respectively belong.

Against this background, it is thus clear that studying language within the socio-cultural contexts in which it is produced and received, and understanding it as an instrument of social power used by agents to sublimate their power-oriented encounters is something that Bourdieu’s sociological approach shares with such cultural approaches to translation as that of Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990; Niranjana, 1992; Venuti, 1995, 1998; Simon, 1996; Tymoczko 1999; Even-Zohar, 2000; Tymoczko and Gentler, 2002; Cronin, 2003; Baker, 2006, among others. However, beyond these commonalities, the fundamental difference between the two approaches is the ability of Bourdieu’s model to critically explain the role played by agents of translation, how they think and communicate, the logic behind their various discursive practices and interactions as well as the dynamics of their cultural production. The contribution of Bourdieu’s social theory in directing the focus within translation studies to translators, and translatorial agents and institutions in general, has been vital to the advancement of the field. By placing more emphasis on the dynamics of cultural production and consumption, and through his concepts of field, habitus and capital, in particular, Bourdieu’s sociological model has managed to facilitate the conceptualisation and understanding of the interactions between agency and structure. A thorough analysis of Bourdieu’s key concepts, their strengths and weaknesses as well as their ability to synthesise in relation to one another will be outlined in sections 3.3–3.6 below. However, some of their merits are worth shedding light on here prior to exploring the other sociological frameworks that have been used and proven fruitful within translation sociology.

Bourdieu (2005a, p.148) contends that it is necessary to account for the social space or sphere of action within which interactions and events take place. The social space Bourdieu refers to here is what he calls field (Grenfell, 2008, p.47; see also Bourdieu, 1998a, p.32). The concept of field is at the heart of Bourdieu’s relational framework. It helps in examining and interpreting the power relations (re)produced through struggle over different forms of capital to achieve dominance in a field, expose the practices of and interactions between social agents that fuel this struggle premised within a field, and reveal the taken for granted rules within a field. In Bourdieu’s words:

That is what I mean when I describe the global social space as a field, that is, both as a field of forces, whose necessity is imposed on agents who are engaged
in it, and as a field of struggles within which agents confront each other, with differentiated means and ends according to their position in the structure of the field of forces, thus contributing to conserving or transforming its structure. (Bourdieu, 1998a, p.32, italics in original)

The structure of any field of culture production is not static but rather dynamic, and its boundaries are not rigid limits determined once and for all but ones that are in an on-going state of change and hence are always subject to challenge and re-structuring. This state of flux in the structure of a field is primarily caused by the constant struggles between agents operating in it and who compete ‘according to the regularities and the rules constitutive of this space of play’ to accrue legitimacy, power and ‘appropriate the specific products at stake in the game’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.102). Thus, as Hanna rightly argues, the ‘dynamic nature of the concept of ‘field’ invites the researcher to think of cultural practices and products relationally, that is, to link these practices to the positions available in the field, the dominant agents occupying them, homologies with other fields and the class structure of the wider social space’ (Hanna, 2006, pp.14–15, italics in original).

Two more of Bourdieu’s concepts are intricately linked to that of field, form the primary pillars that his sociology rests upon and are hence essential to the understanding and interpretation of dynamics of practice of any cultural product, be it translation, fiction or else. These concepts are habitus and capital. Habitus, or ‘immanent law’ as Bourdieu (1977a, p.81) calls it, is an open system of durable, transposable and motivating dispositions of ‘internalised structures, common schemes of perception, conception and action’ (Bourdieu, 1990a, pp.53–60) that are geared towards practical decision making. Thus, on the one hand, habitus is a set of motivating and enduring dispositions that structures the practices of agents. On the other hand, it is exchangeable in the sense that it can transpose across time and in more than one field. It is noteworthy that, although habitus is durable, it is not eternal (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.133) since it can adapt itself to an infinite number of possible situations and can vary over time (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.9; for more details on habitus, see section 3.5).

As far as translation studies is concerned, Bourdieu’s concept of habitus has been of particular interest in agent-oriented research due to its ability to account for agents’ practices (see for example Sheffy, 1997; Sela-Sheffy, 2005; Simeoni, 1998; Meylaerts, 2008, 2010; Wolf, 2013a, 2015; Vorderobermeier, 2014; Fernández-Ocampo and Wolf, 2014). This interest was driven by the need ‘within translation studies to focus more attention on
translators and interpreters’ and ‘to analyse critically their role as social and cultural agents actively participating in the production and reproduction of textual and discursive practices’ (Inghilleri, 2005a, p.126). Thus, this interest in Bourdieu’s concept of habitus in translation studies seems to have stemmed from its ability to account for how agents of translation can be determined and yet be acting too, and how their ‘behaviour can be regulated and shared without being the product of conformity to be codified, recognised rules or other causal mechanisms’ (Inghilleri, 2005a, pp.134–135; for a critique of Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, see section 3.6.2). Understanding agents and their practices can thus aid our understanding of how a certain translation is produced, and how the way they exercise their agency can affect the final translation product (Pym, 1998, ix).

Relevant to Bourdieu’s concepts of field and habitus is his concept of capital. In a broad sense, capital is any resources at stake in a field which determine legitimacy and social relations of power. The Bourdieusian understanding of capital is wider than its economic reference. It is any historically ‘accumulated labour’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.241) which in effect confers power in a field, legitimises the hierarchy of positions in it, and implicitly determines the conditions of membership to the field.14 That said, capital can be viewed as any asset that has the ability to reproduce profitable and meaningful rewards and hence it includes ‘monetary and non-monetary, as well as tangible and intangible forms’ (Anheier, 2005, p.234). Bourdieu also contends that social agents draw upon the various forms of capital ‘in order to maintain and enhance their position in the social order’ (Swartz, 1997, pp.73–75).

Capital can present itself in three distinguishable forms. The first form is the economic capital which refers to monetary income and other financial resources and finds its institutional expression in the form of property rights. Cultural capital15 is the second form and it refers to non-financial assets, such as educational qualifications, which could promote social mobility beyond economic means (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1979, p.80; 1990, passim). The third form of capital is the social capital which refers to the network of social connections or memberships to certain organisations. According to Bourdieu (1986, pp.248–252), social capital can be seen as one of the several resources used to obtain or

---

14 Bourdieu calls the conditions of membership to any field doxa. The concept will be defined in details in section 3.3.4.
15 Bourdieu (1986, pp.243–248) speaks of three subtypes of cultural capital: embodied (personality, speech, skills), objectified (any objects, collections, or belongings), and institutionalised (credentials, qualifications, or specialised knowledge). See section 3.4.3 for more details on Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital.
maintain positions of power within a field. Symbolic capital is another form of capital suggested by Bourdieu. It is a manifestation of each of the other forms of capital when they are naturalised on their own terms (Khalifa and Elgindy, 2014, p.43). In Bourdieu’s (1987a, p.4) words, symbolic capital is ‘the form the different types of capital take once they are perceived and recognised as legitimate’. It is ‘this concentration as such which constitutes the state as the holder of a sort of meta-capital granting power over other species of capital and over their holders’ (Bourdieu, 1994, p.4). That is to say, symbolic capital is the resources available to a social agent on the basis of prestige or recognition, which functions as an authoritative embodiment of cultural value (Khalifa and Elgindy, 2014, p.43) and ‘is founded on a dialectic of knowledge (connaissance) and recognition (reconnaissance)’ (Johnson 1993, p.7, italics in original). It is important to note that all forms of capital are ‘unequally distributed among social classes and class fractions’ (Johnson, 1993, p.7) and are hence accrued in a competitive struggle for power, legitimacy and hegemony. Moreover, all types of capital, according to Bourdieu, are convertible one to the other as a strategy to maintain and promote agents’ social positions within a field.

Other sociological approaches have been introduced within the realm of translation sociology as alternatives, or in some cases complementary, to Pierre Bourdieu’s sociology. Nonetheless, when compared to Bourdieu’s, it is safe to say that these approaches have not inspired as much research. These include Niklas Luhmann’s social system theory, Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory, and to a lesser extent Anthony Giddens' theory of structuration and Bernard Lahire’s theory of the plural actor. The two sociological theories that enjoyed some popularity beside Bourdieu’s approach are these of Luhmann and Latour (see for instance, Inghilleri, 2009, p.280; Buzelin, 2013, p.196; Wolf, 2006b, p.12).

2.4.2 Niklas Luhmann’s social systems theory

Niklas Luhmann (b.1927–d.1998) was a German sociologist best known for his Soziologische Systemtheorie or Social Systems Theory (SST). After initially studying law at the University of Freiburg (1946–1949), Luhmann worked for the Lower Saxony Ministry of Education and Culture in northwestern Germany (1956–1962), where he gained vast experience in the interplay between politics, administration, law and society, and further developed an interest in philosophy and anthropology. He then went to Harvard University to undertake a doctorate in sociology with Talcott Parsons, an eminent structural-functionalist sociologist. Although Parsons’ functional approach evidently had an influence on Luhmann,
he was very soon to extricate himself from its impact and was able to develop a sociological framework for his own ideas, mainly related to legal and political sociology. Upon his return to Germany, Luhmann undertook an academic career and was eventually appointed as Professor and First Chair of Sociology at the University of Bielefeld.

A number of scholars (see, for instance, Hornung, 2006; Ferrarese, 2007) categorise Luhmann’s intellectual trajectory into three main phases. Parsons’ theory seems to have been the kernel of Luhmann’s sociological thought. Influenced by Parsons’ work and ideas, the first phase is marked by Luhmann having been deeply inspired by structural functionalism. The second phase marks Luhmann’s shift from the ‘structural’ to developing his own insights into functionalism (Buzelin, 2013, p.188). This saw him integrating concepts and ideas from socio-organisational complexity theory with Parsons’ conception of functionalism, particularly his notions of system and function, and phenomenology, especially the idea of meaningful communication and how it constitutes social reality. Marking the third phase of Luhmann’s intellectual trajectory is his adoption of the main ideas of the autopoietic theory developed largely by the Chilean biologists Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela during the period between 1972 and 1987. Maturana and Varela primarily developed their theory to describe self-maintaining (autopoietic) living systems as observing and observed entities defining their own boundaries within the human body. Luhmann introduced autopoietic theory to sociology, and adopted it to refine and sharpen his sociological approach, in an attempt to understand and interpret the life, consciousness and communication of social living systems, as well as the interaction between them as self-organising systems; this is SST as we know it today.

Luhmann’s SST draws from a diverse range of fields outside of sociology (e.g., biology, physiology, organisational science and philosophy) to address questions related to the transdisciplinary concept of autopoiesis. Luhmann defines systems\(^\text{16}\) as being unities constituted, and reconstituted, by acts of communication. Communication can be understood as the unities of utterance, information and understanding (Luhmann, 1990,

\(^{16}\) Luhmann’s concept of ‘system’ could be thought of as similar to Bourdieu’s concept of ‘field’, which will be thoroughly discussed in section 3.3. However, when asked about the difference between the two concepts, Bourdieu replied: ‘An essential difference: struggles, and thus historicity!’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.102). In Bourdieu’s view, systems are premised on inherent ‘internal cohesion and self-regulation’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.103). Conversely, however, his concept of field entails positions which relate to one another with respect to difference, distinction and conflict (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.103).
Central to Luhmann’s understanding of systems is that they must always have an environment to operate within. Luhmann uses the concept of structural coupling to highlight the relation between systems and their environments. Although systems are ‘operationally closed’, they connect with the environment in which they are embedded through communicative actions. These communicative/functional systems (similar to Bourdieu’s fields) are the basic elements of the social system. A change in the environment’s complexity can cause internal processes in a system. However, it is important to note that it is the system that establishes and regulates communication with the environment and determines the way in which interaction takes place with it (what, when and through what channels).

Luhmann identifies three main forms of systems that range from the living to the psychic to the social. Each of these forms has its own mode of self-reproduction. Living systems (bodies), on the one hand, reproduce themselves through life. For Luhmann (following Maturana and Varela’s theory), each living entity is an autopoietic living system; that is, it has the ability to self-organise and self-reproduce itself and hence survival (through self-reproduction) is always its primary goal. Psychic systems (minds) and social systems (society), on the other hand, reproduce themselves through thought or consciousness, and communication of meaning (rather than action), respectively. Luhmann (1992, p.257) argues that a ‘social system cannot think and a psychical system cannot communicate’. Both psychic and social systems operate on the level of meaning reconstruction, for they are ‘sovereign with respect to the constitution of identities and differences’ (Luhmann, 1990, p.3).

Luhmann postulates the existence of multiple sub-systems within a social system. When viewed through modern society’s lens, these subsystems could include things such as art, economy, education, religion, law and politics. In this sense, society in Luhmann’s view is perceived as being fashioned out of functionally differentiated subsystems or spheres of communication that function within a system which operates within an environment. Subsystems, like systems, are made up of, and interact through, acts of communication. Therefore, any change in the complexity of a social system’s subsystem will consequently have an effect on and result in a change of the complexity of other subsystems as well as the social system that encompass them and its environment. As such, it is these communications that represent the foundations upon which any society stands rather than
the human beings inhabiting it, as they belong not to the social system but to its environment. According to Luhmann, the existence of society is dependent on the existence of communication (rather than humans), for ‘[o]nly communication can communicate’ (Luhmann, 1994, p.371; see also Luhmann, 2002, p.169). Hence, humans have no ability to dominate or even influence the social system. For Luhmann, ‘human beings are neither part of society nor of any specific subsystem’ and hence they ‘are not integral to the system itself, but rather constitute an environmental resource that the system draws on in order to maintain itself. Humans are the medium through which communication takes place, but they are not themselves communicators’ (Wight, 2015, p.61). What matters for Luhmann is thus how the communicative actions of humans are fashioned and reproduced, yet not determined, by society, and conversely, how society is constructed and reproduced, yet not defined, by the communicative actions of humans. Against this background, it is apparent that humans seem, as Moeller (2006, p.10) rightly argues, to have:

no theoretical place in systems theory. When there is talk about ‘human beings,’ systems theory would have to ask: do you mean the social person who is addressed in communication? The body that can be seen over there? Or the mind that thinks and feels within this body? (italics in original)

Luhmann contends that a social system comprises three components: the code, the structure and the process. Codes are binary oppositions perceived as relevant to the social system and through which information is communicated (for example, source versus target dichotomy in translation studies). Codes underlie each social (sub)system, organise it and distinguish it from other (sub)systems. Through structure, codes also regulate the humans who function in the social (sub)system’s environment; that is, the central values, regulations and expectations in a social system. Process, however, could be referred to as the ongoing communication and interaction between different (sub)systems, and between a system and the intricate environment surrounding it.

A number of scholars have made use of Luhmann’s SST in translation studies. Translation, argues Tyulenev, can be perceived as a social system simply because it has ‘all the properties of a social system’ (Tyulenev, 2014, p.133). He further contends that translation, in light of Luhmann’s SST, can be said to have its own subsystems (for instance, the intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic subsystems) and sub-subsystems (for example, literary translation within the intra- or interlingual subsystems) (Tyulenev, 2013, p.163). He avers that Luhmann’s ideas could be utilised in three research paradigms: (1) the study of
translation as a system in its own right; (2) the study of translation as a subsystem embedded in a larger system; and (3) the study of translation through its social-systemic involvements and its role in society as a boundary phenomenon—that is, studying translation in terms of the relationship between the social system and the environment (Tyulenev, 2009a, pp.150–151). He highlights the merits and limits of using each paradigm in relation to the current theories propounded in the field of translation studies, and argues that Luhmann’s SST can help broaden the theorisation of translation (Tyulenev, 2009b, pp.272–273). Tyulenev elaborates on this further in another study, stating that SST can help give rise to overlooked yet fundamental questions related both to translation theory in general and to the three paradigms he proposed (listed above) such as:

How is translation, being improbable, made probable? (…) How of all sorts of social activities, does translation emerge as a specific activity? what are the internal mechanisms that made/make translation possible? Upon what basis are different social activities categorised as translational and said to belong to the same type of activity? What is translation’s contribution to making the improbability of social order probable?. (Tyulenev, 2012, p.20)

Tyulenev also avers that translation perceived in a Luhmannian sense has a unique element, which he calls a ‘translation communication event’ (Tyulenev, 2014, p.134). An event in the Luhmannian sense is a state that takes place at a particular point in time. Hence, this translation communication event consists of ‘two or more communication events connected through mediation’ which allow ‘both the identification of translational phenomena, despite the multitude of its forms, and the conceptualisation of translation, despite its diversity’ (Tyulenev, 2013, p.162). A translation event—which can be understood temporally as the journey of a ‘translation task, from initial request to delivery and payment’ (Chesterman, 2006, p.13)—can hence be recognised as a communication event in Luhmann’s terms, which functions within, and constitutes part of, a larger translation (social) system (for further discussion on translation events and acts as well as the difference between them, see Toury, 1995, passim, 2012, passim). The translation system is not only comprised of translation events. It also includes ‘statements about these events: discourse on translation, including such texts as translation reviews, prefaces and other paratexts, and also scholarly research on translation: all feed into one system, reflecting it and affecting it’ (Chesterman, 2006, p.14). As such, the translation system can be regarded as autopoietic in nature; that is, self-reflective and self-progressing.

Although Tyulenev has recently written extensively on the application of Luhmann’s SST
within translation studies, Luhmann’s ideas were first introduced to the field by Poltermann (1992, passim). His work focused on translation norms and studying literary translation, primarily in Germany, as a differentiated subsystem of a larger literary subsystem that emerged from a larger subsystem of art embedded in the social system, from a Luhmannian perspective. Informed by Poltermann’s work, Hermans (1999, 2007)\textsuperscript{17} concentrates on how Luhmann’s ideas could be utilised for the study of translation. He perceives literature as a differentiated social system in a Luhmannian sense, affected by translation and literary norms as well as communicative actions and expectations. Hermans brings forward the idea of envisaging translation as an ‘adaptive, self-regulating, self-reflexive and self-reproducing system’ (Hermans, 1999, p.142). Moreover, in light of his understanding of Luhmann’s theory, he argues that SST could offer fresh methodological outlooks and open up new possibilities for the study of translation, being able to ‘challenge and replenish both theoretical speculation and text-based research’ (Hermans, 1999, p.161). He further stresses the theory’s ability to account for issues related to objectivity in translation research, given that ‘describers [and translators] are always positioned somewhere, and have blind spots’ (Hermans, 1999, p.146). Hermans also underscores that by perceiving ‘the process of translation as a matter of observing a source text and making decisions about how to render it’ translation practitioners engage in what Luhmann calls ‘second-order observation’;\textsuperscript{18} that is, observation of the observation (Hermans, 1999, p.145). Vermeer (2006) expanded on Hermans view on Luhmann’s SST and tried to explain it from a functionalist point of view, mainly from the perspective of his skopos theory.\textsuperscript{19} Vermeer proposes the idea of a ‘general translation system’ as a distinct social system that is capable of bringing into focus the correlation between various transatorial actors (i.e., source-text authors, commissioners, translators, readers, etc.); their acting (i.e., the act of translation); and their products (i.e., translations). This general translation system can be perceived as ‘a set of (interdependent) systems in the environment of the overall translation system’ (Vermeer, 2006, p.6). Vermeer posits that in order to establish translation as a social system in its own right, ‘we must go beyond Luhmann’ (Vermeer, 2006, p.6). He therefore proposes


\textsuperscript{18} This is similar to Bourdieu’s idea of double reading/reflexivity discussed briefly in section 3.2.

\textsuperscript{19} The theory was introduced by Hans Vermeer in 1978. As its originally-Greek name suggests, the theory perceives translation as an action that always has a purpose or aim (i.e. skopos), although this aim/purpose might not always be explicit (Reiß and Vermeer, 1984, p.21; see also Vermeer, 1996, passim).
a three-tier analysis framework: (1) the microcosmic level of the translation processes and events; (2) the mesocosmic level of the reality of the human world; and (3) the macrocosmic level of memetics, which refers to the generation and production of memes. In doing so, he aims to demonstrate how the complexity of translation affects translators’ freedom and liability when they undertake a translation (Vermeer, 2006, p.13).

Nevertheless, Luhmann’s SST has attracted a great deal of criticism both within and outside of translation studies. By basing his conception of social systems on ideas and insights from biological and mechanical theories and trying to integrate them into sociology, Luhmann has overlooked the phenomena and developments of social change. It is difficult, therefore, to use the theory as a social analysis tool. Importantly, adapting Maturana and Varela’s theory of autopoiesis to the study of social reality and contexts reduces the value of humans to a mere element of society or external observers of social systems (Fuchs and Hofkirchner, 2009, p.113). Since individuals are excluded from Luhmann’s theory, it is therefore logical that social systems cannot examine or interpret the action, behaviour, motives or even the idea of existence of humans. Luhmann once reportedly said that he ‘was not interested in people’ (Wight, 2015, p.61). This implicitly suggests that SST is intrinsically ‘anti-human’ (Mavrofides, 2010, p.2) in as far as it does not take into account the importance and role of humans in society. Since the purpose of this study is to investigate and interpret the socio-cultural dynamics of translating modern Arabic fiction into English, including the work of Naguib Mahfouz, and since it is human translatorial agents and human-run institutions who primarily motivate and instigate these dynamics, it is thus tenable that Luhmann’s SST would not serve the needs of this study and hence is not the best theoretical framework to guide the analysis of its data.

2.4.3 Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory

Bruno Latour (b.1947) is a French anthropologist and techno-sociologist best known for being one of the primary progenitors of actor-network theory (henceforth ANT). Latour was educated in theology and philosophy and based his doctorate, awarded in 1975 from the University of Tours, around them. Later, however, while being conscripted in Côte d’Ivoire during his military service with the French army, he developed an interest in anthropology. Soon after receiving his doctorate, Latour taught at the École Nationale

---

20 It is noteworthy that the concept of actor bears resemblance to Bourdieu’s concept of agents and that of network bears resemblance to that of field. However, there are some distinctive differences between ANT and Bourdieu’s sociology as will be explained below.
Supérieure des Mines de Paris, between 1982 and 2006, during which time he was also a visiting professor at a number of universities in the United States and Europe. He then moved on to teach at the Institut des Sciences Politiques, where he now (i.e. 2017) acts as the director of the Médialab, while simultaneously serving as a Centennial Professor at the London School of Economics and Professor-at-Large at Cornell University.

ANT grew out of science and technology studies and was developed by Latour (1987), along with Michel Callon (1986) and John Law (1992, 1999; see also Law and Callon, 1992; and Law and Hassard, 1999), to address the need for a new social theory tailored to exploring collective sociotechnical processes. Since then, it has undergone many modifications, refinements and updates which have led to heated debates as to whether the present time is the ‘after-ANT’ or ‘post-ANT’ phase (Law and Hassard, 1999).\(^2^1\) The theory is much inspired by the ideas of Michel Serres (b.1930), among others, and could be thought of as poststructuralist in nature, with its aim being to explore and describe the relational ties within networks through analysing ‘situations in which it is difficult to separate humans and non-humans, and in which the actors have variable forms and competencies’ (Callon, 1999, p.183). As its much-maligned name indicates,\(^2^2\) the main concepts are those of actors and networks, along with other concepts which will be discussed in brief below.

ANT maintains that the social world is composed of hybrid or heterogeneous assemblages or networks, comprising, and \textit{shaped} by, both human and nonhuman entities (see Latour, 1993, pp.1–12). An actor, as defined by Latour, ‘is a semiotic definition—an actant—that is, something that acts or to which activity is granted by others. It implies no special motivation of human individual actors, nor of humans in general’ (Latour, 1996a, p.373, italics in original). Thus, it inextricably links nonhumans (both living and non-living) to humans (calling both of them actors or actants) and proposes that they have an equal balance of value and

\(^2^1\) For an extensive discussion on this point, in addition to Law and Hassard (1999), see for instance: Lowe (2001); Tresch (2013).

\(^2^2\) In \textit{On recalling ANT}, Latour notes in the opening paragraph that: ‘there are four things that do not work with actor-network theory; the word actor, the word network, the word theory and the hyphen! Four nails in the coffin’ (Latour, 1999, p.15).
agency. Latour calls this assumption ‘symmetry’\(^{23}\) (Latour, 1987, p.144), wherein nonhuman actors, like human ones, are perceived as mediators\(^{24}\) rather than intermediaries.\(^{25}\)

An actor acts and, among other possibilities, such ‘acting may be strategic or subservient’ (Mol, 2010, p.256); hence, actors are assumed in the ANT-tradition to have ‘radical indeterminacy’ (Callon, 1999, p.181, italics in original)—depending on the networks they are embedded in and from which actors derive their nature. An actor is also ‘a patterned network of heterogeneous relations, or an effect produced by such a network’ (Law, 1992, p.384). That is, all networks are composed of actors and all actors are networks within themselves. ANT posits that all entities comprising a network are interdependent and, consequently, a network has no centre (Chesterman, 2006, p.22). A network is also ‘never bigger than another one, it is simply longer or more intensely connected (…). Literally, a network has no outside’ (Latour, 1996a, pp.371–372, italics in original). Moreover, a network is not composed ‘of any durable substance’ but, rather, ‘it is the trace left behind by some moving agent’ (Latour, 2005, p.132). Networks are ‘materially heterogeneous’ (Law, 1994, p.23) and dynamic in nature and, therefore, exist in nowhere in particular; they circulate everywhere. A network is thus the tracing of all of the circulating elements and the relations that bind them. That is, the objective of ANT is neither to create nor construct networks; rather, it is a ‘network-tracing activity’ (Latour, 1996a, p.378, italics in original). Hence, the relationship and interaction between actors and networks is of vital importance in ANT, where actors are perceived as the sum total of their connections with other actors and networks.

In a network, causality transports in a routine and predictable way: any node in the network can be connected to, and impact, any other node, including itself. If a network falters, for instance, the actors operating in it may falter too (Mol, 2010, p.258). If actors are not being enacted, they cease to function (Mol, 2010, p.258). Within this context, ANT makes use of

\(^{23}\) It is noteworthy that in one of his later works Latour contradicts himself and firmly states that ‘ANT is not, I repeat is not, the establishment of some absurd “symmetry between humans and non-humans”’ (Latour, 2005, p.76).

\(^{24}\) Unpredictable actors who can ‘transform, translate, distort, and modify the meaning or the elements they are supposed to carry’ (Latour, 2005, p.39). They disobey the basic laws of cause and effect (in the sense that their effect cannot be easily predicted by their cause).

\(^{25}\) Predictable actors who ‘transport meaning or force without transformation’ (Latour, 2005, p.39). They follow the basic laws of cause and effect (in the sense that their effect can be predicted by their cause).
the important concept of “translation”, which should not be confused with the conventional definition of translation as established in translation studies. The concept of “translation”, i.e. transfer with deformation, is used by ANT in opposition to that of ‘diffusion’—that being to transport without distortion. “Translation” in ANT is a relation inducing actors into coexisting (Latour, 2005, p.108) and hence it represents ‘the methods by which an actor enrols others’ (Callon et al., 1986, xvii); it is an on-going process through which actors connect to and transform one another to progressively form alignments and networks. Callon argues that ‘to translate is to displace [socially and physically, and] to express in one’s own language what others say and want, why they act in the way they do and how they associate with each other: it is to establish oneself as a spokesman’ (Callon, 1986, p.223, my italics). In other words, during the process of “translation”, one actor, or more, attempts to control and recruit others through negotiating or manipulating their interests towards his/her/its/their own in order to establish his/her/its/their self-interested problematisation (problem formulation). One actor, or actors, will venture to solicit the support of others, and after negotiating/manoeuvring their positions/connections, they may either follow or form assemblages elsewhere. The dynamic attempt of transforming an actor, or actors, into a network comprises four ‘moments of translation’: problematisation; interessement; enrolment and mobilisation (Callon, 1986, passim).

During the problematisation stage, an actor, or actors, establishes himself/herself/itself/themselves as an ‘obligatory passage point’ (OPP) by formulating a problem that other actors can relate to and identify with. The actor, or the fact-builder (Latour, 1987, p.103), then proposes a solution that would interest the other actors and attempts to convince them to join his/her/its/their network, and dedicate resources to it. Following this is the interessement stage, where the other actors express their interest in the solution suggested, negotiate their role and manoeuvre their way in an attempt to affiliate themselves with the OPP or focal actor(s) who framed the problem. The OPP thereby starts recruiting allies, and selects who to include and who to exclude. The success of the interessement process confirms the legitimacy of problematisation, or the focal actor’s project. Once chosen for inclusion in the network, the selected actors experience the process of enrolment into the project’s irreversible relations, whereby roles are distributed.

26 Any referral to translation in the sense of ANT (i.e. the broader metaphorical sense), unless within a quote, will be presented in quotation marks to distinguish it from translation in its traditional sense as perceived in translation studies.
Thence, actors get mobilised or locked by the OPP in the roles specifically set for them, to stabilise and control their behaviour. During this moment of “translation”, the OPP undertakes a spokesperson role for intermediary actors in the network, hence becoming a macro actor (Callon and Latour, 1981, passim). Latour (1987, pp.108–121) suggests five strategies for the OPP to successfully enrol and control other actors. The OPP should: (1) cater to their explicit interests; (2) persuade other actors to go out of their way and follow his/hers/its/theirs by convincing them that their usual way is cut off; (3) seduce other actors through suggesting making a short detour (the main road is clearly cut off; the new detour is well signposted; the detour appears shorter); (4) reshuffle other actors’ interests and goals through these tactics: displacing goals, inventing new goals or new groups, rendering the detour invisible, winning trials of attribution; and (5) become indispensable to other actors.

It could therefore be argued that, according to ANT, to “translate” is to engage in a power struggle, to exercise power of persuasion, or manipulation, to garner support for developing, stabilising, or strengthening a network. This argument is echoed by Law’s definition of “translation” as a ‘play to achieve relative durability, to make verbs behave as if they were nouns’ (Law, 1994, p.103, my italics).

A central point here is that ANT holds that, when studying any phenomenon, a researcher/analyst must not have any a priori assumptions about actors’ behaviour, limiting them to mere informers led by any selectively picked (pre-existing) framework of analysis27—because the ‘task of defining and ordering the social should be left to the actors themselves, not taken up by the analyst’ (Latour, 2005, p.23). Therefore, an ANT researcher has to always ‘follow the actors themselves’, to learn and understand from them and their experiences (Latour, 2005, p.12). In the process of following the actors, according to Latour (Latour, 2005, p.190), a researcher must follow three main injunctions: (1) go slow; (2) do not jump; and (3) keep everything flat. Latour states that the ANT idea of following the actors meticulously is a both long and arduous task. However, he maintains that it is the only way that would not ‘limit in advance the shape, size, heterogeneity and combination of associations’ of any sociological observation (Latour, 2005, p.11).

27 Latour uses an analogy to demonstrate this point: he states that as it would be odd for a painter to begin his masterpiece by first choosing the frame, it would similarly be bizarre for an analyst to first find a frame to put their data in (Latour, 2005, p.143).
It is a point to note here that, in its earlier phases, ANT advocated a ‘flat ontology’ which perceived networks as non-hierarchical, collaborative and flat structures. This view received a welter of criticism (see, for example: Leitner and Sheppard, 2002; Grabher, 2006), for it overlooked the power relations that emerge in a network as well as networks’ tendency to reproduce rather than contest inequities among their entities. Conversely, recent ANT accounts, while still supporting the idea of flat ontology, interpret it differently. For instance, Latour (2005, p.176) opposes the earliest understanding of the world/networks as non-hierarchal and flat, and asserts that adopting a flat ontology does not mean that hierarchies do not exist; it ‘simply [means] that if you wish to go from one site to another, then you have to pay the full cost of relation, connection, displacement, and information’. He further states that:

flattening does not mean that the world of [actors-networks] has been flattened out. Quite the contrary, they have been given enough space to deploy their own contradictory gerunds: scaling, zooming, embedding, ‘panoraming’, individualising, and so on. The metaphor of the flatland was simply a way for the ANT observers to clearly distinguish their job from the labour of those they follow around. (Latour, 2005, p.220)

That is to say, once again, that Latour does not reject the idea of power hierarchies, and to ‘flatten’, for him, is to ‘untangle’ all the relations, connections, displacements and information, and to avoid the pitfalls of any pre-existing theory’s presumptions/findings through following the actors themselves and learning from them, and their experiences.

The question of whether ANT is a theory or a method is contentious. Both Callon and Latour assert that ANT is not a theory but a method. Callon states that ‘we never claimed to create a theory. In ANT the T is too much’ (Callon, 1999, p.194). In the same vein, Latour concurs that ANT ‘was never meant to be a theory of what the social [world] is made of [but] simply another way of being faithful to the insights of ethnomethodology’ (Latour, 1999, p.19). Similarly, Law (2006, p.5) notes that ANT should be thought of not as a theory, but as a ‘set of methodological sensibilities’ or a ‘toolkit’. Nevertheless, one would find that both theory and method are loosely and interchangeably used in most of the ANT literature, with no definite distinction. However, Law and Callon’s (1988, passim) study of a British military

---

28 In reassembling the social, for instance, Latour describes ANT, in one page, both as a theory and a method. He states that ANT is ‘a theory, and a strong one I think’. He then states that ‘ANT is a method, and mostly a negative one (...); it says nothing about the shape of what is being described with it’ (Latour, 2005, p.142, italics in original).
aircraft project sheds some light on the indistinct difference between theory and method. They argue that both the social and technical aspects of an engineer’s work are concurrently fashioned by each other, and hence the two are inseparable. The study thus attempts to demonstrate the interrelation between the social and technical; hence, the methodological principle was guided by this theoretical consideration, which alternatively means that the two aspects (social and technical) are part of both the theoretical and the methodological. One wonders here if the theoretical prediction emerged first, leading to Law and Callon’s methodological finding that the social and technical are intertwined. If so, this may be taken to suggest that two of the main founders of ANT have fallen prey to that which they (and hence ANT) warn and stand against: having a pre-existing theoretical framework upon which their methodology rests—which in turn undermines ANT’s credibility (see Dudhwala, 2015, p.8).

A significant aspect of ANT is that although it emerged from techno-scientific studies (as outlined above), its application extends to a wide array of fields within humanities and social sciences. This includes the field of translation studies. While it is not entirely applicable to translation studies, ANT does provide valuable ideas that, when tailored to the study of translation, could potentially lead to new insights into and an alternative understanding of translation practices. Hence, these ideas could open up new avenues in translation research (for examples thereof, see Chesterman, 2006, p.22; Wolf, 2007a, p.24; Tyulenev, 2014, p.167). As far as translation studies is concerned, ANT has been applied to a number of studies. This application has mainly been in tandem with or supplementary to another sociological approach, especially that of Bourdieu, and seldom on its own—which suggests that ANT is not (yet) a fully-fledged theory (see for example, Buzelin, 2005, 2007; Córdoba Serrano, 2007; Bogic, 2009, 2010; Hekkanen, 2009; Kung, 2009; Jones, 2009, 2011; Haddadian-Moghaddam, 2012, 2014; Abdallah, 2012, 2014; Walker, 2014, 2015).

For an overview of other network theories that have been applied to translation, see Folaron and Buzelin (2007).
Pym (2010), for instance, speaks of possible connections between ANT and Homi Bhabha’s ‘third space’ theory (see also, Wolf, 2000, 2007b, 2008). Although ANT and Bourdieu’s sociology do make use of some seemingly similar ideas, it is noteworthy here that Latour finds the two approaches ‘completely incompatible’ (Latour, 2005, p.155). This could be interpreted as a priori existing power relations in the field of sociology: a struggle for proving oneself and maintaining one’s place. For discussions of the (in)compatibility of ANT and Bourdieu’s sociology, see for instance, Albertsen and Diken (2003), Inghilleri (2005a), Buzelin (2005), and Hekkanen (2009).
ANT has attracted a welter of criticism on a number of grounds. The first is the idea of ‘symmetry’ between human and nonhuman actors. The crux of the criticism is that ANT examines both human and nonhuman actors (animate and inanimate) through the same lens, refuses to make any analytical distinction between them, and invites one to treat all actors from an equal starting point on the assumption that they have equivalent agency and value. The idea is inapplicable in its entirety in the field of translation. This is because human actors (unlike nonhumans) have intent and this human intention can, for instance, impact the process of translation and, hence, translatorial networks and their construction. ANT does not take this idea into consideration. This study maintains that a translation activity can be affected by an external nonhuman (f)actor; however, in opposition to ANT, it does not elevate the pro-active significance of nonhuman translatorial actors to that of humans. Moreover, it is the understanding of this study that human action or agency is enabled by various kinds of platforms, technologies, institutions and social relations, and is contingent on the internal and external factors that condition it.

In addition, ANT comes with a built-in disadvantage—as remarked by Latour himself. He stated that ANT ‘is a powerful tool to destroy spheres and domains, to regain the sense of heterogeneity and to bring interobjectivity back into the centre of attention’; however, ‘it is an extremely bad tool for differentiating associations’ (Latour, 1996a, p.380). This means that ANT is perhaps inept at explaining the differences between various types of assemblages/network connections. Moreover, although ANT is a useful tool for tracing associations, it is not a particularly good one for tracing practices of representation. According to Couldry (2008, p.166), for instance, ‘ANT has no tools to help us to separate good representations of “society” or “world order” from bad ones, no tools to grasp how certain representations and claims about our world have a particular rhetorical and emotional hold on us’. Nevertheless, and since an act of translation (as a social, cultural or

32 A case in point here is when the American University in Cairo Press (AUCP) was forced to forge partnerships with other publishers in the United States and the United Kingdom because it did not possess the means (printing machines) to produce books. Printing machines here could be thought of as a nonhuman external factor that affected the translation production of Arabic fiction into English. However, although this is the reason, printing machines did not exercise any form of agency represented in forging the partnerships themselves. It was the AUCP (i.e. the human agents running the AUCP, to be more precise), who did (see Khalifa and Elgindy, 2014, p.50; see also section 4.4.6.3).
33 Although a translation institution or a publishing house could be thought of as nonhuman actors, it is the understanding of this study that any translation institution or publishing house and their decision-making processes are primarily driven by humans, as explained in the above footnote.
linguistic transfer) could be thought of as an act of representation (of a society, culture or language in another), ANT cannot in turn provide a thorough account of translation as a social practice (the primary purpose of this study); affected by and affecting the social world. Consequently, it cannot interpret the plethora of representations that translation entails or generates. This is another reason, given the nature of this study, for not adopting ANT as its framework.

Additionally, Latour maintains that power, as in the case of society, ‘is the final result of a process and not a reservoir, a stock, or a capital (...). Power and domination have to be produced, made up, composed’ (Latour, 2005, p.64, my italics). Nevertheless, I argue that power is not merely the outcome of a process, as Latour avers, but an ongoing and ever-expanding process in itself. This is because for one to produce, make up or compose anything, one needs a reservoir, a stock or capital on which to base it. The process of “translation”—defined in ANT as the set of ‘negotiations, intrigues, calculations, acts of persuasion and violence, thanks to which an actor or force takes, or causes to be conferred on itself, authority to speak or act on behalf of another actor or force’ (Callon and Latour, 1981, p.279)—is a case in point here. As explained above, the process of “translation” entails four main moments. During the first moment of the process (problematisation), the focal actor/OPP formulates his/her/its/their problem based on a certain form of power (i.e. knowledge, intellect, or interest) that he/she/it/they (assumes/assume to) has/have. Then he/she/it/they uses/use the power of persuasion to convince other actors to join their network. Then, during the moment of enrolment, the OPP’s exercise of power becomes very evident in the selection process, whereby they choose who and who not to include in the network. In the last moment of “translation” (mobilisation), the actors who have successfully joined act at the behest of the OPP to stabilise the network. This is another sign of the existence of unbalanced power relations in networks. All of this is before the final result of the process of “translation”, which culminates in appointing the OPP as a spokesperson for all other intermediary actors in the network. This, I argue, is the final acknowledgment of his/her/its/their power exercised and manifest throughout the process. This means that ANT falls short of identifying and accounting for sources of power i.e. from where they originate and from what they are made.

Similarly, translation ‘in the linguistic sense of the word’, according to ANT, ‘means that one
version translates every other, acquiring a sort of hegemony\(^{35}\) (...) that forces all the others to follow them’ (Latour, 1987, p.121, my italics). Since hegemony/authority (although potentially temporary and malleable) is the dominance or exercise of power of one group (or more) over another, this insinuates that, although ANT purports the non-existence of any \textit{a priori} power and criticises the classical sociologies of the social (like that of Bourdieu) for assuming the existence of unequal power relations at face value, it accepts (at least in part) the presence of disproportionate power relations along the chain of the network/social world and also takes them for granted. We can infer from this that, in opposition to what ANT claims, social relations are structurally defined, that power is a crucial part of any social interaction, and that at the core of the social world lies hierarchy, hegemony and unbalanced distribution of power. Since ANT does not take a \textit{conscious} account of unequal power relations and claims to be against social asymmetry (although tacitly using it to define one of its main concepts) and since unbalanced power relations are evident in the activity of translating modern Arabic fiction into English (see chapters four and five for examples thereof), ANT does not seem to be the perfect framework from which this study should draw.

In addition, ANT insists that the social world is not to be postulated and that it is \textit{only} visible ‘by the \textit{traces} it leaves (under trials) when a \textit{new} association is being produced between elements which themselves are in no way “social”’ (Latour, 2005, p.8, italics in original). One could deduce from Latour’s words that an ANT analysis lacks historical depth, for its primary goal is to define and describe the formation of fluid associations/assemblages that are bounded only by the moment-linked properties of non-social entities. This means that, in the context of translation studies, ANT is beneficial for studying translations ‘in the making’ (Buzelin, 2007); that is mapping out ongoing translation projects only. Since part of this study attempts to examine the long-term socio-historical processes that led to the emergence and evolution of a translation activity of Arabic fiction into English from a historical perspective, historical analysis is of the utmost importance and hence the use of ANT does not seem plausible in this case.

One last point here is that ANT’s motto has always been ‘to follow the actors’ (Latour, 2005, p.12) and it purports that ‘one must first describe the network’ before establishing diagnoses or making decisions (Latour, 1991, p.130). Beside the possibility of falling into the

\(^{35}\) How and why they acquired hegemony is not accounted for in Latour’s definition or ANT altogether.
trap of using the network as an object rather than a method of study, following actors and describing networks (as indicated by Latour) is a slow and long process, and hence a seemingly endless one. This in turn leaves little (or no) room for diagnosis, analysis and/or drawing conclusions. I, therefore, agree with Leach (2015) that:

There needs to be some point at which it is decided that the network is sufficiently described, but (...) how might we manage to designate such a point while remaining within the network and not imposing some limit from an external perspective?

It is not the concern of this study to address whether there is an answer to this question or not. However, based on the above, it is fair to say that, despite its merits, ANT is not the most suited framework to aid the analysis of this study.

At present, it is the belief of this study that Bourdieu’s sociology (despite the shortcomings of some of its concepts, which will be explored and critiqued below—see section 3.6.2) holds more potential for guiding an investigation of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a socially regulated activity than both Luhmann’s SST and Latour’s ANT. The relational nature of Bourdieu’s sociology allows for a better understanding of the relational nature of any social interaction and hence facilitates a clearer interpretation of the complex dynamics of cultural production, i.e. the process(es) of preparing and producing any cultural product, translation included.

2.5 Concluding remarks

This chapter has provided a brief introduction regarding the shift towards sociology in translation studies, and has outlined the sociological research strands available in the field. It has also investigated the main sociological models that have been used and have been proven fruitful in the field, providing the rationale for not adopting them to guide the analysis of this study. The chapter concluded that Bourdieu’s sociology is the best suited framework for studying the socio-cultural determinants governing the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English. In the chapter that follows, a more detailed rationale for the choice of Bourdieu’s sociological model will be provided, and his relational concepts will be thoroughly explored and critiqued.
CHAPTER THREE: PIERRE BOURDIEU’S SOCIOLOGY

3.1 Initial remarks

The aim of this chapter is to critically explore Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of cultural production, with a view of developing a methodology for the study of modern Arabic fiction translation in English as a socially situated activity. The chapter will first briefly introduce the bedrock of Bourdieu’s sociology and the way his social circumstances and the socio-political factors in post-war France contributed to the development of his intellectual ideas and theories, as well as looking at the way he developed his sociology to reconcile some of the dichotomies prevalent during his time. Bourdieu’s concepts of field, capital, habitus and other interrelated concepts, will then be thoroughly examined and critically discussed against the backdrop of their application in translation studies. The chapter will then move on to discuss the way Bourdieu’s theory filtered through into the field of translation, and the validity of its application in the translation field in general and modern Arabic fiction in English translation in particular. Examples will be drawn from the modern Arabic fiction translation context, as well as from other studies of translation and interpreting, to aid the understanding of Bourdieu’s theory. These examples will also serve to highlight the inadequacy of some of Bourdieu’s concepts in terms of accounting for certain translation phenomena, thus stressing the need to critically evaluate the implications of his work for the study of translation.

3.2 The foundation of Bourdieu’s sociology

In order to understand the specificity of Bourdieu’s work, it is instructive to shed some light on his social background and how ‘his modest origins made him particularly sensitive to issues of power and prestige in France, shaping his research interests, social activism and defence of the underprivileged’ (Reed-Danahay, 2004, p.162). Born in 1930 in Denguin, a small village in the region of Béarn in southwest France, to a modest family with peasant roots, Pierre Bourdieu spent his childhood in a rural milieu. At the age of 11, he moved to the neighbouring urban city, of Pau, to attend the Lycée de Pau, a public secondary school, as a boarding school\(^1\) student (Grenfell, 2004, p.8). During this period, Bourdieu’s everyday life was characterised by persistent struggle for survival to ‘secure one’s due, keep one’s place, and defend one’s share (…) arrive on time, win respect, always ready to exchange blows, in a word, to survive’ (Bourdieu, 2008, pp.92–93, my italics). Class racism was

\(^1\) Residential or intern school.
prevalent at the boarding school and the interaction between teachers and pupils was
defined in terms of physical appearance, names and attire rather than intellectual qualities
(Bourdieu, 2008, pp.98–99). This was an important milestone in Bourdieu’s life as it ‘marked
him and predisposed him to get involved in struggles and polemics’ (Reed-Danahay, 2004,
p.31). In Bourdieu’s own words, it formed in him a ‘cleft habitus inhabited by tensions and
contradictions’ (Bourdieu, 2008, p.100, italics in original). The struggles and ‘social
estrangement’ Bourdieu encountered at the boarding school and his experience of being
the ‘other’ there enveloped his existence and nurtured within him an anti-establishment
sentiment represented in ‘longing for vengeance’ against the Parisian intellectual world
(Bourdieu, 2008, p.93). These struggles seem to have also been instrumental in fashioning
his disposition towards understanding the social world and ongoing struggles taking place
within it between various agents as ultimate means to gain and maintain power, legitimacy
and hegemony.

Bourdieu’s intellectual ability allowed him to be admitted to the Lycée Louis-Le-Grand in
Paris when he was 16, and then to the esteemed École Normale Supérieure, an elite teacher-
training institution, where he studied philosophy and graduated in 1955 despite refusing to
complete his thesis as a reaction against the authoritarian nature of education offered by
the institution (Wolfreys, 2000). During these formative years, Bourdieu was mainly
influenced by two dominant, yet opposing, schools of thought in post-war France. These
primarily aimed at describing human experience and behaviour, on the one hand, and the
social construction of reality, on the other; namely, Claude Levi-Strauss’s structuralism and
Jean-Paul Sartre’s existentialism respectively. This later formed the basis of Bourdieu’s
sociological view on the phenomenological subjectivism/structural objectivism dichotomy
as will be explained below. In 1956, after a year of teaching in a high school in Moulins,
Bourdieu was conscripted into the French army and was deployed to Algeria for his two-
year army service despite his opposition to France’s colonial occupation. After finishing his
conscription, Bourdieu returned voluntarily to Algeria for another two years (1958–1960) to
teach and conduct ethnographical fieldwork. Like the boarding school, the Algeria
experience had a significant impact on Bourdieu’s growth as an intellectual as it formed the
basis for his later-to-be-refined analytical concepts and theoretical framework, when his
interest changed from philosophy to anthropology and sociology, and provided the material
for many of his studies (Wacquant, 2004, p.389). That is to say, Bourdieu’s childhood
experiences have lain the foundation of defining his intellectual thought and
‘epistemological experiment’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.59) on colonial Algeria’s Kabyle society paved the way for the development and optimisation of his entire scientific output.

Bourdieu has contributed significantly to and has had a substantial influence on the field of sociology through his work on practice, structure and dynamics of cultural production. His research in Algeria resulted in the publication of his book *Sociologie de L’Algerie*. That was followed by voluminous ground-breaking publications covering a wide range of issues including the theory of sociology, the sociology of education and sociology of aesthetics focusing mainly on French art and culture. Thanks to its critical and relational nature, Bourdieu’s sociology nowadays enjoys a widespread application in disciplines ranging from medicine, business and music to media, cultural studies and, of course, translation. It thus seems indubitable that its influence will continue to expand for years to come.

Bourdieu developed his sociology to transcend the traditional sociological dichotomies that have long dominated the field of sociology as micro and macro analysis of social realities, synchrony and diachrony as well as the classic objectivist and subjectivist modes of thought. He perceived these dualities of explaining social phenomena as restrictive, biased and inadequate of explaining social life and hence argued that they ‘must be overcome’ (Wacquant, 2007, p.266). Indeed, he states that ‘I can say that all of my thinking started from this point: how can behaviour be regulated without being the product of obedience to rules?’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.65). Social world/life in the Bourdieusian sense ‘must be understood in terms that do justice both to objective material, social, and cultural structures and to the constituting practices and experiences of individuals and groups’ (Postone et al., 1993, p.3). Hence, Bourdieu’s sociology should be thought of as being, ‘monist or resolutely *anti-dualistic*’ and authentically *synthetic*’ (Wacquant, 2007, p.264, italics in original) in the sense of rejecting the exclusivist approach inherent in the binary oppositions prevalent at his time; especially that of subjectivism and objectivism. Bourdieu remarks that

> Of all the oppositions that artificially divide social science, the most fundamental, and the most ruinous, is the one that is set up between subjectivism and objectivism. The very fact that this division constantly reappears in virtually the same form would suffice to indicate that the modes of knowledge which it distinguishes are equally indispensable to a science of the social world. (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.25)

Central to this discussion is Bourdieu’s challenge to the abstract logic of the existentialist and structuralist oriented schools of thought; which are instantiations of the classic
subjectivist and objectivist dichotomies respectively. Although Bourdieu drew inspiration from both existentialism and structuralism, he avoided adopting them wholesale and was critical of many of their aspects too arguing that ‘they have social foundation, but they have no scientific foundation’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.34). He clearly denounced the ‘absurd opposition’ between society and individual that dominated the structure of the majority of social sciences approaches with regards to the analysis of the social world (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.31).

He rejects the structuralist ahistorical, mechanical and deterministic view of social life, primarily that of Lévi-Strauss, which seeks to examine social realities synchronically in terms of deep static set of structures of relations and forces which obtrude themselves upon the agent. Bourdieu criticises structuralism for perceiving ‘the social world as a universe of objective regularities independent of the agents and constituted from the standpoint of an impartial observer who is outside the action, looking down from above on the world he observes’ (Bourdieu, 1993b, p.56) and for overlooking the social conditions that govern the social world and generate social practices. He also argues that ‘action is not the mere carrying out of a rule, or obedience to a rule. Social agents (...) are not automata regulated like clocks, in accordance with laws they do not understand’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.9). That is, in Bourdieu’s view, in contrast to structuralism, human agents cannot be reduced to passive entities whose practices are, in some way, produced and reproduced by structures within the social world (Bourdieu, 1993b, p.56). In other words, for Bourdieu, structuralism symbolised ‘the death of the subject’.

Bourdieu is also critical of the existentialist assumption, mainly advocated by Sartre, that social realities can only be explained on the basis of human conscious and in light of agents’ free will and choices which define how they interact with one another. According to Bourdieu, Sartre construes the world of action as ‘nothing other than this universe of interchangeable possibles, entirely dependent on the decrees of the consciousness which creates it and hence totally devoid of objectivity’ (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.42, my italics). That is, existentialism holds that the universe has no purpose or value and indicates an unbridgeable gulf between humans and the world they inhabit. For Sartre (1947, p.27), humans are ‘condemned to be free’ for once condemned to exist in the world they are responsible for their choices and their entire existence; regardless of any external factors or powers. He maintains that the first principle of existentialism is ‘Man is nothing else but what he makes
of himself’ (Sartre, 1947, p.18). Such a substantial subjective understanding of the social world, for Bourdieu, reduces social structures to ‘the mere aggregate of individual strategies and acts of classification’ (Wacquant, 1992, p.9) and thus overlooks the objective social structures that ‘these strategies perpetuate or challenge’ (Wacquant, 1992, p.10).

It is through his theory of practice, especially its core interrelated concepts of field, habitus and capital, that Bourdieu attempts to overcome the objective and subjective polarisations and provides an alternative capable of relating and accounting for the interactions between the subjective individual dispositions and actions of human agents, and the objective social sphere within which they operate. For Bourdieu, the function of sociology is to unmask the deeply buried structures of the various social worlds that constitute the social universe and the dynamics that aim to secure their reproduction or alteration (Bourdieu, 1989, pp.16–18; see also Wacquant, 1992, p.7). While the objective reading or ‘social physics’ (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.27), enables scholars to grasp from the outside (Wacquant, 1992, p.7), to examine the social world as observers who reconstruct and interpret reality independently from the representations of those who exist in it, the subjective reading or ‘social phenomenology’ (Wacquant, 1992, p.9) allows social scientists to perceive the social world as the product of the decision, action and cognition of the conscious, alerting agents to whom the world is given as recognisable and meaningful. Practice for Bourdieu is thus neither the produce of totally conscious or unconscious processes (Jenkins, 1992, p.72). He, therefore, calls for a ‘double reading’ of social reality, which comprises both the subjective and objective. In Bourdieu’s words, it ‘is this double truth, objective and subjective, which constitutes the whole truth of the social world’ (Bourdieu, 1992, p.255, italics in original). In other words, it is double truth that allows for capturing the intricate subjective and objective reality of the social world. That said, Bourdieu’s conceptual tools can be said to be the most capable of unmasking the patterns of rationality that underlie all processes of translation; a rationality that neither subjectivist nor objectivist.

It is essential to note here that Bourdieu’s sociology proposes and stresses the importance of objectifying the objective, or ‘reflexive sociology’ as he calls it (see Bourdieu, 1990b, passim; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, passim); which aims at ‘increasing the scope and solidity of social scientific knowledge’ (Wacquant, 1992, p.37) in order to attain ‘a self-analysis of the sociologist as cultural producer and a reflection on the sociohistorical conditions of the possibility of a science of society’ (Wacquant, 1992, p.36). What distinguish
Bourdieu’s ideas on self-reflexivity from other sociological forms of reflexivity, according to Wacquant, are three main aspects:

First, its primary target is not the individual analyst but the social and intellectual unconscious embedded in analytic tools and operations; second, it must be collective enterprise rather than the burden of the lone academic; and, third, it seems not to assault but to buttress the epistemological security of sociology. (Wacquant, 1992, p.36, italics in original)

Bourdieu was very attentive to the encounter between the observed and the observer (Inghilleri, 2005a, p.137) and hence was his emphasis that social scientists must be mindful of their own biases which may distort their socio-analytical gaze (Wacquant, 1992, p.39). He argues that they must be aware of the implicit conditions and structures of their social practices and adopt ‘a sociology of sociology’ so as to preclude the occurrence of what he describes as ‘the most serious epistemological mistake in the human sciences’ (Bourdieu, 1998a, p.133). That is to say, for Bourdieu, unless agents challenge the historically constructed structures that limit them and their social practices, they are very likely to remain ‘the apparent subjects of actions which have the structure as subject’ (Wacquant, 1992, p.49). It is reflexive practice that makes agents to become aware of these structures that inhibit them by ‘uncovering the social at the heart of the individual, the impersonal beneath the intimate, the universal buried deep within the most particular’ (Wacquant, 1992, p.44). That said, Bourdieu’s reflexivity can thus help researchers gain a better understanding of the reality of social practices and their articulation. It is through his theory of practice that Bourdieu provides an alternative to the binary schools of thoughts that plagued much of social theory—an alternative which takes account of the external forces that fashion behaviours and attitudes (objectivity) as well as agents’ actions and perceptions of the world (subjectivity). His theory introduced a number of concepts into the lexicon of sociology and which could be thought of as cross-disciplinary in nature. The main concepts of Bourdieu’s intellectual enterprise will be discussed in details in sections 3.3–3.5.

3.3 Bourdieu’s concept of field

Bourdieu does not view the social world as an autonomous objective structure that is independent of human action/thought. Rather, he perceives it as a subjectively constructed structure of objective relations between positions occupied by agents who define its dynamics through their discursive (i.e. individual and collective) practices and dispositions. He states that ‘what exist in the social world are relations—not interactions between agents
or intersubjective ties between individuals, but objective relations which exist “independently of individual consciousness and will” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.97). Bourdieu’s concept of field was devised to grasp this relational character of social reality and explain the driving factors behind agents’ actions and behaviours. The concept could, therefore, be thought of as an attempt to overcome both the existential and structural understandings of social phenomena. Bourdieu states that:

The notion of field allows us to bypass the opposition between internal reading and external analysis without losing any of the benefits and exigencies of these two approaches which are traditionally perceived as irreconcilable. (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.205, my italics)

Bourdieu’s field could be defined as a boundaried socially organised, semi-autonomous and ‘multi-dimensional space of positions’ (Bourdieu, 1991b, pp.230–231). Although fields are relatively autonomous, they are also structurally homologous with other fields (Bourdieu, 1988a, p.136). Within a field, there exists social agents (i.e. individuals, groups or institutions) who acknowledge and refer to its history and define its structure. Each agent holds a position within a field and compete over maintaining or improving their positions by preserving or modifying the existing distribution of stakes and resources in it. Social agents, according to Bourdieu, ‘are not automata regulated like clocks, in accordance with laws they do not understand’, but rather they are acting agents who ‘put into action the incorporated principles of a generative habitus’ (i.e. the dispositions they have ‘acquired through experience’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.9, italics in original; see section 3.5 for a detailed analysis Bourdieu’s habitus). In this section, Bourdieu’s conception of field will be thoroughly discussed and appraised in order to explore the extent to which it could be utilised in investigating modern Arabic fiction translations into English as a historically constituted, socially situated activity that represents a field in its own right.

A field can be analytically defined as ‘a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.97). However, ‘[e]ach position is objectively defined by its objective relationship with other positions’ (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.231). To be a literary translator, for instance, is to inhabit a position in a field like that of

---

² Bourdieu provides some examples of these positions: ‘for example, the position corresponding to a genre like the novel or to a subcategory like the society novel, or from another point of view, the position locating a review, a salon, or a circle as the gathering place of a group of producers’ (Bourdieu, 1996a. p.231). For full account of available positions in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, see section 5.3.4.
world literature in translation. That in turn means that one’s position as a literary translator is objectively related to and defined by the positions of other agents: international authors, publishers, editors, literary critics, readers, and the like. Since each agent that occupies a position in the field is allocated a certain amount and form of capital (i.e. the product of competition between agents which define their position in the field—see section 3.4 for a full discussion on Bourdieu’s capital), they employ strategies to maintain or enhance their position. There is, therefore, a constant state of competition or struggle for power/recognition at the heart of any field’s structure. Bourdieu asserts that any field of cultural production:

is a field of forces, but it is also a field of struggles tending to transform or conserve this field of forces. The network of objective relations between positions subtends and orients the strategies which the occupants of the different positions implement in their struggles to defend or improve their positions. (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.30, italics in original)

Furthermore, Bourdieu likens fields to field-games. However, he stresses that unlike games, fields are ‘not the product of a deliberate act of creation’ and that the rules or regularities they follow are not explicitly codified (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.98). Thomson (2008, pp.68–69) elaborates on Bourdieu’s analogy by providing an example of a football field. A football pitch, like a field, is an arena with defined boundaries where a game takes place. Playing a game requires having players, who invest in the game and stand in predetermined places on opposing teams (sometimes with great ferocity that escapes questioning, depending on their ‘belief’ in the game). It is necessary that players, especially novice ones, are aware in advance of the rules of the game, and possess the required skills to take part in it. Rules of the game become tacit over time and hence ‘taken for granted’ assumptions are embedded within a game. The referee, for instance, does not have to start each game by explaining the rules etc. Each player in the game is assigned a semi-autonomous position with relative value which changes with each game, especially in relation to other players in the field. Once a game is under way, all players are tacitly in agreement, ipso facto, just by participating in the game, that it is worth playing. Rules of the game, available positions on the football pitch in relation to player’s defined positions, players’ skills as well as the condition of the field itself, shape and inform where players can and cannot go and what

---

3 See section 3.3.5 for more information on Bourdieu’s concept of illusio.
4 See section 3.3.4 for a detailed discussion of doxa.
they can and cannot do in the game. Both the field and players' actions can thus be perceived as interdependent. The similarity between a football field and a social field is clearly evident. Like a football field, a social field encompasses social positions, which are occupied and manipulated by social agents, who could be individuals, organisations or institutions. That is, what can be done in a social field is determined and regulated by its boundaries and conditions, its rules of participation as well as the agents involved and their positions in it.

Fields proliferate and within them emerge subfields (Swartz, 1997, p.122). Fields and subfields do not operate in isolation but rather in relation to, and interconnection with, other social fields as well as their own unique historical development. Within a field, there exists a specific logic of practice which determines its rules and regularities. Agents act within a field in light of their knowledge and understanding of these rules and regularities. Agents’ struggle and manoeuvre in pursuit of desirable resources/capital, which generate the dynamics and delineate the boundaries of any social field. Agents’ actions and decisions are influenced in part by the amount and type of capital they possess (and seek) in a field. Unequal distribution of power between agents pervade all relations that take place across social fields. Seen in this light, Bourdieu’s concept of field is to be understood as premised on the idea of hierarchal power relations and struggle between agents over ‘stakes’ and ‘capital’, which may be field-specific or generic, and that

The existence of specialised and relatively autonomous field is correlative with the existence of specific stakes and interests: via the inseparably economic and psychological investments that they arouse in the agents endowed with a certain habitus, the field and its stakes (themselves produced as such by relations of power and struggle in order to transform the power relations that are constitutive of the field) produce investments of time, money and work, etc. (...) In other words, interest is at once a condition of the functioning of a field (...), in so far as it is what ‘gets people moving’, what makes them get together, compete and struggle with each other, and a product of the way the field functions. (Bourdieu, 1990b, pp.87–88)

By way of illustration, an agent (e.g. translator or publisher) in the literary translation field may choose to translate specific literary texts and decide not to translate others depending on the amount and form of capital gains expected from the translation. For example, following the success of its translations of some modern Arabic literary texts, which were included in its African Writers Series, the British publisher, Heinemann Educational Books, on recommendation by translator Denys Johnson-Davies, made a decision in the 1970s to
translate more Arabic literary texts and established a new *Arab Authors Series*. However, after a take-over of the publishing house in the late 1980s, and given that the *Arab Authors Series* ‘did not match the commercial success of the African series’, the new owners decided to discontinue publishing the *Arab Authors Series* (Clark, 2000, p.11). Furthermore, Heinemann cited the lack of market success and profit (that is, economic capital) as reasons for suspending the Series (Tresilian, 2010). As such, the decision of what and what not to translate was not based on the works’ literary value and merit but rather on their anticipated economic yield (see section 4.4.3 for a detailed analysis of this case).

Fields are founded on a ‘historically generated system of shared meaning [and] historically embedded social contexts’ (Iellatchitch et al., 2003, p.732). Bourdieu explains that they are ‘historically constituted areas of activity with their specific institutions and their own laws of functioning’ (1990b, p.87). Examining a field, for Bourdieu (2005a, p.5), does not only entail investigating the relational historical contexts in which its practices took place, but also looking at its inherent history, (e.g. agents involved and their social dispositions) and practices conditioned by it. Bourdieu (1993b) offers a guide for identifying fields and their properties: how they work, as well as the laws conditioning their existence and functioning. Therein, Bourdieu (1993b, pp.72–77) summarises a number of elements that could be broken down into three field-identification features and four descriptors of a field’s mechanisms.

With regards to the field indicators, on the one hand, Bourdieu speaks of the following:

1- A solid indication of the existence of a field is the emergence of biographers as well as literature and art historians whose job is to conserve a field’s history, and what is produced in it. These ‘conservators of lives’ have enough knowledge of the field’s history to ensure the preservation and consecration of both its producers and products as well as their (i.e. conservatives of lives’) own self-preservation.

2- Another solid indication of the existence of a field is when it is no longer possible to understand a work and its value without prior knowledge of the history of its original field of production.

3- An indication that a field is functioning is when one starts tracing the history of that field in its agents’ works and lives.

As for the four descriptors of a field mechanisms, on the other hand, they are as follows:
1- It is power relations among agents or institutions engaged in the struggle over preserving or expanding their capital resources in a field that determine its structure.

2- Dominant agents in a field more or less completely monopolise its capital resources, and employ ‘conservative’ strategies to defend orthodoxy; whereas newcomers, generally employ ‘subversive’ strategies, the strategies of heresy, creating new heterodox positions in the field.

3- For a field to function, there has to be capital resources at stake and agents prepared to take part in the struggle over them. These agents should necessarily be endowed with the kind of habitus that indicates their knowledge and understanding of the field’s immanent laws and stakes etc.

4- Agents in a field share some fundamental interests and hence, under all the antagonisms between them, lies an objective complicity. By accepting to be part of a field all agents tacitly agree to be part of the struggle over what is at stake in the field. Moreover, new agents implicitly agree to pay an admission fee to the field, represented by investing time and effort in it, and having practical knowledge of its principles and laws of functioning. They also tacitly agree to abide by the regulations and mores of the field and keep their field-subversion strategies to a certain limit, if they are not to incur exclusion from the field. That is because a total abrupt challenge of a field’s principles could destroy not only the dominant agents, but also the field itself.

For a sociological study of an intellectual field to take full meaning in the Bourdieusian sense, it has to encompass the concrete totality of the relations which constitute it. This is achieved by making known the historic and social conditions which make the existence of any intellectual field possible and which define the limits of validity of the study of the state of this field (Bourdieu, 1969, p.95). In another study, Bourdieu argues that to construct a field appropriately, one must carry out three necessary steps: (1) ‘analyse the position of the field vis-à-vis the field of power’; (2) ‘map out the objective structure of the relations between the positions occupied by the agents or institutions who compete for the legitimate form of specific authority [i.e. capital resources]’; and (3) ‘analyse the habitus of agents (…) which find in a definite trajectory within the field under consideration a more or less favourable opportunity to become actualised’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pp.104–105). One’s only chance to unmake and remake a field is through having ‘a realistic knowledge of what it is’
(that is, its social history) and ‘what they [i.e. agents] can do to it by virtue of the position they occupy in it’ (Bourdieu, 1991b, p.242).

### 3.3.1 Dynamics of the field: Positions and position-takings

Bourdieu’s concept of field is at the heart of his relational sociology. A field, as explained earlier, is a space of positions occupied by social agents who compete to maintain or expand their positions. In response to available positions in a field, a range of practices or strategies (choices, decisions and stances) to be made by agents of the field arise. Bourdieu calls this *position-takings*, which he defines as ‘the structured set of the manifestations of the social agents involved in the field’ (Bourdieu, 1983, p.312). That is, the strategies which agents ‘implement in their struggles to defend or improve their positions’ in response to the constantly changing social conditions surrounding a field’s activities (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.30).

For example, a position within the literary or artistic field, on the one hand, is a role, (ful)filled by individuals, groups, institutions or organisations, and each role is defined by possession of a determinate quantity of a particular form of capital. Position-takings, on the other hand, are the manifestations that literary or artistic agents apply as a defence of their respective positions. Position-takings arise quasi-mechanically from the relationship between agents. That is, to use Bourdieu’s own words, they emerge ‘almost independently of the agents’ consciousness and wills’ and hence ‘take relatively invariant forms’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.59). Position-takings can manifest themselves in a number of forms including, ‘literary or artistic works, (...) political acts or pronouncements, manifestos or polemics, etc.’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.30). Position-takings are, therefore, the works, strategies, discourses or stances employed by social agents in their attempt to adjust the balance of power in a field.

It is important to note, however, that the space of existing positions and the space of position-takings within a field, according to Bourdieu, are indivisible (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.30). That is because the space of positions can only be explored in relation to its embodiment in agents’ works, stances and discourses, and the space of position-takings, or agents’ strategies, are governed by the space of available positions.

Every position-taking is defined objectively—and at times intentionally—by the range of options or possibilities available to social agents in a field. This in turn means that even if a position remains unchanged in a field, a certain position-taking, its meaning and value, may change in response to any change in the space of options that are simultaneously presented to producers and/or consumers to choose from (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.30; see also Bourdieu,
That is, as Bourdieu puts it, the ‘meaning of a work (artistic, literary, philosophical, etc.) changes automatically with each change in the field within which it is situated for the spectator or reader’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, pp.30–31). For Bourdieu, position-taking occurs at two levels: both within and between fields. This means that social agents ‘secure recognition for themselves within the assumptions of one field, but they also “trade” that recognition for recognition within a different field altogether’ (Robbins, 2000, xiv).

The dynamics of any field (how it changes with time or in response to internal or external factors that affect other fields which it interconnects with) are determined by the positions and position-takings of its agents, be they individuals or institutions, and are in a constant state of change. Changes in both positions and position-takings are the result of the struggle among social agents in a field over various forms of capital, which is the generative principle conditioning fields’ existence (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.232). These struggles are themselves governed not only by the structure and volume of an agents’ capital, but also by their dispositions and social trajectory, that is, their habitus.

It is important to note that it is usually newcomers to a field that create change in the available positions in it and which also give rise to new positions. This is achieved by their struggle to impose ‘new modes of thought and expression’ in an attempt to ‘assert their difference, get it known and recognised [and] “make a name for themselves”’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.58). This prompts a restructure in the hierarchy of positions and position-takings in a field. Bourdieu asserts that:

> When a new literary or artistic group imposes itself on the field, the whole space of positions and the space of corresponding possibilities (...) find themselves transformed because of it: with its accession to existence, that is, to difference, the universe of possible options finds itself modified, with formerly dominant productions, for example, being downgraded to the status of an outmoded or classical product. (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.234)

That is to say, any re-hierarchisation attempt in a field presents itself in a form of struggle between two main factions: proponents of the field’s autonomy and advocates of its heteronomy. This leads the discussion to the autonomy and heteronomy of any field of cultural production, which will be thoroughly discussed below.

3.3.2 Autonomy and heteronomy of the field

Bourdieu states that ‘[e]very field is the site of a more or less openly declared struggle for the definition of the legitimate principles of division of the field’ (Bourdieu, 1991b, p.242).
These ‘legitimate principles of division’ lay the foundation of the field’s boundaries—which, as Bourdieu argues, ‘can only be determined by empirical investigation’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.100). The boundaries of any field are porous, and in a constant state of flux, due to the ceaseless struggle between agents operating within it. Boundaries of a field are, therefore, constantly negotiated. The struggle between agents within a field over existing resources renders the field’s borders ‘dynamic’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.104). As such, an agent’s change of position in or newcomers’ entry to a field necessitates a change in its overall structure (Johnson, 1993, p.6). There are two main elements, according to Bourdieu, that determine the boundaries of any social field: (1) the power struggle for recognition and dominance between field members over maintaining or expanding their positions in a field; and (2) the position of (members of) a field in relation to the position of other (members of) intersecting fields, especially the field of power (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.90). The limits or points of entry of any field are ‘situated at the points where the effects of the field cease’ to have any impact or consequence on practice (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.100). This, in turn, means that the boundaries of a field such as modern Arabic fiction in English translation can only be measured by examining its structure, that is, the objective relations between the field and its occupants, and between the field under investigation and other fields (see Khalifa and Elgindy, 2014, p.43).

Put differently, the boundaries of a given social field are the result of the incessant struggle between the two poles operating in it: the proponents of the field’s autonomy who believe that cultural products are not supposed to submit to any laws apart from those of the field itself (that is, for example, supporters of ‘pure art’); and those who hold that these cultural products serve social, economic and political objectives (that being, for instance, advocates or ‘bourgeois’ or ‘commercial’ art) (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.223). The struggle in the field of fiction translation, for instance, is between the advocates of the viewpoint that fiction translators should only serve the intentions of the source author as well as source text’s aesthetics and cultural norms, and the supporters of the idea that the activity of fiction translation is conditioned by a variety of socio-historical, economic and political factors to which the translator must deal with. This struggle is fundamentally about demarcating the limits and imposing the boundaries of the field. These two major groups in a field set out to define the true criteria of membership to the field in correspondence with their own interests and to maintain or expand their positions (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.223). In a cultural
field like that of translation studies, for instance, when a group proclaims that true members of the field are those that produce translations for translation sake, they tacitly exclude producers of ‘bourgeois’ or ‘commercial’ translations. Conversely, when a translator or an editor purports in the introduction/preface of a translation that it is necessary to use standard language in translating political fiction, for example, they implicitly disqualify any translator who uses the vernaculars for political fiction from the membership of the field of fiction translation.

Autonomy in Bourdieu’s sociology denotes that a field’s existence is independent of any social forces, and that a field is occupied by disinterested agents who prioritise recognition from their peers in the field, are indifferent to any demands apart from those of the field they inhabit and who create art for art’s sake—who, in the example of the field of fiction translation, for instance, produce fiction translations just for the sake of producing translations—not for yielding any economic profits, or consolidating or expanding their power or fame. However, in response to external demands or policies of public relations with other fields, a field could encounter pressure towards heteronomy. Bourdieu asserts that the literary and artistic field is a site of a ‘double hierarchy’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.38) and hence has a ‘dualist structure’, involving both high-brow forms that appeal to bourgeois or elite taste and popular forms more likely catering to mass market demands (see Bourdieu, 1996a, pp.113–140).

In Figure 1 below, Bourdieu illustrates the interconnections and interrelations between the literary and artistic field, (which is placed within) the broader field of power and the much broader ‘field of class relations’ (Bourdieu, 1999a, p.38). In the figure, Bourdieu uses notations to denote the dominant and dominated positions within and between these fields: the (+) sign indicates the dominant position and the (−) sign indicates the dominated one. This, in turn, points to the existence of two hierarchisation principles where one is being internal and the other external; these are the autonomous principle and the heteronomous principle respectively. The autonomous principle, as explained above, could be understood in terms of the existence of competing hierarchies within given fields and sub-fields (that is, within the Arabic literary translation field, there exists an Arabic fiction translation field, an Arabic poetry translation field, an Arabic drama translation field, etc.).

---

5 Bourdieu also called it the ‘national’ social space (1996a, p.124). For criticism of Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of his concept of field as being national, see section 3.6.2.
In the heteronomous principle, there exists hierarchies between a variety of competing fields (that is, literary and artistic field, the cultural field and the field of power). To illustrate his idea of ‘double hierarchy’, Bourdieu portrayed the literary and artistic field in the figure as embedded in the field of power, which indicates that although it constitutes part of the dominant section of society, it is also dominated, in part, within the field of power.

**Figure 1:** The field of cultural production and the field of power (see Bourdieu, 1993a, p.38).

This indicates that positions, position-takings, and struggles within a field and between one field and others are all conditioned and structured by hierarchies of two different axes, these being a horizontal and a vertical one. The former, on the one hand, can be perceived as the relative degree of impact of the autonomous versus heteronomous, or internal versus external, on the structure of the field. This degree could be articulated in terms of the field’s autonomy in relation to the wider social sphere and based on the position of the literary and artistic field within the field of power. On the latter—that is, the vertical axis, on the other hand, the hierarchy within the field denotes the various degrees of consecration, which can be measured by the amount of capital or prestige, of positions within the field. Both the horizontal and vertical hierarchies are interrelated. That is, the greater a field’s autonomy, the stronger consecrated positions exist within the field, and the weaker a field’s autonomous position in relation to the wider social sphere, the stronger the mass-market-
or economic-oriented positions within the field. This demonstrates that fields are not rigorously analogous to classes, and are often relatively independent or autonomous spaces of social action.

An example on the opposition between autonomy and heteronomy in the field of translation can be found in Hanna (2006), where he examines the shifts in the modes of production in the field of drama translation in turn-of-the-19th/20th century Egypt. Hanna (2006, 2016) argues the field witnessed a change of production mode from heteronomous (submitting to the dictates of the market, targeting mass audience) to autonomous (distant from the dictates of the market and catering to a niche market). In mapping out the history of Hamlet’s translations into Arabic, for instance, Hanna demonstrates how Tanyus Abdu, one of the first Arab translators of Shakespeare’s tragic play, chose to alter the aesthetic form of the play into a musical and change its ending to a happy one where the ghost of the late King Hamlet appears in the last scene to hand the throne to Prince Hamlet (Hanna, 2006, p.128) to appeal to the Arab audience who, at the time, appreciated musicals and folk narratives with happy endings (Hanna, 2006, p.150). However, although Abdu’s Hamlet, first staged in 1901, dominated the theatrical scene for nearly 17 years, it was heavily criticised by translation historians as ‘an icon of infidelity’ (Hanna, 2006, p.127). This gave rise to voices in the field of drama translation calling for the autonomisation of the field. This, accordingly, led to the emergence of new autonomous and semi-autonomous positions in the field in response to the heightened struggle and competition between newcomer agents in the field, representing the autonomous trend, and the field’s avant-gardes who represented the heteronomous trend (Hanna, 2006, pp.169–175). New emerging agents in the field of drama translation—like Khalil Mutran, who translated Hamlet, chose to position his heroic drama translation ‘against a culture of musicals and variety shows’ (Litvin, 2011, p.70, italics in original)—started producing translations less subservient to the tastes of any mass-audience, hence pressuring the field towards autonomy.

Bourdieu also speaks of the idea ‘relative autonomy’ of fields to illustrate their double hierarchy in terms of their independence from and interconnectedness with external factors. He asserts that the more autonomous a field is:

i.e. the more completely it fulfils its own logic as a field, the more it tends to suspend or reverse the dominant principle of hierarchisation but also that, whatever its degree of independence, it continues to be affected by the laws of the field which encompasses it, those of economic and political profit. The more
autonomous the field becomes, the more favourable the symbolic power balance is to the most autonomous producers and the more clear-cut is the division between the field of restricted production, in which the producers produce for other producers, and the field of large-scale production (...) which is symbolically excluded and discredited. (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.39)

He further states that in the most perfectly autonomous part of a field, the economy of practices is based on:

systematic inversion of the fundamental principles of all ordinary economies: that of business (it excludes the pursuit of profit and does not guarantee any sort of correspondence between investments and monetary gains), that of power (it condemns honours and temporal greatness), and even that of institutionalised cultural authority (the absence of any academic training or consecration may be considered a virtue). (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.39)

One can draw an example from the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. Between 1908 and 1967, the volume of production of English translations of modern Arabic fiction were very limited and were mostly dependent on the efforts of some persevering individuals—with very little or no translation training—who endeavoured to introduce modern Arabic fiction to the English speaking world and make it accessible by means of translation. The selection of what to be translated was largely driven by the translators themselves, and it seemed that it had little to do with the work’s literary merits, expected reception or monetary profits. Rather, the selection was informed by the translators’ personal preference, their awareness of a particular author’s prominence in their own culture or having a personal relationship with the source author. The production of English translations of modern Arabic fiction at that time could, therefore, be thought of as being autonomous, with translations arguably concentrating on what Bourdieu’s calls a ‘field of restricted production’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.115). That is supported by Bourdieu’s argument

---

6 Bourdieu argues that the structure of any field of production rests on the opposition between ‘the field of restricted production’ (in which cultural production targets a niche market, mainly consisting of intellectuals and producers of cultural goods) and ‘the field of large-scale production’ (where cultural production aims at non-producers of cultural goods, that is, the public at large) (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.115). Whereas the field of restricted production, on the one hand, indicates the autonomous character of culture goods, the field of large-scale production, on the other hand denotes their heteronomous character, that is, their submission to the needs and laws of the market.

7 See footnote number 6 above.

8 Bourdieu states that works produced by the field of restricted production ‘are “pure”, “abstract” and “esoteric”. They are “pure” because they demand of the receiver a specifically aesthetic disposition in accordance with the principles of their production. They are “abstract” because they call for a multiplicity of specific approaches, in contrast with the undifferentiated art of primitive societies, which is unified within an immediately accessible spectacle involving music, dance, theatre and song. They are “esoteric” for all the above reasons and because their complex structure continually implies tacit reference to the
that the ‘autonomy of a field of restricted production can be measured by its power to define its own criteria for the production and evaluation of its products [and how it] implies translation of all external determinations in conformity with its own principles of functioning’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.115).

However, in response to some external social, economic and political factors, the field of modern Arabic fiction translated into English witnessed a shift in the mode of production, with translations focusing on the ‘field of large-scale production’. Awarding the Nobel Prize in Literature to Naguib Mahfouz in 1988, for instance, marked a turning point in the history of the field. After an initial period where the field was relatively autonomous and English translations of modern Arabic fiction were entirely dependent on individual enterprises as well as their social and cultural capital, mainstream publishers started to take an interest in the field in order to attain popular and large-scale success as well as economic and symbolic capital, hence marking the field’s shift towards heteronomy (see Khalifa and Elgindy, 2014, pp.41–56; a thorough discussion of the structure of the field of Arabic fiction translation into English will be provided in chapters four and five).

3.3.3 Homology within and between fields

Homology refers to the shared relations between different fields of cultural production that mediate practices that are undertaken within and between them (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.105). As explained earlier, for Bourdieu, any field is relatively autonomous, but is also structurally and functionally homologous with other fields (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pp.105–106; see also Bourdieu, 1988a, p.173; Johnson, 1993, p.6; and Swartz, 1997, p.129). Producers of cultural products operating in a certain field inevitably form homologous relations with other agents and institutions from outside their field because they are essentially ‘not only concerned with the production of cultural goods, but also with their circulation and marketing’ (Hanna, 2006, p.77). In other words, although fields of cultural production are semi-autonomous, homologies exist both within and between them and the field of power, that is, the political and economic fields (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pp.105–106). Each of these fields has its own dominant and dominated, representatives and represented, and traditional and avant-garde groups, as well as its subversive struggles and mechanisms of reproduction and change (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.140).

entire history of previous structures, and is accessible only to those who possess practical or theoretical mastery of a refined code, of successive codes, and of the code of these codes (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.120).

9 See footnote number 6 above.
Although they correspond and share structurally equivalent—though non-identical—properties, each field assumes within itself an altogether specific, irreducible identity, form or function (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.140). Homology can therefore be defined as resemblance that is bound up with difference (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.140; see also Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.106).

Homology is also depicted as the outcome of the power of dominant fields, especially the field of power, and its ability to impose on less-dominant or dominated fields and the structure that takes place within them. It is the supposition that the structure of social class is linked to the structure of aesthetic preferences and practices through an isomorphic relation. To think in terms of homology is thus to assume that taste is a marker of class and the determinant par excellence of one’s social fate (Bourdieu, 1984, p.244). This suggests that the tastes of social agents are defined by their class positions within the social sphere and are conditioned by the amount and form of capital these agents possess. Such tastes also correspond to and are hence structured hierarchically by such semantic oppositions as ‘highbrow/lowbrow’ and ‘original/banal’ etc. (Coulangeon and Lemel, 2007, p.95) that reinforce homologous social distinctions (Swartz, 1997, p.131). In other words, homology is ‘the projection of one space onto another, which is deemed possible because they reflect the same basic (i.e., objective) relations, namely, the distribution of different kinds of capital or power’ (De Nooy, 2003, p.313). Homology also accords the relation and objective orchestration between supply and demand in the field of culture production (Bourdieu, 1984, p.230), or, put differently, between the relational positions manifested in the production and consumption structures of cultural products and produced works (Gouanvic, 2004, p.360).

This indicates the existence of homologous hierarchies of legitimacy of cultural values both at the levels of producers and consumers, as well as products and consumers. These hierarchies of legitimacy classify cultural products and practices in terms of their ‘cultural legitimacy’, which ensures ‘the homology between the cultural status of a product and the social status of its potential consumer’ (Verdaasdonk, 2003, p.360) and reduces the risk of any potential economic loss. However, Bourdieu maintains that there exists an isomorphic relation or homology between the internal struggles occurring within the field of cultural production and the external changes or forces in the wider social space. Bourdieu uses this type of homology to explain what he calls the ‘life cycle’ of a cultural product (Bourdieu,
Any cultural product, such as a translation, painting or song, is the result of a producer’s effort to attain distinction by creating a work that is acknowledged as unique in relation to other works existing in the field. This distinction is often achieved by discrediting and deviating from the current mainstream modes of production and taste, and adopting an attitude of disavowal of the economic yield that could be realised from the new work to claim a space/distinction in the field. This leads to the emergence of a new group of consumers with a distinctive level of taste. Therefore, the initial phase in the life cycle of a work of art, which involves the renunciation of economic capital, consists of the accrual of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.255). This is succeeded by a phase of exploitation of symbolic capital to ensure and accumulate economic gains, which leads to the confrontation of this cultural product by a new rival (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.255). It is noteworthy that homology in any field of cultural production is generally mis- or not-understood by field members. This is because the doxa, which is the set of rules in a particular field, works to misrecognise its contribution to the field of power and to (re)produce social inequality and hierarchies within fields of cultural production (Thomson, 2008, p.73). This leads the discussion to Bourdieu’s concept of doxa.

3.3.4 Doxa of the field

Doxa, understood as generally accepted opinions or commonly shared beliefs and knowledge, has its roots in the ancient Greek language. Amossy (2002, p.369) calls anything that is perceived to be true, or at least plausible, by a particular social faction or majority of people endowed with reason as doxic. A cursory review of the meaning and origin of the Greek terms *endoxa* and *doxa* will enable us to better grasp what Bourdieu means by his concept of doxa.

Endoxa, derived from the word doxa, was first used by Aristotle in his work *Topics* as the positive opposite of *paradoxa*.\(^{10}\) It refers to what appears true ‘by everyone or by majority or by the wise—i.e. by all, or by the majority, or by the most notable and reputable of them’ (Aristotle, 1991, pp.2–3). This suggests that the term was first used by the Greeks to denote opinions or ideas that were deemed acceptable and authoritative insofar as they constitute part of the consensus (Amossy, 2002, p.371). This consensus, however, does not literally embrace everyone because everyone, as far as the Aristotelian philosophy is concerned, refers to the social elites who are perceived as the legitimate representatives of power (i.e.

---

\(^{10}\) Equivalent to ‘paradox’, meaning problematic opinions or ideas.
dominant agents in a field) and excludes such underprivileged factions as women, slaves and barbarians (i.e. the dominated groups in a field) (Amossy, 2002, p.371). In other words, endoxa (and doxa) not only refer to what is perceived as acceptable, but also what is powerful, legitimate and authoritative. It is worth noting that there is a distinct difference between doxa and ‘Truth’. Despite being perceived as what is acceptable or plausible at a particular moment in time in a certain field or society, doxa denotes verisimilitude and hence does not define what is true or false (Amossy, 2002, p.371). This suggests that doxa is mutable and that what is perceived as doxic in one epoch may be substituted with a different doxa in another (Hanna, 2006, p.69). It is worth noting that doxa in Greek not only means opinion, but also reputation, fame and glory (Hariman, 1986, p.48). A related prediction is that agents with more knowledge of the doxa of any social space enjoy more reputation, fame and glory therein than those with less doxic knowledge.

Bourdieu uses the concept of doxa in his theory and flags its intrinsic importance for the existence of any field being the ‘system of presuppositions inherent in membership in a field’ (Bourdieu, 2005b, p.37). As Webb et al. (2002, xi) state, it is the ‘set of core values and discourses which a field articulates as its fundamental principles and which tend to be viewed as inherently true and necessary’. Doxa is the product of a homologous relation between any given field and the habitus of its agents, or, in other words, between the objective structure of the field and the subjective mental disposition of the agents in that field (Bourdieu, 1977a, pp.165–166; see also Petit, 2009, p.65). It is the deeply rooted, implicit, axiomatic and unwritten ‘rules of the game’ (Maton, 2008, p.54; see also Deer, 2008, p.122) that social agents adhere to without essentially being conscious of it. Similar to Aristotle’s definition of endoxa, Bourdieu perceives doxa as the outcome of:

> a particular point of view, the point of view of the dominant, which presents and imposes itself as a universal point of view—the point of view of those who dominate by dominating the state and who have constituted their point of view as universal by constituting the state. (Bourdieu, 1998a, p.57)

Accordingly, doxa, in the Bourdieusian sense, can be understood as the ‘unthinkable’ (Bourdieu, 1993b, p.172, italics in original) or ‘that which is taken for granted’ in a field and underlies its practices (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.166). That is, doxa is ‘a set of fundamental beliefs which does not even need to be asserted in the form of an explicit, self-conscious dogma’.

---

11 Whereas ‘Truth’ with a capital ‘T’ means absolute truth or genuine knowledge, ‘truth’, with a small ‘t’ refers to what appears to be true but may not constitute ‘Truth’ or ultimate reality.
In other words, doxa refers to everything that is naturalised in a field and hence goes unquestioned and unsaid between its agents (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.166).

Although doxa operates at an unconscious level in a field, it can generate conscious struggles between its agents. On the one hand, these struggles can take the form of the dominant groups’ endeavours to preserve a field’s doxa and keep it concealed from and misrecognised by the dominated groups so that the dominant groups can continue to impose their definition of social reality and reproduce their systems of classification. In a misrecognised state, doxic beliefs, as maintained by Bourdieu, are shared by all agents of a field. Although the dominated may disagree with the dominants on a number of practices in a field, both groups concur, albeit unconsciously, with specific doxic ‘truths’. Bourdieu calls this misrecognised unanimity as the ‘unquestioned and unified cultural “tradition”’ of a field (Bourdieu, 1992, p.248). On the other hand, when the dominated agents become aware of the doxa, including its strength and mechanism of domination, another form of conscious struggle emerges as the dominated agents start questioning the legitimacy of the dominant agents as well as the prevailing doxa, and try to push back against its limits and expose and challenge its tacit beliefs (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.169). This form of struggle leads to the eruption of a field’s doxic beliefs into the realm of consciousness and hence ‘the field of opinion’ or ‘the universe of discourse (or argument)’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.168, italics in original). This, in turn, disrupts the homology between the subjective and objective structures in a field (Bourdieu, 1977a, pp.168–169) and fosters the emergence of positions along the continuum of two opposing discourses: orthodoxy and heterodoxy, which tries to routinise and de-banalise the doxa of and practices in the field respectively (Bourdieu, 1996a, 201). When dominant agents, who are generally the established agents in a field, engage in the discourse of orthodoxy, they employ their ‘conservation strategies’ to maintain or restore the doxa of the field; dominated agents, who are generally the newcomers in a field (the biologically young), make use of the discourse of heterodoxy, deploying ‘subversion strategies’ to recede or completely transform the existing doxa and unsettle its dominant position in a field (Bourdieu, 1993b, p.73). Deer (2008, pp.123–124) maintains that heterodoxy, in its most efficient form, emerges from groups that are neither the most dominated class nor the dominant part. They usually have high cultural capital, but poor economic capital.
As the doxa legislates the boundaries of field(s), regulates its membership and tacitly imposes the conditions of entry, it can therefore help account for the class structure, distribution of power and types of struggles that take place in a field such as modern Arabic fiction in English translation. It can also be used to explain the struggles between the operative agents in the field for distinction and legitimacy through the accumulation of various forms of capital, especially after Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize in 1988. Moreover, it can account for whether these agents’ practices are supportive of the autonomy or the heteronomy of the field.

3.3.5 Illusio, misrecognition and symbolic violence

Illusio, misrecognition and symbolic violence are intrinsically interwoven Bourdieusian concepts and will therefore be considered altogether. They are the condition and product of a field’s functioning and hence are of paramount importance to the intelligibility of Bourdieu’s sociology. They were introduced by Bourdieu to explain how the fundamental structures and relations of social domination, compliance and inequality are achieved, concealed, reproduced, and legitimised in a field.

Derived from the Latin root *ludus* (meaning game), illusio can be understood as the ‘almost always unperceived’ (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.333, my italics) collective and fundamental belief in the interest and value of the ‘game’ and its stakes (Bourdieu, 2000, p.11). Illusio constitutes the pre-requisite to enter a field; the ‘precondition’ of developing ‘interest’ to (continue to) partake in a field, its activities and struggles. It is the product of the ‘conjunctural relationship between a habitus and a field’ (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.228). That is to say, the interest that social agents show in a certain field is prompted by their habitus, which is produced, conditioned and further promoted by the objective structure of the field (Hanna, 2006, p.88). This indicates being caught up in the game and that recognition of illusio by agents engaged in a field goes implicitly or without saying; they take part in the game willingly yet unconsciously, misrecognising the context and conditions of their actions. Bourdieu states that:

agents take advantage of the possibilities offered by a field to express and satisfy their drives and their desires, in some cases their neurosis, or that fields use the agents’ drives by forcing them to subject or sublimate themselves in order to adapt to their structures and to the ends that are immanent within them. In fact, the two effects are observed in each case, no doubt in unequal proportions, depending on the field and the agent. (Bourdieu, 2000, p.165)
This ‘doxic submission to the established order’ (Bourdieu, 2000, p.178), unquestioned and undebated belief in the logic of a field, is rooted in what Bourdieu calls misrecognition and symbolic violence, both instruments of domination and legitimization. Bourdieu (1991b, p.223) defines symbolic violence as a power ‘which is misrecognised as such and thus recognised and legitimate’. In contrast to overt violence, it is a kind of gentle, non-physical, usually obscure, power of oppression exercised on social agents with their complicity (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.167), ‘unrecognised as such, chosen as much as undergone, that of trust, obligation, personal loyalty, hospitality, gifts, debts, piety, in a word, of all the virtues honoured by the ethic of honour’ (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.127). Symbolic violence, argues Bourdieu, becomes legitimate only when it manages to mask the power relations which allow it to exist, and insofar as it is perceived as legitimate, ‘culture adds its own force to those power relations’ supporting their consecration and hence their systematic reproduction without any apparent expenditure of energy (Jenkins, 1992, p.104; see also Bourdieu, 1991b, p.170). This process is realised through a process of misrecognition, or the production of (false) belief, ‘whereby power relations are perceived not for what they objectively are but in a form which renders them legitimate in the eyes of the beholder’ (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990, xxii). This induced false belief, or misunderstanding, is usually achieved by structural rather than conspiratorial means (Terdiman, 1987, p.813).

Misrecognition refers to the fundamental advantage of the dominant holders of power within a field, which results from their ability to control not only the actions of the dominated, but also the language through which the dominated perceive their domination (Terdiman, 1987, p.813). In other words, misrecognition occurs when social agents fail to recognise their social oppression and perceive it as the natural order of things: when ‘they come to believe that this is the way things are, rather than have become’ (Chong, 2011, p.65, italics in original). Misrecognition can therefore be described as the incongruity between what is believed to be happening and what is actually happening. That is to say, the concept of misrecognition encompasses ‘a form of forgetting’ (Webb et al., 2002, p.24), a kind of disregard of the historical contexts in which the socio-cultural, political and economic realities take place, which can only be ‘sustained by a collective self-deception, a veritable collective misrecognition inscribed in [the] objective structures (...) and in [the] mental structures’ of agents (Bourdieu, 1998a, p.95, italics in original). Such misrecognition ‘is
structurally necessary for the reproduction of the social order, which would become intolerably conflicted without it’ (Terdiman, 1987, p.813).

Against this background, I argue that examining illusio, misrecognition, and symbolic violence in a field in tandem can help illustrate how a ‘game’ can be sustained, through things such as ‘gift exchange or rites’ (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.74), regardless of the way it is being played. What matters is thus not the mere belief but the action itself. The more illusio and symbolic violence of a field are misrecognised by its dominated social agents, the ‘socially repressed’ as Bourdieu (1977a, p.172) calls them, and are perceived as unproblematic, the more the game becomes worthy of, and interesting to, being played by the dominant agents in the field.

A minister, for example, empowered by their position as the representative of a particular church, may use language as a tool and strategy to acquire special authority and distinction. Language becomes more than just a communication tool; it becomes an instrument of social power and manipulation—a ‘game’ in itself. Church attendees legitimise the game through their collective belief in the power of the minister’s words to bring forth guilt, forgive the sinner and promote repentance, among other things. The minister could thus be said to exercise a form of symbolic violence on the church attendees. Church attendees share the same fundamental belief and are all in implicit accord that the minister represents and speaks for them—which is factual, thus a form of recognition—and believe that he is the servant of the people—which is fictitious, hence a form of misrecognition (see Bourdieu, 1985a, pp.60–61; see also Snook, 1990, p.175). This example could, of course, be said to be true in relation to any religion or faith.

3.3.6 An original project without origin?12 Genealogy of the field

Bourdieu criticised the dominant western schools of thoughts existing at his time for failing to account for the ‘objectivity of the subjective’ (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.135; see also Johnson, 1993, p.4) and for their ‘amnesia of genesis’ (Bourdieu, 2005a, p.5, italics in original). That is because they mainly based their analyses on the psychological aspects or social variables of a literary author and their works to try to interpret facts, thus overlooking their historical relations with the social world and the social conditions of the production and reception of their literary products (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.193). To support his views, Bourdieu cites the

---

12 The title is taken from Bourdieu (1996a, p.188).
example of Sartre's *projet originel* in which he based his analysis of Flaubert and his works on psychological grounds. Furthermore, such an approach has led to the emergence of two opposite strands for examining cultural/literary products: these being ‘retrospective illusion’ and ‘genetic sociology’.\textsuperscript{13} Retrospective illusion, on the one hand, ‘establishes final events as the ends of initial experiences or behaviour’ and hence conceives of cultural works as ‘starting from an absolute beginning’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.193; see also Hanna, 2005, p.167, 2006, p.96). That is, literary critics, like Sartre, have the ‘illusion’ that the relationship between the individual and context can only be construed through a diachronic analysis of the subject’s life experiences or behaviours. Hence, according to this uni-determined view (that is, the product of a solitary social determinant), literary texts should merely be examined by following a linear reasoning tracing individual trajectories and biographies, without paying any attention to the historical and socio-cultural contexts that conditioned their production and reception. Bourdieu’s proposed ‘genetic sociology’, on the other hand, ‘problematises the social conditioning of cultural works [and] locates these practices in a social universe of available positions to be occupied by agents with particular dispositions’ (Hanna, 2005, p.167, 2006, p.97). That is to say, by taking particular account of both a cultural field’s objective structure and the trajectories of its occupying agents, Bourdieu’s genetic sociology offers a multi-directional understanding of the historical and socio-cultural practices characterised in a cultural work (Hanna, 2005, p.168, 2006, p.97). Therefore, as Bourdieu argues, a ‘genetic sociology alone can grasp the essential, that is, the genesis and structure of the specific social space in which the “creative project” was formed’ (Bourdieu, 1988b, p.541).

Bourdieu’s concept of ‘genesis’ informs his understanding of both sociology and history. For him, sociology and history are inseparable. In Bourdieu’s own words:

\begin{quote}
all sociology should be historical and all history sociological (...) we cannot grasp the dynamics of a field if not by a synchronic analysis of its structure and, simultaneously, we cannot grasp this structure without a historical, that is, genetic analysis of its constitution and of the tensions that exist between positions in it, as well as between the field and other fields, especially the field of power. (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.90)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} Bourdieu also calls it ‘genetic structuralism’ (see Bourdieu, 1990b, p.14). This should not be confused with Lucien Goldmann’s (1963/1972) methodology.
The salient importance of Bourdieu’s genetic sociology applied to translation studies is that it invites one to explore any translational phenomenon through its socio-historical determinants without overlooking translatorial agents’ social trajectories, their positions and positioning and their discursive practices. The majority, if not all, of the studies of modern Arabic fiction translations into English have adopted a unidimensional evolutionism approach, thus overlooking the socio-historical factors governing the translation process (see section 3.6.1 for the details thereof). This study tries to fill this void by investigating the genesis and socio-historical trajectory of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation (see chapters four and five).

3.4 Bourdieu’s concept of capital

In the Bourdieusian sense, capital is the set of usable resources and powers in a field (Bourdieu, 1984, p.114). It is what gives meaning to a field in the sense that it serves to signify the various assets or resources at stake within it, (trans)form its structure, and define the positions of its agents as the object of their struggles and competition. Capital is therefore any historically ‘accumulated labour’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.241) which in effect yields power in a field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.101), legitimises the hierarchy of positions in it and implicitly determines its conditions of membership. It also functions as an exchange tool through which power relations are sustained and legitimated. Bourdieu’s use of the word ‘accumulated’ in his definition of capital is significant, as it indicates its historical character. That is, capital is not always gained at once, but typically takes time to accrue, requiring the constant labour and struggle of agents to accumulate. Social agents and institutions in a given field engage in a conscious struggle to amass, invest in and convert different forms of capital in order to preserve and enhance their social position and positioning (Swartz, 1997, p.75). Bourdieu avers that capital ‘is what “gets people moving”, what makes them get together, compete and struggle with each other, and a product of the way the field functions’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.88). He also states that ‘kinds of capital, like trumps in a game of cards, are powers which define the chances of profit in a given field’ (Bourdieu, 1991b, p.230). Capital is therefore ‘what makes the games of society (...) something other than simple games of chance’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.241). That is, social ‘games’ are not based on chance. Instead, they are games in which the chances of losing or winning are reliant on the type and volume of capital that agents or institutions possess. Capital is thus the ‘energy’ or force that fuels the development and transformation of a field and its agents through time (Moore, 2008, p.105).
Bourdieu breaks away from a strictly economic understanding of capital by extending its definition beyond material and monetary value. He contends that it is ‘impossible to account for the structure and functioning of the social world unless one reintroduces capital in all its forms and not solely in the one form recognised by economic theory’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.242). He extends the narrow economic metaphor of capital to ‘all the goods, material or symbolic, without distinction, that present themselves as rare or worthy of being sought after in a particular social formation’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.178, italics in original). Capital is therefore any resource that has the ability to reproduce profitable and meaningful revenues or cultural value, such as authority, prestige or social status, including ‘monetary and non-monetary, as well as tangible and intangible forms’ (Anheier, 2005, p.234; see also Bourdieu, 1986, p.243). Conceptualising capital in such a way allows Bourdieu to examine the practices of the social world as revolving around not only accruing economic capital but other non-economic forms of capital as well.

Capital has a generic or chameleon-like quality, and hence, can present itself in a variety of forms. Bourdieu speaks of three main types of capital: (1) economic (e.g., material wealth or property rights), (2) cultural capital (e.g., academic degrees, titles and cultural goods in general), and (3) social capital (e.g., social networks and connections). Bourdieu also speaks of symbolic capital, which is another name for social distinction (Bourdieu, 1991b, p.238).

Symbolic capital is a mystified form of capital which other types of capital assume when they are perceived and recognised as legitimate (Bourdieu, 1987a, p.4) and which in the long run, under certain conditions, can guarantee economic profits (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.75). It is, to use Bourdieu’s words,

> the form taken by any species of capital whenever it is perceived through categories of perception that are the product of the embodiment of divisions or of oppositions inscribed in the structure of the distribution of this species of capital. It follows that the state, which possesses the means of imposition and inculcation of the durable principles of vision and division that conform to its own structure, is the site par excellence of the concentration and exercise of symbolic power. (Bourdieu, 1994, p.9)

Symbolic capital of a given agent or institution is not only able to transform itself but to also continuously fluctuate in response to changing field structures and positions (Hardy, 2008, p.132). It is not only the instrument but also the object of competitive struggles within any field of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.141). It is the outcome of:
a struggle in which each agent is both a ruthless competitor and supreme judge (and therefore, in terms of an old opposition, both *lupus* and *deus*). This capital, or the titles that guarantee it, can only be defended, especially in times of inflation, by means of a permanent struggle to keep up with and identify with the group immediately above (either directly, for example, through marriage and all forms of public alliance and official co-option, or symbolically) and to distinguish oneself from the group immediately below. (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.136, italics in original)

Bourdieu argues that social and cultural capital are disguised forms of economic capital in that they are prompted by and conducive to it. For Bourdieu (1986, p.241), although capital has ‘a tendency to persist in its being’, all kinds of capital are fungible, which means that they can be traded for one another (Figure 2). Economic capital is at the root of every kind of capital, as all are ultimately oriented toward generating revenues or profits, and are thus, in practice, ‘transformed, disguised forms of economic capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.252). This is not to say that Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of capital necessarily implies economic determinism, but that different forms of capital hold value in their capacity to be translated or converted into economic gains. The ability of an agent or institution to exchange or transform one form of capital into another in a given field demonstrates the amount of power they have and can exert through it. Capital possession and use can hence be a force that restrains or expands the boundaries of any field and its activities.

It is important to note that the value of any capital transforms and continuously fluctuates both across different social fields and in different positions within the same field. If one is doing business, for instance, economic capital may hold higher value than cultural capital, as the main goal, among others, in this field is accruing wealth. However, in academia, cultural capital would be perceived as having a higher value, with the field and its members more inclined to attain this kind of capital, which may then be converted into a kind of symbolic and/or economic capital. In what follows, I explicate on the three main types of capital identified by Bourdieu.
3.4.1 Economic capital

As economic capital is basically self-explanatory, Bourdieu did not engage deeply in defining it. Economic capital is unique from all other types of capital in the sense that it is the only tangible form of capital, and, interestingly, it is also the most abstract of all phenomena insofar as it is simply numbers in space that social agents compete and debate over. The term refers to any material goods that are ‘immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalised in the form of property rights’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.243). In other words, it is any resources or stakes available to an agent which they can pursue solely for their economic value or so as to be turned into money. It does not necessarily refer to money or cash, but can also speak of other assets, such as intellectual property ownership, which can be directly converted into money. Economic capital can also manifest itself as family income and wealth.

Economic capital is perceived as an ‘efficient’ form of capital (Pasco, 2003, p.65) in that it can be more easily managed, conserved, transmitted and calculated than any other form of capital (Swartz, 1997, p.80). The value and volume of economic capital changes as one moves from one faction or position to another, either within the same field or between different ones (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.45). Economic capital is perceived as the primary form of capital available in the field of power, which can exert influence over any field of cultural
production. Economic capital could hence be said to have an effect on both agents and the
fields in which they operate (depending on their degrees of autonomy) insofar as it can
control various activities and actions taking place within them (Bourdieu, 1998a, pp.19–34).

Each form of capital available in a field has a value of translatable economic capital that is
set by agents or institutions within it that occupy dominant positions. The amount of
economic capital that an agent or institution possesses in a field indicates the degree of
power they have in it. For example, agents with high economic capital can obtain exclusive
access to certain forms of social class, education and professions (i.e. cultural capital), and
are more likely to get the chance to establish connections and beneficial social links than
other agents (i.e. social capital). This process in turn can lead to the aggregation of symbolic
capital (recognition and distinction) among agents/institutions of high economic capital,
which can lead to their realising and securing additional economic capital. This process
speaks to how economic capital can be converted into or exchanged for any other form of
capital, be it concrete or abstract. This process of acquiring and converting capital can also
happen in reverse. For example, an agent or institution endowed with cultural capital and/or
symbolic capital (i.e. good educational qualifications, earned prizes etc.) stands a good
chance of securing economic capital as well (in the form of a lucrative job, more prizes etc.).
Similarly, an agent or institution that possesses social capital stands a good chance of forging
partnerships or attaining positions of high social status, which can in turn be converted into
economic capital. Either way, economic capital underpins and reinforces the value of all the
other types of capital. In the field of literary translation, publishers may choose to
commission and publish certain translations due to their expected financial returns based
on the symbolic or cultural capital of a literary work or author. For example, following
Mahfouz’s winning of the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1988, his publishers re-printed his
translations and conspicuously flagged Mahfouz as the awardee of the Nobel Prize on all
front covers as a strategy to maximise their profits and accrue more economic gains.
Currently, most, if not all, translations of Mahfouz’s works include ‘Winner of the Nobel
Prize in Literature’ on their front covers. For the same reason, international mainstream
publishers, such as Doubleday, were quick to secure publishing rights for his works in English
translation immediately after he had won the Nobel Prize.
3.4.2 Social capital

Social capital, as described by Bourdieu, is the product of various investment strategies aimed at initiating, strengthening or reproducing social relations and is acquired from membership of various types of social networks or groups in a field. It is, therefore, ‘the aggregate of the actual or potential resources’ possessed and mobilised by social agents/institutions (Bourdieu, 1986, p.248). The concept places great emphasis on social ties or networks of social relations, which maximise the opportunities available to an agent or institution to promote their interests in a given field of cultural production. In Bourdieu’s words, social capital is:

> the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition. (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.119)

This indicates that the volume of social capital available to a social agent relies on the size of their social networks and their degree of prestige in the fields in which they operate, as well as the range of other forms of capital they possess and that can be mobilised through these connections, on anticipation of trade-offs being met and via their social status within the group (Bourdieu, 1986, p.249; see also Edwards et al., 2003, p.6). An example of the above can be drawn from societies where marriages outside of one’s social class or between people of unequal social status is against the societal norm. For instance, the idea of *nasab* (‘chain of one’s ancestry’) is a highly important determinant of social capital in some Arab countries. It is particularly significant in the Gulf, where one’s family lineage or name is a key factor in determining whether they would be allowed to intermarry into another family or not.

It is noteworthy that Bourdieu’s understanding of social capital is based on class power conflicts, and accordingly he utilises the concept not to refer to friendly social connections, but rather to social networks that privilege one group over another or create a hierarchical social inequality. According to Bourdieu, dominant groups in a given field use social capital as an exclusionary tool to determine who would be allowed into their faction. The credentials for membership of such a group become not so much dependent on what one knows, but rather *who* one knows, or what other, mostly material, assets one may have. As a result, social capital should not be thought of as separate from economic (or cultural) capital. That is because ‘the exchanges instituting mutual acknowledgement presuppose the
reacknowledgement of a minimum of objective homogeneity, and because it exerts a multiplier effect on the capital one possesses' (Bourdieu, 1986, p.249).

Moreover, Bourdieu (1986, p.243) maintains that social capital is ‘made up of social obligations (‘connections’), which are convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalised in the form of a title of nobility’. Social agents with connections in the social world tend to secure jobs through their families or business relationships, rather than their academic degrees (i.e. cultural capital). They are even more likely to earn significantly higher salaries than social agents with no family or business connections, although they may have the same educational qualifications as them, or possibly less (Bourdieu, 1996c, p.168). This suggests that cultural capital does not, on its own, constitute a sufficient condition for professional social success and economic gains (i.e. higher salaries) and that social capital, like other forms of capital, constitutes power and masks economic capital at its root.

Social capital requires an investment of time and effort; alternatively, it can be inherited or transferred from one generation to the next (Edwards et al., 2003, p.6). It ‘is the product of investment strategies, individual or collective, consciously or unconsciously aimed at establishing or reproducing social relationships that are directly useable in the short or long term’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.249). The reproduction of social relationships can be achieved through the exchange of compliments, gifts or other material, or symbolic benefits that solidify the bonding between social agents/institutions and confirm the constitution of the group to which they are affiliated (Bourdieu, 1986, pp.249–250). For a social agent or institution to maintain or propagate their social capital, they need to sustain their social presence. This can, for example, be accomplished by organising or participating in important events or forming marital alliances, and consecrated by acquiring or conferring ‘the highest official decorations’; in other words, titles or other forms of distinction or symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1996c, p.303). This is exemplified by the field of modern Arabic literature translation, wherein the American University in Cairo Press (AUCP), for instance, ensures that it is almost always socially present by organising conferences and symposiums related to Arabic literature translation and sending delegates to international book fairs etc. In terms of consecration, the press describes itself as the ‘Middle East’s leading English-language publishing house’ (AUCP, 2014a) and now confers titles in the form of prizes, such as the Naguib Mahfouz Medal for Literature. This helps it to consolidate and strengthen its
social capital, position, and ties in the field of Arabic literature translation in particular and the field of publishing in general. Such networking, in turn, endows it with power and recognition, which can eventually be realised in terms of economic capital.

The collective institutionalised capital is a significant form of social capital identified by Bourdieu. It can be delegated to a representative, either ‘a single agent or a small group of agents’, that is ordained ‘to represent the group, to speak and act in its name and so, with the aid of collectively owned capital, to exercise a power incommensurate with the agent’s personal contribution’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.251). The delegates, who may be either officially or personally mandated, ‘receive effective social existence only in and through representation’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.252). Leaders of (translation) associations, political parties or trade unions are typical examples of this form of social capital being gathered in the hands of representatives. By speaking on behalf of an entire group, the delegate can exercise greater influence than that wielded by individual agents (Bourdieu, 1986, p.252).

By way of illustration, in the field of modern Arabic literature translation, several translators—who could be said to have declared themselves ‘custodian[s] of the limits’ of the field, in Bourdieu’s (1986, p.251) terms—with the backing of the collectively owned social capital, took joint action to pressure the AUCP to accept standard contracts with a fixed share of royalties and to have translators’ names appearing on translated book covers. Their action was partially successful, with their names now appearing on all translations published by the AUCP and the royalty dispute ending in a compromise rate (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.82).

3.4.3 Cultural capital

Cultural capital alludes to nonmaterial assets that embody or contribute to cultural value (Throsby, 1999, p.3) and that are ‘convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.243). This includes a broad range of cultural goods—such as educational credentials; mores and beliefs; artistic, verbal, linguistic or stylistic skills; and even one’s place of residence—which can foster social mobility\(^\text{14}\) and can be exchanged for economic resources. The term also refers to ‘culturally valued taste and consumption patterns’ (Mahar et al., 1990, p.13) that one either acquires or inherits and which can, in turn, confer power and prestige (Barker, 2004, p.37). It is ‘a form of knowledge, an internalised code or a

\(^{14}\) By social mobility, I mean the degree to which the status of an agent, group or institution is open to change in relation to material wealth.
cognitive acquisition which equips the social agent with empathy towards, appreciation for or competence in deciphering cultural relations and cultural artefacts’ (Johnson, 1993, p.7).

According to Bourdieu, cultural capital can materialise in three distinguishable forms: the embodied, the objectified and the institutionalised (Bourdieu, 1986, p.243). In its embodied state, cultural capital takes the form of ‘long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.243), which agents acquire either consciously, through social activities and processes such as education, membership in professional organisations, or the mass media, or unconsciously, through the family or various forms of socialisation in traditions and culture (Bourdieu, 1986, pp.245–246). That is to say, embodied cultural capital constitutes both acquired and inherited properties. The accrual of embodied cultural capital pre-supposes the personal investment of time and/or exertion of effort since it cannot be attained by delegation (Bourdieu, 1986, p.244). It inculcates itself as an integral part of social agents, converting itself into a habitus, (trans)forming agents’ taste and style of thinking to become their ‘natural’ way of being (Bourdieu, 1986, pp.244–245). Because it is accumulated by and within the capacity of individual agents, and declines and dies with them (with their biological capacity, their memory, etc.), embodied cultural capital cannot be instantaneously transmitted through gift giving, purchase or exchange (Bourdieu, 1986, p.245). However, because the social conditions of embodied cultural capital acquisition are ‘more disguised than those of economic capital, it is predisposed to function as symbolic capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.245). This means it becomes recognised not as capital but as legitimate competence or authority, securing material and symbolic profit for its possessors (Bourdieu, 1986, p.245).

Objectified cultural capital contains ‘a number of properties which are defined in the relationship with cultural capital in its embodied form’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.246). It materialises in the form of physical objects or cultural goods that a social agent or institution possesses, ‘such as writings, paintings, monuments, instruments, etc.’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.246). The value of objectified cultural capital is set not in the object or item itself, but in the value placed on owning this object or item. The materiality of cultural capital in its objectified state makes it more transferable than embodied cultural capital to economic capital (Bourdieu, 1986, p.246). A collection of historical stamps owned by a stamp collector, for instance, may possess, besides its symbolic value, economic value too. This value depends on the collector’s embodied knowledge of details, such as when, why, by, and for
whom a stamp was issued, as well as its condition and historical value. While this collection of stamps can be exchanged for economic capital, what transmits in this exchange process is the legal ownership of the collection (i.e. objectified cultural capital), but not necessarily with embodied cultural capital (i.e. the knowledge of its cultural meaning or value) attached to it (Bourdieu, 1986, pp.246–247). This demonstrates the strong connection between cultural capital in both its objectified and embodied forms, because any material object, for example, cannot become effective capital unless its possessors have the necessary knowledge and ability to appropriate it to wield symbolic and economic gains from it. Objectified cultural capital can hold material and symbolic value as long as it is ‘implemented and invested as a weapon and a stake in the struggles which go on in the fields of cultural production’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.247). For example, the economic and symbolic value of dictionaries or any other reference tools available to a translator is conditioned by the way the translator utilises them to maximise their economic and symbolic gains in the translation field, drawing on their embodied capital (Hanna, 2006, p.59).

In its institutionalised state, cultural capital manifests itself in certificates of cultural competence, such as academic degrees, awards or titles that confer on their ‘holder a conventional, constant, legally guaranteed value with respect to culture’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.248). Unlike embodied cultural capital but rather like objectified cultural capital, institutionalised cultural capital can easily be transformed into economic and social capital, while also serving as a tool that agents can use to demonstrate their (cap)abilities. It follows that holders of educationally uncertified cultural capital may always be required to prove themselves, ‘because they are only what they do, merely a by-product of their own cultural production’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p.23, italics in original). Conversely, holders of academic qualifications or titles of cultural nobility ‘only have to be what they are’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p.23, my italics). Bourdieu relates this to ‘the performative magic of the power of instituting’ which impresses recognition of and belief in the validity and value of a certain certified qualification (Bourdieu, 1986, p.248). In other words, academic qualifications permit the establishment of ‘conversion rates between cultural capital and economic capital by guaranteeing the monetary value of a given academic capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p.248). Thus, certified academic qualifications enable agents to attain—or ‘buy’—prestigious jobs with high salaries (Grenfell and James, 1998, p.21). It is in this way that agents with certified academic degrees exchange their cultural capital for economic, and symbolic, capital. It is noteworthy, however, that institutionalised cultural capital, like economic capital, can lose
its value over time, particularly when a certain degree or qualification ceases, as a result of qualification inflation, to secure the same prestigious jobs (Grenfell and James, 1998, p.21).

Thus, institutionalised cultural capital, with its importance in determining the position of social agents within fields of cultural production, can, for instance, help researchers to understand the reasons behind the decision of some publishers of English translations of modern Arabic fiction to display their institutionalised cultural capital, or that of their authors or translators, paratextually; that is, on the front cover, back cover, or dust cover of a translation, or in the preface or introduction. For example, the blurb on the back cover of the first Egyptian edition of the English translation of Mahfouz’s *Midaq Alley*, published, before he had won the Nobel Prize, by the AUCP and translated by Trevor Le Gassick, states that:

The translator, Trevor le Gassick [sic], born in England in 1935, is now Associate Professor at the University of Michigan.

The publisher’s decision to highlight the institutionalised cultural capital of the translator (‘Associate Professor’) and the fact that he is a native speaker of English who works at an American university, emphasises the translator’s cultural competence and knowledge. This may also be understood as a strategy to strengthen his position in the translation field. It could also be interpreted as the publisher’s desire to present the book not as a translated text, but rather as an academic or scholarly work, which would earn the publisher more economic capital, given the need for Arabic-related academic/scholarly materials at the time of the translation’s publication (see section 4.3.2).

3.5 Bourdieu’s concept of habitus

As mentioned above (see section 3.2), Bourdieu developed his concept of habitus to account for social agents’ social practices and to bridge the epistemological divide between subjectivism and objectivism, the two approaches that have long dominated the social sciences (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.121). The concept of habitus has a long tradition behind it. 15 It was first introduced by Aristotle through his idea of *hexis*—a Greek word whose Latin translation, habitus, ‘refers to a habitual or typical condition, state or appearance, particularly of the body’ (Jenkins, 1992, p.74). Bourdieu ‘completely rethought’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.10) the Aristotelian understanding of habitus and markedly

---

distinguished between it and habit—understood as a ‘mechanical assembly or performed programme’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.218). He maintains that whereas habit is ‘repetitive, mechanical, automatic, reproductive rather than productive’, habitus is ‘something powerfully generative. [It] is a product of conditionings which tends to reproduce the objective logic of those conditionings while transforming it’ (Bourdieu, 1993b, p.87).

For Bourdieu, habitus consists of a set of durable and transposable dispositions (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.53) that are ‘acquired through experience’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.9, italics in original) and geared toward practical decision making. As such, dispositions are variable from place to place and time to time (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.9). Moreover, although dispositions that make up habitus are long-lasting, with a propensity to perpetuate and reproduce themselves, they are not everlasting or ad infinitum (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.133; see also Bourdieu, 2002, p.29). This means that habitus is always objectively guided, reinforced or modified by the immanent necessity/demands and logic of the game16 (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.11). Habitus is an embodied form of capital, a sense of place, innate within agents, but having ‘a power of adaptation’ (Bourdieu, 1993b, pp.86–87) to an infinite number of possible situations, no matter how complex they might be (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.9).

Bourdieu avers that habitus is the operational site of two modes of structure: structuring structure and structured structure (Bourdieu, 1984, p.170; see also Bourdieu, 1990a, p.53). Habitus is structuring in that it structures how social agents perceive, act in and impact the social world (i.e. field) they operate in. It is structured because it is ‘historically constituted by and for membership of the field’ (Bourdieu, 1993b, p.75). This membership, as well as agents’ positions and position-takings in a field, is determined by the amount and form of capital agents possess. In other words, although habitus is structured by one’s dispositions, formed and transformed by one’s life experiences and influences through history, it also is conditioned by the structure and rules of membership of any given field. That is, since habitus is always ‘objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.95), it may function as a constraining factor but not an absolutely determining one. In addition to the familiar example of an individual changing their religion or faith to another (or none whatsoever—see section 3.6.2), an individual who immigrates to another country and gets exposed to and settles in a new culture may also experience a

16 Bourdieu often makes use of the analogy of a game in reference to the activity/ies taking place on a field (for more information thereof, see section 3.3).
change or a complete rupture in their habitus. Because they encounter different experiences, they will either question and become intolerant to some of their earlier beliefs, pushing them to change their habitus or acquire a new one, or they will grow to appreciate their culture and the habitus they have even more. This emphasises that habitus ‘belongs to a genetic mode of thought, as opposed to essentialist modes of thought’ (Bourdieu, 1993b, p.86, my italics). Therefore, habitus should be understood as:

systems of schemes of perception, appreciation and action [which] enable [social agents] to perform acts of practical knowledge, based on the identification and recognition of conditional, conventional stimuli to which they are predisposed to react; and, without any explicit definition of ends or rational calculation of means, to generate appropriate and endlessly renewed strategies, but within the limits of the structural constraints of which they are the product and which define them. (Bourdieu, 2000, p.138)

Bourdieu (1990b, p.9) defines practice as agents’ strategies for action that are not the mere outcomes or implementations of ‘a rule, or obedience to a rule’. Although an agent’s habitus can undoubtedly affect their practices and behaviour, Bourdieu stresses that habitus is only one factor of ‘production of practices among others’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.108). Put differently, although habitus has the capacity to produce actions, it can never generate practice in isolation. It is the interdependence between the internal system of acquired dispositions—i.e. habitus—and other external structural forces—i.e. field and capital—that informs and generates practice. In other words, for Bourdieu, ‘there exists neither internal nor external dimensions but a concurrence of both’ (Gouanvic, 2005, p.148). Bourdieu explains this interaction using the following formula: ‘[(habitus) (capital)] + field = practice’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p.101). Practice is thus performed at the conjunction of field, habitus and capital. Without critically examining their interaction, one cannot produce a fruitful sociological interpretation of the actual practice. Moreover, examining habitus in a vacuum could radically alter Bourdieu’s theoretical understanding and give rise to the false assumption that habitus is deterministic or mechanical.

It should be noted that, for Bourdieu, the notion of habitus, as is the case with field, is relational in that it connects between practices and structures (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990, p.203; see also Wacquant, 1989, p.43). It mediates the relationship between them in that it consists of ‘objective structures [that] tend to produce structured subjective dispositions that produce structured actions which, in turn, tend to reproduce objective structure’ (Swartz, 1977, p.548; see also Bourdieu, 1977b, p.487). This progressively
inscribes inside the minds and bodies of social agents a subjective ‘sense of one’s place’ (Bourdieu, 1984, p.466), a sort of social order, a hierarchy, that privileges some factions and disenfranchises others. Habitus thus functions as a kind of social orientation, guiding agents in a given field toward the social positions adjusted and objectively accessible to their class and properties, and toward the practices or goods that befit their expectations and aspirations (Bourdieu, 1984, p.466). This means probabilities of success or failure internalise and transform into individual “expectations,” “aspirations,” “inclinations,” or “desires”; that are subsequently externalised in practices that are more likely to reproduce the objective structure of life chances consistent with the conditions under which they were produced (Bourdieu, 1977b, p.496; see also Swartz, 1997, p.103). A child born and raised in a successful and well-educated family is expected to legitimise and reproduce his family’s social legacy and assume a similar life path, rather than work in a low-skilled or low-paying job. Conversely, a child born into poverty in an uneducated, underprivileged family is expected to have a self-relegated attitude towards education and will thus be more likely inclined to pursue a career similar to his or her parents’, since this is what seems to be objectively possible or reasonable to the child. Nevertheless, because ‘human behaviour is not monolithic’, some ‘revolutionary’ agents who possess ‘subversive habitus’—those whom Bourdieu calls ‘misfits’—are able to challenge the existing structures and hierarchical social order to the extent of remaking them (Bourdieu, 2002, pp.29–31, my italics). A pertinent example here is Bourdieu himself; a descendent of a modest family of farmers and son of a postal worker who became a renowned academician and acclaimed intellectual (see section 3.2).

Relevant to our understanding of the concept of habitus is Bourdieu’s emphasis that sociology and history cannot be disengaged or studied separately from each other, because the ‘separation of sociology and history is a disastrous division, and one totally devoid of epistemological justification’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.90, italics in original). With this in mind, Bourdieu contends that habitus ‘is the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product’ (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.56) but also that ‘is not a fate, not a destiny’ (Bourdieu, 2002, p.29). He also maintains that because habitus is the ‘product of history, that is of social experience and education, it may be changed by history, that is by new experiences, education or training’ (Bourdieu, 2002, p.29, italics in original). It is also ‘an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures’
(Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.133, italics in original). Take, for instance, a person’s correcting their pronunciation through elocution lessons; while difficult to achieve, this can be successfully realised through intentional, conscious and pedagogic effort (Bourdieu, 2002, p.29). The dynamic, flexible nature of habitus equips agents with an internalised ‘know-how’ toolkit (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.139) and provides them with a pool of ‘generative schemes’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.95) that can be called into play where and when contingent.

Conceptualising habitus as a ‘present past’ or embodiment of history (Bourdieu, 1990a, pp.54–56) made up of a long accrual of experiences, social background and values distinctive to a social agent, suggests that in the field of translation, a translator’s habitus is not only formed and informed by the field(s) in which they operate, but also that it is subject to transformation by other experiences that may fall outside of the realm of their professional field. Therefore, while choices made by a translator in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation may, for example, be conditioned by the dominant codes of practice within their professional field, they might also be influenced by a variety of other factors, such as changes in the structure of the fields they operate in, in the forms of capital existing in it, or in the translator’s personal circumstances, including social position, among other factors.

3.6 Bourdieu in/and translation studies: Application and criticism

Pierre Bourdieu’s sociological framework has fairly recently piqued the interest of several researchers in a number of contexts in translation studies, since its tenets have, thus far, proven viable for a reflection on the translation process and its social implications. Conversely, the theory has been critiqued on a number of counts. In the following sections, the application of Bourdieu’s sociology and the criticism levelled against his theory and its application, especially in relation to the field of translation studies, will be outlined and evaluated.

3.6.1 Application of Bourdieu in translation studies

From the 1990s onwards, translation studies has increasingly developed an interest in and started embracing the concepts of Bourdieu’s sociology. The shift towards Bourdieu’s theory of practice was mainly driven by the attempt of translation scholars to examine translation in its social context, and to fill the gap left open by DTS and polysystem theory. That is, their disregard of the role of social agents and their practices evident in every phase

There has also been a growing interest in organising conferences and publications on the application of Bourdieu’s theory, and sociological approaches in general, in translation studies. These include a special issue of The Translator, which appeared in 2005, and was dedicated to discussing Bourdieu’s work in relation to the sociology of translation and interpreting. The year 2006 witnessed the publishing of a relevant edited volume, entitled Sociology of Translation, which was edited by Arturo Parada and Oscar Díaz Fouces. Moreover, the first conference on translation and interpreting as social practices was organised in May 2005, by Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari, and culminated in publishing two important edited volumes on application of sociological approaches in translation studies. These volumes are Übersetzen – Translating – Traduire: Towards a “Social Turn”? edited by Wolf and published in 2006a, and Constructing a Sociology of Translation, which was edited by both Wolf and Fukari, and appeared in 2007. A large number of the contributions in both edited volumes were dedicated to the application of

---

17 There also exists a large body of research in interpreting studies that employ Bourdieu’s sociology (see for example, Inghilleri, 2003, 2005b, 2008; Thoutenhoofd, 2005; Sela-Sheffy and Shlesinger, 2008; Garcés and Blasi, 2010; Solano, 2012; Guéry, 2014).

18 There are other important studies which I could not list here due to space limitations. Moreover, the existing extensive body of research written on Bourdieu’s theory and its application in the field of translation makes it impractical to review all of the research work here.

19 It is noteworthy that the above studies cover different language pairs, use different concepts of Bourdieu’s ‘thinking tools’, depending on their research questions and points of enquiry, and employ a wide variety of methods—such as desktop research, archival work, close comparative reading of textual and/or paratextual materials, interviews, questionnaires etc.
Bourdieu’s sociology in the fields of translation and interpreting to identify the social factors conditioning the translation process.

In addition to this, a number of other events were organised and other edited volumes published to discuss the role of translation as social phenomena. These include a workshop at the University of Tel Aviv in 2006, entitled ‘Institutions, Habitus and Individuals: Social, Historical and Political Aspects of Cultural Exchanges’; a seminar in 2005, and a workshop in 2008, both held at Rovira i Virgili University, titled ‘Socio-cultural approaches’ and ‘Researching Translation as Social Action’ respectively; and a conference called ‘Going Social? Potentials and Paradoxes of the Sociological Study of Translation/Interpreting’ convened at the University of Salford in 2010. Once again, the majority of contributions in the last mentioned conference, for instance, discussed the potential and paradoxes of the application of Bourdieu, both in translation and interpreting studies.

Recently, there have been an increased number of publications on the different sociological approaches to translation and translatorial agents. These include a special issue of Monti, published in 2010, under the title ‘Applied Sociology in Translation Studies’ edited by Esther Monzó Nebot and Oscar Diaz Fouces; the 2014 edited book by Claudia Angelelli, entitled The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies; the volume Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies which appeared in 2014, and was edited by Gisella Vorderobermeier and expounded on Bourdieu’s concept of habitus and its application; and the 2014 volume entitled Translators Have their Say? Translation and the Power of Agency, edited by Abdel-Wahab Khalifa, which was mostly dedicated to the application of Bourdieu’s theory in translation research. All these activities attest to the current importance of Bourdieu’s sociology, and the pivotal position it has occupied in the field of translation.

That is to say, since its introduction in the field of translation, the Bourdieusian approach has been adopted and adapted in several forms, and from different perspectives, to reflect on the translation process and its social implications. However, as far as the studies that deal with English translations of modern Arabic fiction into English from a Bourdieusian, and sociological in general, viewpoint are concerned; it is safe to say that there is less than a handful of existing studies, and that most of the research in this area has primarily focused on the linguistics of translation. That is, the network of socio-cultural factors conditioning the production, consumption and circulation of these translations appears to have been largely overlooked within scholarly discourse. A quick search in major scholarly databases,
such as the British Library EThOS, DART-Europe E-theses Portal, OATD, ProQuest, Archive-EDU, COnnecting REpositories, OpenAire, and Google Scholar, reveals that approximately only three\textsuperscript{20} studies currently exist that draw on Bourdieu for the study of Arabic fiction or Arabic fiction genres in English translations;\textsuperscript{21} these being Boutrig (2012), Khalifa and Elgindy (2014), and Alkhawaja (2014), which will be discussed below according to their date of publication.\textsuperscript{22}

In his \textit{Agents in Translation: Bridging Gaps or Consolidating Stereotypes}, Boutrig discusses the English and French translations of Alaa Al-Aswany’s \textit{عماره يعوريبين} (\textit{Umārat Ya’qūbihān}) (‘The Yacoubian Building’) from a sociological viewpoint. Drawing mainly on Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, he examines the manifest relationships between agents involved in the translations; these being the author, translators and publishing houses (Boutrig, 2012, p.79). His study also grapples with the question of reception, and offers a paratextual analysis of prefaces, illustrations, and footnotes in the translated text to address and investigate how readers’ reception was shaped or determined by them (Boutrig, 2012, iii; see also pp.66–77). Chapter four of Boutrig’s (2012, pp.52–65) study briefly highlights the role of symbolic capital in the international circulation of books and examines the power relations governing the international circulation of translations. The study is novel in its scope, and provides incisive and valuable information on the agents involved in the translation of the Al-Aswany’s \textit{magnum opus} into English and French from a Bourdieusian viewpoint. Although the study looks at the English and French translations of Al-Aswany’s novel, it is unfortunate that it provides a cursory review of the history of Arabic literature in English translation, without providing a similar brief review of the translation movement of Arabic literature into French. Moreover, the discussion of the international circulation of translations, though

\textsuperscript{20} There are a number of studies that draw, either partially or fully, on Bourdieu’s sociology for the study of the Arabic literary/fiction field, but speak little on translation. For instance, in his doctoral thesis-turned-book ‘Conscience of the Nation’, Richard Jacquemond explores the social history of modern ‘Arabic’ literary production in Egypt during fifty years (from 1952 onwards). Although the book does not directly deal with translated Egyptian literature, it does however, have a section that briefly addresses the topic (see Jacquemond, 2008, pp.109–130; see also pp.232–236). Similar studies include: Mehrez (2008); Geer (2009); Saugestad (2011); Abou-Bakr (2011); Rooke (2011); El-Desouky (2014).

\textsuperscript{21} While I was wrapping up this thesis, I came across a couple of other relevant publications. These are: Sayeheen (2015) and contributions in Shamma (2016).

\textsuperscript{22} Both Khalifa and Elgindy’s article and Alkhawaja’s study were published in 2014. However, whereas Khalifa and Elgindy’s article was initially received by the publisher for the peer-review process in February 2014 and was resubmitted in revised form and published in April 2014 (Khalifa and Elgindy, 2014, p.41), Alkhawaja’s PhD thesis was submitted in April, 2014 (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 1, i) and was published online on 21 November 2014 (eprints.aston.ac.uk/24450/). That said, Khalifa and Elgindy’s article will be discussed prior to Alkhawaja’s study.
useful, is rather brief and could have benefited from more breadth to include further details about the unbalanced circulation of other translated Arabic works of fiction and literature than the examples provided therein. Some quantitative or statistical analyses to complement and substantiate the study’s findings would have also been beneficial. As far as the theoretical framework is concerned, the lack of a critical analysis of Bourdieu’s theory in general and addressing the critique levelled at the concept of habitus in particular, while perhaps beyond the scope of this particular study, is to be considered as one of the shortcomings of Boutrig’s study.

Another study that applies Bourdieu’s theory of practice in relation to modern Arabic fiction translation is Khalifa and Elgindy (2014). Conducting a purely sociological study, informed by the tenets of Bourdieu’s theory of practice, Khalifa and Elgindy set out to examine the genesis of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a socially situated activity. The authors particularly make use of Bourdieu’s concepts of field and capital as analytical tools to both describe and interpret the complexity and dynamics of the translation activity taking place in this field of cultural production. Altoma (2005, pp.54–58) argues that there are three identifiable thresholds or ‘phases’ within the history of translating modern Arabic fiction into English: these are the initial phase, the expanding phase, and the post-Nobel phase. Khalifa and Elgindy reconstruct Altoma’s argument, putting forward alternative dates for the processes of development identified by Altoma, and a Bourdieusian analysis of the dynamics of translation in the phases he suggested. Their article culminates by arguing for the recognition of a fourth phase, which could be referred to as the post 9/11 phase, in which they investigate its agents and dynamics (Khalifa and Elgindy, 2014, pp.52–53). Although useful in essence, and successful in laying the ground for future research (see Sayaheen, 2015, pp.17–18), especially in relation to the genesis of the modern Arabic fiction in English translation field, the study lacks depth in some parts. For instance, the post-Nobel phase is thinner in analysis than the other three phases, and the study overlooks important socio-political factors that have affected the field, including the events that purportedly led to Mahfouz winning the Nobel Prize in 1988. Including a thorough statistical analysis of what has been translated in each phase might have corroborated Khalifa and Elgindy’s arguments, too. Moreover, a clearer, more precise definition of the boundaries and limitations of the study would have been useful. For

23 This thesis draws and expands on Khalifa and Elgindy’s (2014) study.
instance, although the study claims to deal with the ‘bulk of narrative prose works’ written in Arabic and translated into English (Khalifa and Elgindy, 2014, p.43), it does not engage with English translations of Arabic children’s fiction works. Another thing that could have been valuable, but is missing from this study, as well as Boutrig’s, is a micro-textual analysis to supplement the macro-sociological one.

Alkhawaja’s (2014) study explores the role of social agents in structuring and restructuring the field of the Egyptian novel in translation through examining the translations of six novels\(^{24}\) by Naguib Mahfouz, drawing on a mix of sociological and textual approaches to identify and describe the translators’ behaviours, which she claims result from their habitus (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 1, ii; see also p.257). To this effect, and drawing on Bourdieu’s theory of social practice (concentrating mainly on his concept of habitus), Ivir’s (1987) strategies for investigating culturally specific items, and Venuti’s (1995) concepts of domestication and foreignisation, she analyses what she posits to be a field at the macro and micro levels. This is done insofar as to how translators’ have structured the field understudy, and conversely how their habitus was influenced by different socio-cultural factors\(^{25}\) in the field, and how their habitus has informed their translation strategies, especially in relation to the way they translated culturally specific items (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 1, p.204), based on randomly selected examples (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 1, p.140; see also p.215), in Mahfouz’s novels. Her overall aim is to ‘explore how Bourdieu’s hypothesis, which states that the habitus is the product of structure, producer of practice, and reproducer of structure, can be a useful tool in explaining phenomena affecting translation practice’ and to ‘explain how translators’ habitus is influenced by the field and how the field could influence translators’ practices in their translations’, particularly in terms of the way they rendered cultural specific items into English (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 1, p.204). To understand ‘how the translational habitus was constructed (...) or at least was influenced’ in the field, she conducts interviews\(^{26}\) with the main agents, primarily translators, who contributed to the translation of her six-novel-


\(^{25}\) Alkhawaja briefly examines three socio-cultural factors. These are ‘the affect [sic] of Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize, the 11 September attack and globalisation on translators’ translational habitus’ (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 1, p.233) and how this affects their behaviours at the textual level, especially in relation to translating culturally specific items in her six-novel-corpus.

\(^{26}\) Among other sources, the current study will draw on parts of the interviews conducted by Alkhawaja (2014, Vol. 2).
corpus (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 1, pp.232–233). The study concludes that translators have increasingly tended to adapt a foreignising approach in their translations, to ‘deliver translations which are more exotic in tone than before’, as a result of their translational habitus, which is itself impacted by socio-cultural factors taking place in the field (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 1, p.245).

Alkhawaja’s study provides valuable insights into how translatorial agents’ habitus impacts the end translation product, as well as into some of the factors that have affected the development of the field of novel translation in Egypt, especially in relation to the English translations of six of Naguib Mahfouz’s works, and how they have influenced translators’ practices/behaviours at the textual level. Moreover, the interviews conducted by Alkhawaja and presented in the study provide a rich resource on agents involved in the commissioning, translation production and circulation of Mahfouz’s works. Nevertheless, it is unfortunate that the study focuses on the field of Arabic novel translation into English only in the Egyptian context and exclusively in relation to one author, i.e. Mahfouz. The findings of the study would have been much more useful and illuminating had the author adopted an international, rather than a national, analysis of the translated Arabic novel field and its agents (especially non-Egyptian authors, and publishers of translated Arabic novels into English that are located outside of Egypt—see section 3.6.2 for a critique of Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of a field as being national). Although the study is to be commended for adopting a macro and micro analysis, it lacks a systematic analytical approach towards what it investigates. Another point is that while it claims to be sociological in nature, it makes no attempt to engage, for instance, with analysing paratextual elements or the issue of retranslation, although two of the novels it tackles have been translated twice, and opts for analysing culturally specific items, translators’ behaviours, and if their strategies are geared towards domesticating or foreignising the translated text.

27 Zuqāq al-Midaq was translated by Trevor Le Gassick, and first published in 1966 as Midaq Alley by Khayyats and was republished by the AUCP and other publishers in both the USA and the UK. The novel was then retranslated by Humphery Davies and was published in 2011, to celebrate the centenary of Mahfouz’s birth, by the AUCP, also as Midaq Alley. There are also two existing English translations of Mahfouz’s ‘Al-Liṣṣa al-kilāb. The first translation of the novel was made by Adel Ata Elyas, in his PhD thesis-turned-book, as The Thief and the Dogs. Although Elyas completed his PhD in 1979, the translation was published eight years later by Dar Al-Shoroug, Jeddah, in 1987. The second translation of the novel was published in 1984 by the AUCP, and then republished by other publishers both in the USA and the UK. Here, too, the novel was translated, by Trevor Le Gassick, in cooperation with M. M. Badawi, also as The Thief and the Dogs.
Guided by a bibliography of modern Arabic fiction translations into English from 1908 to 2014, the current study builds on the existing research conducted on the field of modern Arabic fiction (or its genres) in English translation, and attempts to fill the gaps left open by the studies briefly outlined above. While various studies in the field of translation have made use of the socio-analytical framework developed by Bourdieu, the genesis of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and the phenomenon of retranslation, especially in relation to Mahfouz’s works of fiction, still deserve further attention. Moreover, all of the above studies pull Bourdieu’s sociology apart, making use of one or more of its concepts without referring (or referring fleetingly) to the others, to fit in with their analyses. However, this study makes use of Bourdieu’s concepts in relation to one another, so as not to risk losing the dynamism and complexity of the theory’s social analysis (see section 3.6.2).

3.6.2 Critique of Bourdieu’s sociology

Although Bourdieu’s theory of social practice has stimulated the interest of a number of translation studies researchers, as previously mentioned, it has, nevertheless, attracted much criticism from both within and outside the field of translation. In what follows, I attempt to address the main criticisms that have been levelled against the theory and its application in this area of research.

Bourdieu’s concept of habitus has received the largest share of criticism in the field of translation and beyond. At the crux of the argument is the propensity of some scholars, who rely on Bourdieu to limit their understanding of agents to the translator, to only view agency from an individualistic and deterministic perspective, to focus on the product rather than the process, and to emphasise the differences between subject and object (Buzelin, 2005, p.215; see also Sheffy, 1997, pp.37–38; Sela-Sheffy, 2005, p.3; Meylaerts, 2008, p.94; Haddadian-Moghaddam, 2014, p.17). These criticisms are partly justified when it comes to how Bourdieu’s sociology has been interpreted and applied in translation studies. However, most of them are generally not reflective of Bourdieu’s theory itself. Simply put, these criticisms could be said to revolve around six main points regarding the tendency of Bourdieusian contributions to translation (or Bourdieu’s theory in general) to (1) reduce agents to translators only (see, for instance, Buzelin, 2005, p.209, p.215; Kung, 2009, p.126; Abdallah, 2014, p.114; Haddadian-Moghaddam, 2014, p.17); (2) focus on the human perspective, overlooking any nonhuman elements (see, for example, to Buzelin, 2005, p.194; Hekkanen, 2009, p.12; Kung, 2009, p.126; Bogic, 2009, p.78; Abdallah, 2014, p.114);
(3) concentrate on the product, saying ‘very little about the actual process of translation (as rewriting)’, and who participates in it (see Buzelin, 2005, p.214, p.215; see also Bogic, 2009, p.78); (4) accentuate the distinction between subject and object, and view agency from a deterministic or individualistic perspective (see, for instance, Sheffy, 1997, pp.37–38; Selasheffy, 2005, p.3; Buzelin, 2005, p.215, Meylaerts, 2006, pp.60–61, 2010, p.2; Haddadian-Moghaddam, 2014, p.17); (5) conceptualise the field as being national, overlooking the supranational dimension of cultural production (see, for example, Simeoni, 1998, p.20; Meylaerts, 2005, pp.277–282; 2008, p.94; Pym, 2011, p.82; Billiani, 2014, p.2); and (6) over-emphasise the idea of struggle, assuming the pre-existence of power and overlooking the possible cooperation between agents in a field (see, for instance, Meylaerts, 2005, p.277; Hekkanen, 2009, p.7; Pym, 2011, p.82; Haddadian-Moghaddam, 2012, p.17, 2014, p.17; Buzelin, 2013, p.189). While some of these criticisms may be irrelevant to the current study, their approaches include some disputable assumptions (points 1 to 4), and a few valid points (points 4 and 5), which could affect its credibility and the choice of Bourdieu as the foundation of its theoretical framework. Therefore, they will be briefly addressed below.

In relation to the first of these points, it is essential to point out that Bourdieu’s works did not directly engage with translation studies and he seldom cited examples from the field.28 An exception can be found in one of his last articles in which he discussed the international circulation of ideas and cited examples from the field of translation (see Bourdieu, 1999, pp.220–228). Significantly, in this article Bourdieu mentions the word ‘translator’ only once, while mentioning words such as ‘publisher’ five times, for instance. Moreover, Bourdieu’s examples neither implicitly nor explicitly exclude any agents from participating in the process of translation. In fact, his words seem to tacitly include all agents in the discussion. He states that:

A large number of translations can only be understood if they are placed in the complex network of international exchanges between holders of dominant academic posts, the exchanges of invitations, honorary doctorates, etc. The question that must then be asked is how it comes about that a certain writer or editor becomes the importer of a certain thought. Why is writer X published by publisher Y? For it is obvious that there will always be some sort of profit involved. Heretical imports are often the work of marginals in the field, bringing

---

28 Gouanvic (2002b, p.160) purports that Bourdieu did not account for translations in his theory because ‘far from constituting a field of their own, translated texts are submitted to the same objective logic as the indigenous texts of the target space’.

---
a message, a position of force from a different field, which they use to try and shore up their own position. (Bourdieu, 1999, p.223, my italics)

That is to say, Bourdieu’s theory itself does not exclude any agent (or factor) from the discussion. In translation studies, we do not only talk about one main sole producer, which is the translator; we also talk about co-producers. Accordingly, if Bourdieu’s theory is relevant and applicable to the translator, it is the understanding of this study that it also applies to other co-producers or translation agents29 who contribute to the fashioning of any translation activity. This is also evident in studies from within translation studies that apply the theory beyond the translator (see, for instance, Gouanvic, 1997, pp.125–152; Ben-Ari, 2014, pp.23–39). It is, therefore, how Bourdieu’s sociological enterprise has been interpreted and (mostly) applied in the field that has probably given rise to that rather false assumption.

Concerning the second point, whether Bourdieu’s sociology overlooks nonhuman elements or takes no account of them is disputable. I would argue that Bourdieu’s theory does engage with nonhumans and distinguishes between humans and nonhumans in a rather unconventional way that is neither reductive nor simplistic. To illustrate, Bourdieu speaks of the existence of ‘agents’—which could be interpreted as human subjects—as well as ‘institutions’—which could be understood as nonhuman agents formed and mainly determined by human agents’ actions. Moreover, to examine Bourdieu’s sociology is to discuss his concepts relationally and in tandem to one another, and not separately. To do otherwise would be to misunderstand how they interact to produce and interpret social relations, and to fail to grasp the dynamism of Bourdieu’s social theory in general. A fortiori, a closer look at the concept of capital and what Bourdieu means by it will reveal that it solely refers to nonhuman resources in the process of cultural production, which define the structure of a field as well as the positions of, and relation between, its agents (both human agents and human-run institutions). Moreover, this examination can help determine the logic of their practice, as well as their very existence and position-takings (also understood as a nonhuman aspect—see section 3.3.1 for more information on position-takings). It is noteworthy that capital (or nonhuman resources) should not be restricted to the traditional

---

29 Haddadian-Moghaddam (2015, p.147) rightly argues that the term translation agents should not be used loosely as this could lead to calling everything that fills the gap between the producer and readers may simply be called an agent of translation. By way of illustration, he posits the question: ‘Is the postman who delivers a translated book purchased online to our door, an agent of translation?’.
forms of capital identified by Bourdieu. Bourdieu advocates a pragmatic usage of his theory (Wacquant, 1992, p.31) and even speaks of other unconventional types of capital, such as juridical, scientific or academic capital, to cite a few examples (see Bourdieu, 1987b, pp.805–853; Bourdieu, 1988a, pp.73–127; Bourdieu, 1994, pp.9–12).30 In addition, Bourdieu refers to internal and external factors that could affect the practices in a field. Since Bourdieu did not restrict these factors to only those that are humanly-prompted, one could infer that factors, in the Bourdieusian sense, could refer to both those that are humanly-induced and those that are nonhumanly-induced.

With regards to the view that Bourdieu’s theory, or rather its application, focuses on the product and says very little about the process and who participates in it, a large number of studies have been conducted in the field of translation building on Bourdieu, thereby making this assumption unwarranted on a number of grounds. Therefore, I agree with Gouanvic that Bourdieu’s theory is:

not only a sociology of the institution but also of its agents. It is a sociology of the text as a production in the process of being carried out, of the product itself and of its consumption in the social fields, the whole seen in a relational manner. For Bourdieu, practical instances cannot be adequately described if we neglect one of the elements nor if we make distinctions between things which should not be thought of separately; for example, if we distinguish between the external and internal dimensions of a production, between the objective structures which are the fields and the incorporated dispositions which are the habitus. In this sense, for Bourdieu there exists neither internal nor external dimensions but a concurrence of both. (Gouanvic, 2005, p.148)

It should, however, be noted that Bourdieusian approaches to translation focus mainly, if not entirely, on examining the extra-textual elements of the translation product, thus overlooking the analyses of the translated text itself and translation strategies used to render it on a micro level. Bourdieu, as noted by Wolf (2007a, p.17), emphasises ‘the necessity of combining these two levels [i.e., the extra-textual and the textual], a methodological move which enables a comprehensive explanation of the functional logics in the field’ (see also Bourdieu, 1996a, p.298). Nevertheless, it is postulated that although Bourdieu’s theory is capable of, and a good tool for, guiding translation analyses both on

---

30 There are existing studies that expand on Bourdieu’s theorisation of capital. See for example, Helga Nowotny and her conceptualisation of an ‘emotional capital’ (Nowotny, 1981, p.148).
the process and product levels, it is not a very good tool for accounting for textual data or a translator’s lexical choices on the micro level.

To address the fourth point, Bourdieu is often chastised for overemphasising the distinction between the subject and the object, to the extent that he is accused of failing to overcome this dualism. This line of criticism is especially related to Bourdieu’s conception of habitus, which critics argue constrains agents’ agency. They, therefore, perceive habitus as a form of objective determinism purporting that it gives precedence to structure over agency (see for example, Meylaerts, 2006, p.60, 2010, p.2).

To begin, if a criticism can be made against Bourdieu’s theory in this regard, it must be of the subjective side of habitus, and not the objective side, that choices are variously constrained. However, it is important to note that Bourdieu formulated his sociological enterprise in response to, and in order to overcome, such dichotomies as subject vs. object, agency vs. structure, thought vs. habit, micro vs. macro, etc. (see section 3.2) and to establish ‘an experimental science of the dialectic of the internalisation of externality and the externalisation of internality, or (…) of incorporation and objectification’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.72, italics in original). He avers that ‘it is necessary to abandon all theories which explicitly or implicitly treat practice as a mechanical reaction, directly determined by the antecedent conditions, and entirely reducible to the mechanical functioning of pre-established assemblies, “models” or “rôles”’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.73, my italics). He, therefore, developed his concept of habitus to escape ‘both the objectivism of action understood as a mechanical reaction “without an agent” and the subjectivism which portrays action as the deliberate pursuit of conscious intention’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.121).

Habitus could thus be thought of as a multi-layered repertoire/repository of both conscious and (mostly) unconscious internalised beliefs or behaviours, all forming a ‘system of dispositions’ within social agents. Disposition, according to Bourdieu, ‘expresses first the result of an organising action [and] designates a way of being, a habitual state (especially of the body) and, in particular, a predisposition, tendency, propensity, or inclination’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, p.214, italics in original). Although an agent’s internalised system of dispositions could provoke a tendency to unconsciously reproduce certain acts or act in a patterned way when faced with similar situations, the field in which they operate, the type of capital for which they strive, and the constantly changing external factors—not to mention their
intention for undertaking an action—prompt them to resist (or altogether reject) this predisposition, and to make use of their practical or conscious volition or decision-making abilities. That is, habitus is best understood as ‘a mediating construct, not a determining one’ (Mahar et al., 1990, p.12). To illustrate, an individual of a particular religious faith that had become an integral part of their life may nonetheless choose to go against their socially constituted nature, the internalised set of beliefs laid down in them by their earliest upbringing or education (i.e. their habitus), and convert to another religion, adopt another faith or choose to no longer practice a faith whatsoever (for more examples thereof, see section 3.5).

It is noteworthy that although one’s habitus can undoubtedly affect their practices, Bourdieu stresses that habitus is only ‘one principle of production of practices among others’ (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.108, my italics). Moreover, since practices are not simply the mere outcome of one’s habitus only but also of the relations between one’s habitus and one’s current surroundings and circumstances (Maton, 2008, p.52; see also section 3.5 for a thorough discussion of the concept of habitus), habitus should not be considered in isolation from its interrelated concepts of field and capital. Examining habitus in a vacuum could radically alter Bourdieu’s theoretical understanding and give rise to the false assumption that habitus is deterministic or mechanical. However, considering habitus in relation to Bourdieu’s other concepts of capital and field enables a better understanding of agents’ social changes, how they exercise their volition and voice their agency. Moreover, it allows for fathoming the contradictions in agents’ practices and behaviour in similar situations in different fields. Hence, I agree with Inghilleri that Bourdieu’s concept of habitus is able to account for how agents of translation can be determined and yet also act, and how their ‘behaviour can be regulated and shared without being the product of conformity to be codified, recognised rules or other causal mechanisms’ (Inghilleri, 2005a, pp.134–135).

Bourdieu’s own description of his critics largely holds true here. He states that:

they criticise not my analyses, but an already simplified, if not maimed, representation of my analyses. This is because they invariably apply to them the very modes of thought, and especially distinctions, alternatives and oppositions, which my analyses are aimed at destroying and overcoming. (Bourdieu, 1990b, p.107)

Nevertheless, Bourdieu’s sociology has been rightly criticised on a number of counts. Most relevant to this study are the last two points outlined above: conceptualising the field as
being national, overlooking the supranational dimension of cultural production, and assuming the pre-existence of power, over-emphasising the idea of struggle and overlooking the possible cooperation between agents in a field. Both points will be briefly discussed below.

Turning to the fifth element of the critique, one of the apparent shortcomings of Bourdieu’s theory is its conceptualisation of a field as being national. Bourdieu’s understanding of fields is primarily grounded in the context of the nation-state—especially in relation to France and Algeria. However, a field like modern Arabic fiction in English translation, which is the concern of this study, is a transnational literary field that extends beyond national borders (see chapters four and five). Nevertheless, this does not mean that the idea of the field is static with predetermined boundaries since Bourdieu himself calls for a practical adoption of his theory. He states that

The notion of field does not provide ready-made answers to all possible queries, in the manner of the grand concepts of ‘theoretician theory’ which claims to explain everything and in the right order. Rather, its major virtue (...) is that it promotes a mode of construction that has to be rethought anew every time. It forces us to raise questions: about the limits of the universe under investigation, how it is ‘articulated,’ to what and to what degree, etc. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.110, italics in original)

There is an existing body of research that reconceptualises Bourdieu’s definition of a national field and calls for extending it beyond national boundaries to transnational boundaries, and attempts to expand on Bourdieu’s field theory in order to engage with transnational or global social orders (see, for example, Dezalay and Garth, 1996; Heilbron, 1999; Casanova, 2004; Fourcade, 2006; Steinmetz, 2008a, 2008b; Go, 2008; Buchholz, 2006, 2013; Mejías-López, 2009; Krause, 2014). These studies, as well as others, showcase the merits of Bourdieu’s theory and demonstrate what it can offer when extended beyond national borders/boundaries to reach a global or international level.

31 This claim has been voiced by ANT advocates in the field of translation. It is noteworthy that although this is true to Bourdieu’s theory, ANT is not so different, as it also tacitly assumes the pre-existence of power in an actor-network (see section 2.4.3 for more details on this point).

32 In much of his latest work, Bourdieu spoke of global or international fields, but did not conduct a systematic empirical global field analysis himself. By way of illustration, Bourdieu (1991a, pp.373–387) speaks of the field of world sociology; in his forward to Dezelay and Garth’s book Dealing in Virtue, Bourdieu (1996b, vii–viii) briefly discusses the global or international legal field; Bourdieu (1998b, p.41) addresses the global media field; and finally, Bourdieu (2003) refers to the global field of the economy (p.49), the global economic field (p.84, p.89, p.91), and the global economic and financial field (p.86).
As for the sixth and final point of criticism, it has been argued that Bourdieu disregards cooperation between agents and stresses that within a field they are in a constant state of competition and struggle. Although Bourdieu (1984, pp.226–256) clearly states that the struggle between the dominated and the dominant is inherent in all fields, elsewhere he describes the possible alliances between different agents in a field. He states that in order to break ‘out of the circle of symbolic reproduction’, or disrupt the structure of a field, ‘alliances can be set up which are more or less durable and which are always based on a more or less conscious misunderstanding’ (Bourdieu, 1991b, p.245). These alliances, according to Bourdieu, are based on what he terms the ‘homology of position’ (see section 3.3.3 for information on homology) which:

is the source of an ambiguous alliance, in which cultural producers, the dominated among the dominant, supply to the dominated, by a sort of embezzlement of accumulated cultural capital, the means of constituting objectively their vision of the world and the representation of their interests in an explicit theory and in institutionalised instruments of representation—trade-union organisations, political parties, social technologies of mobilisation and demonstration, etc. (Bourdieu, 1991b, p.245)

That is, there could be instances where the dominated factions among the ‘dominant’ (for example, intellectuals) share their accumulated resources—especially cultural capital—with the ‘dominated’ (such as industrial workers) in a field. This, in turn, strengthens the dominated’s perceptions of their own position and positioning in the social world, and also provides them with the means to objectively establish their vision of it. However, this endows the dominant with symbolic capital and gives them the right to claim the role of the chaperone in a field and impose their idea of the world on the dominated. Bourdieu calls this process of (false) sharing ‘embezzlement’ and believes it is based on conscious misunderstanding (see section 3.3.5 for information on Bourdieu’s concept of misrecognition). It is apparent that Bourdieu’s sociology places great emphasis on the idea that struggle and contention between antagonistic groups is at the heart of any field of cultural production. However, what remains as a noticeable gap in Bourdieu’s sociology is the fact that cooperation and sharing of capital resources could create or alter the dynamics of any field of activity (or define the relations between its agents) without having to disrupt its system or laws of functioning. An example of this could be drawn from Khalifa and Elgindy (2014, p.50) as they demonstrate how, due to the internal dynamics of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, its key players in the 1970s and 80s had to resort to
cooperation and consolidation among themselves in order to strengthen and expand the boundaries of the field.\footnote{Khalifa and Elgindy (2014, p.50) also highlight how this trend shifted after Mahfouz had won the Nobel Prize in 1988, which gave rise to other forms of capital in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.}

No theory exists that is all-encompassing or comprehensive. Theories are created by humans, and as humans evolve, develop and die, theories may become obsolete, or evolve and expand in response to the new developments and questions that one asks of them. Bourdieu acknowledged this fact, hence his call for the pragmatic use of his theory and the perception of its concepts as nothing more than ‘thinking tools’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.160) or temporary constructs ‘\textit{which takes shape for and by empirical work}’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.161, italics in original). That is to say, the concepts of Bourdieu’s theory must not only be understood as he ostensibly understood them; instead, one can expand on or extend its boundaries and limits. Despite its shortcomings in certain respects, Bourdieu’s sociology provides a sense of historicity and an attention to power relations which aid in the analysis presented in this study.

3.7 Concluding remarks

This chapter has presented the rationale underlying the choice of Bourdieu’s sociology, critically examining the different viewpoints available on the nature of the theory, and has thoroughly discussed and provided examples of its main concepts. Bourdieu’s sociology has been demonstrated to be useful in guiding the analyses of this study and in investigating the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, at different interconnected levels. It can, for instance, help deepen the understanding of the social determinants regulating the translation activity as well as its practitioners and products. It can also provide valuable socio-cultural and political insights into the dynamics of translation production and the multiple discursive practices arising at every stage throughout the translation process. Since unbalanced power relations are evident in the activity of translating modern Arabic fiction into English, Bourdieu’s sociology can also offer reasonable explanations for the existing struggle-related issues in the field. In turn, this could aid the interpretation of the field’s internal (and external) dynamics of production and consumption; for example, through a consideration of the unequal allocation of capital in the field and through questioning why some individual agents or institutions are more consecrated than others.
In the chapters that follow, Bourdieu’s ‘thinking tools’ will be utilised to investigate the genesis and social history as well as the structure and dynamics of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

4.1 Initial remarks

The aim of chapters four and five is to examine the genesis of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a socially situated activity and to explore the internal and external factors that have formed and shaped its structure, the dynamics of its competition and/or cooperation, and its boundaries. The chapters identify the four phases that the field has undergone and conducts a thorough analysis of each in terms of its structure, the capital at stake, the agents involved and their positions, the modes of production used and the amount of activity. In contrast to the predominant linear understanding of the history of modern Arabic fiction translation into English, these chapters make use of Bourdieu’s analytical tools of field, capital, positions and position-takings as well as other concepts to describe and interpret the historical trajectory and social practice of the field’s translation activity. A sociological reading is offered on the premise that ‘the viability of a translation is established by its relationship to the cultural and social conditions under which it is produced and read’ (Venuti, 1995, p.18). The phase commencing in 1988 is the dividing line between the two chapters because, in marked contrast to the preceding phases, the field experienced a sudden boom in its activities, agents and positions following Naguib Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize in 1988.

This study focuses specifically on fiction because it is a genre that offers more revelations about the socio-cultural and political determinants that impact translation activity in the wider field of modern Arabic literature translated into English than other literary genres. Many scholars perceive fiction as a rich source of material for translation and consider it ‘the most frequently encountered literary medium in contemporary publishing’ (Allen, 2003, p.1).

Drawing on Bourdieu’s sociology, the following sections of this chapter investigate the genesis and social history of the first two phases of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and outline their characteristics.

4.2 Modern Arabic fiction in English translation: Genesis of the field

The field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation is not rigid but dynamic, and its boundaries are not static or predetermined. Its boundaries are conditioned by internal and external factors that both form and inform them. The former relates to the interplay
between agents (i.e. their cooperation/struggle) and ‘the rules of the game’ within the field, and the latter relates to the relationship between the field of fiction translation and other fields, particularly the field of power; that is, the political and economic fields.

The limits, or the points of entry, to any field are institutionally established and ‘situated at the points where the effects of the field cease’ to have any influence or consequences on practice (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.100). Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, p.100) argue that the boundaries of a field can be determined solely by empirical analysis (see also Jenkins, 1992, p.54). This means that the boundaries of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation can only be assessed by studying the field’s structure, that is, the objective relationships between the field and its agents, and between the field in question and other fields.

Altoma (1996, 2000, 2005) argues that the evolution of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation has three identifiable thresholds or phases (i.e. the initial phase, the expansion phase and the post-Nobel phase). Informed by a bibliography of modern Arabic fiction translated into English, which I have compiled (see Appendix A),¹ this study challenges and reconstructs this argument, putting forward alternative dates for the phases identified by Altoma. It also provides a thorough Bourdieusian analysis of the dynamics of translation in the phases Altoma suggested by examining the network of socio-cultural and historico-political determinants conditioning the production, consumption and circulation in the field. Chapters four and five culminate by arguing for the recognition of a fourth phase, which could be referred to as the post-9/11 phase, and investigate its agents and dynamics. These chapters also attempt to provide insights into overlooked aspects of these four distinct, though overlapping, phases. Drawing on Bourdieu’s ‘thinking tools’, these chapters also describe and interpret the complexity of the translation activity taking place in this field of cultural production.

4.3 The initial phase (1908–1967)

Altoma (2005, pp.54–55) identifies this phase as beginning in 1947. Although it could be argued that the boundaries of the field started taking shape from that date, it is also possible to trace the first English translation of a work of modern Arabic fiction back to 1908. Although the number of translations was not voluminous during this phase, which spans for

¹ For a detailed outline on how the appended bibliographies to this study were compiled and arranged, as well as the difficulties encountered in the process, see section 1.4.
nearly 60 years, given the various factors that affected the field during that time, it is perhaps instructive to divide it into two sub-phases: the embryonic, starting 1908 and ending 1946, and the formative, from 1947 to 1967. Each of these sub-phases is discussed in more detail below.

Before discussing each sub-phase, it is important to note that during this phase little attention was given to translating and/or translated modern Arabic fiction into English by either English publishers or the English reading public. The factors that contributed to this lack of interest include:

1- Lack of interest in modern Arabic fiction on the part of the translators and publishers, who were primarily interested in translating religious texts as well as historical, geographical, scientific and philosophical ones (Le Gassick, 1971, p.27).

2- The late development of modern Arabic fiction seems to have coincided with the reservations expressed by various orientalists about the appeal and literary value of modern Arabic fiction, either in translation or in original form. These reservations are manifest in Gibb’s (1963, p.161) statement that Arabic ‘short stories, novels, and plays, [sic] remain bounded by the horizons and conventions of the Arab world: when translated into other languages they are often more interesting as social documents than as literary achievements’ (my italics).

3- The lack of specialists with adequate knowledge of Arabic language and culture seems to have fostered the idea that the Arabic language is inherently disadvantaged. Due to the limited familiarity with Arabic language and culture, and because of the perception of an umbilical relationship between “Arabic” and “Islam” in the Anglophone world, Arabic was regarded in the West in general as a ‘louche’ and ‘controversial language’ (Said, 1990, p.278). It was also seen as being intrinsically untranslatable or ‘unapproachable’, with nothing to offer (Said, 1990, p.278).

4- The hegemony of English and the rise of the Anglophone culture’s sense of autonomy and self-sufficiency resulted in the perception of modern Arabic literature (and fiction) as being of ‘lesser significance than the tastes of the Anglophone reading public’ (Clark, 2000, p.4).

5- The scarcity of publishing opportunities, which was associated with the high cost of preparing and publishing a translation (Le Gassick, 1969, pp.4–5).
The selection of what would be translated during this phase, which is also evident to some extent in the other phases, was largely driven by the translators themselves and seemed to have little to do with the literary merits. Instead, the selection was based on the translators’ personal preferences, their awareness of a particular author’s prominence in their own culture or their having a personal relationship with the author. This process indeed resulted in a ‘sporadic and haphazard’ translation flow of modern Arabic fiction into English (Le Gassick, 1992, p.48). Publishers were mainly small literary presses in the United States, United Kingdom and Egypt, the three primary places of publishing for translations of modern Arabic fiction into English to this very day.

It was through the efforts of persevering individuals, who endeavoured to introduce and make accessible modern Arabic fiction to the English-speaking world by means of translation, that the field of modern Arabic fiction translation began to form. These individuals’ work was rather long and arduous. During this phase, translations were not voluminous because finding a publisher was difficult. Büchler and Guthrie (2011a, p.17) state that during this phase, ‘it was almost impossible to find a publisher willing to take on an Arabic book in translation’. In an attempt to change the trends of the publishing market, the avant-garde translators of modern Arabic fiction paid more attention to translating short stories than novels/novellas (see Graph 1). Although the reasons for this can be ascribed to the dominant position enjoyed by the short story in modern Arabic fiction at that time, it could also be argued that it was easier to publish translated short stories by squeezing them into periodicals and intellectual journals. This led to the emergence of new positions in the field related to the medium and genre of translation.

Graph 1
4.3.1 The embryonic sub-phase (1908–1946)

The embryonic sub-phases could be defined as the period that translations of modern Arabic fiction into English started to exist. The main agents, their positions and motivations for undertaking translation, and the internal and external forces that shaped the formation of the field are discussed below.

The period between 1908 and 1947 was marked by the slow and sporadic publication of a small number of modern Arabic works of fiction translated into English (Le Gassick, 1971, p.28; Altoma, 2005, p.14). As the bibliography in Appendix A below indicates, only six works of fiction were published in book form during this sub-phase. This is in addition to a number of short stories that were published sparsely in literary magazines (for a full list thereof, see Allen, 1969, passim; Alwan, 1972, passim).

The first existing translation of a modern Arabic work of fiction is Frank Nurse’s translation of Shukri Al-Khuri’s 1902 novella [ال특فاة العامية أو قصة قناتووس] [al-Tufah al-‘Āmmiyah aw Qisṣat Fīnyānūs], which was originally published in Al-Khuri’s own literary magazine [الأصمعي] [al-Aṣma‘ī]. The translation was done as part of Nurse’s doctorate degree at the University of Heidelberg in Germany and was printed in the United States in 1908 as The Pitiful Pilgrimage of Phinyanus (see Image 1).

In the first few lines of the preface to his translation, Nurse sets out to distinguish himself and Al-Khuri’s novella. He outlines the uniqueness of Al-Khuri’s work in the modern Arabic literary tradition, its ‘revolutionary nature’ (and the writings of Al-Khuri in general), before referring to how its ‘sale and possession’ was banned by the ruling Ottoman Empire and how he laboriously managed to obtain a copy (Nurse, 1908, iii). Although the motivation behind translating this specific novella is unstated in the preface, one may deduce from the above that the political controversy surrounding the original text, the socio-cultural backdrop of the conditions in which it was written and the fact it was banned by the Ottoman Empire were behind Nurse’s choice of this particular text for translation. This example is suggestive of how the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation has been influenced since its early beginnings, at least in part, by internal and external forces, which can best be described as sociological phenomena related to the field of power, i.e. the field of politics. Nurse’s lack of expertise in the Arab culture and literary tradition is

---

2 The magazine was founded in 1898 in São Paulo, Brazil by Shukri Al-Khuri. It was the first Arabic literary magazine to be published in Brazil (see Image 1).
evident in his introduction, in the first line of which he misidentifies Al-Khuri as Syrian, although he was Lebanese.

It was not until twenty-four years later that another modern Arabic work of fiction was published. The year 1932 witnessed the publication of the first part of Taha Hussein’s tripartite autobiographical novel [Al-Ayyām (‘The Days’)] (first published in Arabic in 1929), which was translated by E.H. Paxton as *An Egyptian Childhood: The Autobiography of Taha Hussein*. The translation was published in London by George Routledge and Sons, now Routledge, which at that time was a small publishing house focusing on academic and scholarly works (see Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd Archives at University College London’s Special Collections). Hussein was a graduate of the Sorbonne, and both he and Paxton were working at the Egyptian University (now Cairo University) in the early 1930s. Hussein was a prolific writer at that time and the first Egyptian to have ever attained the post of dean of the Faculty of Arts (Paxton, 1932, vi–vii; see also Abaza, 2010, p.247). It was arguably Hussein’s social, cultural and symbolic capital that led to the translation of his work within three years of its publication in Arabic. Hussein’s symbolic capital is also evident in the citation of his name in the subtitle of the translation, which demonstrates his fame not only in the Arab world but also in the Anglophone world and Europe in general. The translator, Paxton, was British, a graduate of Oxford with a degree in Arabic with Persian and a lecturer in English at the Egyptian University (Isaac, 1977, p.65). Similarly, it could be argued that it was Paxton’s cultural and symbolic capital that led to the translation’s publication in London. It seems that Paxton wanted to consecrate himself as a competent Arabist through this translation, perhaps in order to achieve career advancement (see Isaac, 1977, p.65). In 1939, for example, he became ‘the first regular programme organiser of the new’ BBC Arabic Service (Isaac, 1977, p.65). It could be said that translating a modern Arabic work of fiction by one of the Arab world’s leading writers added to Paxton’s symbolic capital, which he could later transfer into economic capital.

The second part of Hussein’s autobiography appeared in Arabic in 1939 and was published in English translation in 1943. However, the translation was done by a different translator, under a different title and through a different publisher, which demonstrates the haphazard state the field was in when it emerged.³ This time, the autobiography was translated by

³The modest sales of the first volume (according to Johnson-Davies (2006a, p.16) only two hundred copies were sold) may have discouraged its publisher from translating and publishing the second volume and may have encouraged the publisher of the second volume to distance its title from the first one.
Hilary Wayment as *The Stream of Days: A Student at the Azhar*. The translation was initially published by a local publishing house in Cairo, Al-Maaref Printing and Publishing House, and later published in a revised edition by Longmans, Green and Co. in London, now Longman, in 1948. As was with the case with the translation of the first part, it appears that investing in Hussein’s cultural, social and symbolic capital was one of the reasons which led to the translation of the second part and its publication both in Egypt and London. This is evident in the following quotations from the translator’s introduction: ‘Taha Hussein’s autobiography is one of the acknowledged masterpieces of contemporary Arabic literature’ (Wayment, 1948, v).

*Image 1:* Front covers of the translation and Al-Khuri’s literary magazine *al-Aṣma‘ī*. 
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The translator continues by counting the forms of capital attributed to Hussein. He had:

- won a doctorate at the Sorbonne, and became one of the first Egyptians to apply scientific methods of analysis to Arabic literature; how his daring innovations involved him in a cause celebre with the Rector of the Azhar; how he became Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Giza, whose academic independence he defended against the attacks of reaction; how, finally, as Director of General Culture and Acting Under-Secretary of State for Education, he was largely responsible for the creation of the new Farouk I University at Alexandria, of which he acted as Rector during the first two years of its existence. (Wayment, 1948, x)

The publication in London seems to have also been aided, as was the case with Paxton’s publication, by Wayment’s social and cultural capital, who was a British historian, author and lecturer in English at the same university where Taha Hussein worked. In other words, being a native of Britain and of the English Language, who was familiar with both Arabic and the Egyptian setting, in addition to having had worked with the author may have helped secure the publication of the translation in London. Speaking of the popularity of Al-Ayyām, Kuiper (2009, p.107) contends that it is the first modern Arab fictional work to have received positive acclaim in the West.

In 1941, the first English translation of a collection of modern Arabic short stories was published. The stories were written by Mahmoud Kamel, one of Egypt’s foremost and most prolific writers at that time (Al-Tamawy, 2010). The collection was translated by Gerald Brackenbury, whose command of Arabic placed him as an officer in the Egyptian Labour Corps before he later taught English at the Khedivieh School in Cairo and became a professor at the Higher Training College in Cairo (see Wilson and Bell, 1917, p.201; Brackenbury, 1920, iii; Brackenbury, 2015). Le Gassick (1971, p.28) states that Kamel ‘arranged’ for the translation of his collection. Kamel was also one of Egypt’s most famous lawyers and literary figures, a prominent translator of European literature into Arabic, the founding editor of a number of literary magazines (where most of his works were published) and had connections both in the Egyptian literary and political fields. In addition to being active in the Egyptian literary field, as explained above, Kamel was also involved in Egyptian politics at that time. For example, in 1938, he called in his own literary magazine [al-Jāmiʿah] for the establishment of a political party in Egypt and proposed the name [al-Kul lil-Waṭan] (Al-Tamawy, 2010). Although the party was never established, it seems to have earned him some symbolic capital in the Egyptian politics field. For instance, on the title page of a copy of Blue Wings owned by the researcher, there is an inscription by Kamel that reads: ‘With the author’s best wishes to Sir Walter Monckton M. Kamel 1/12/1941’. Sir Monckton was the director-general of the British Propaganda and Information Services in Egypt (Walker, 2003; see Image 2).
the collection translated, despite it having been difficult to secure an English publisher for this collection, as indicated in the translator’s introduction:

Attempts at the translation of modern Egyptian writings into English have had many obstacles. English publishers steadily refuse to consider the publication of works on Egypt such as Tewfik el Hakim’s [sic] book on the life of the fellah from a legal aspect, on the ground that no one who has not lived in Egypt for a number of years can possibly understand or appreciate it, while the number of English novel readers resident in Egypt is too small to make such publications pay. (Brackenbury, 1941, pp.5–6)

The book was published in Cairo by Al Gamiaa Publishing House, arguably Kamel’s own publishing house and at his own expense, which demonstrates the difficulty of finding a publisher for English translations of modern Arabic fiction during this phase.

Another Arab author who had his fictional works translated from Arabic into English during this sub-phase is Khalil Gibran. The incredible sales of his book *The Prophet,* though written in English, seem to have garnered enough attention for his Arabic works to be translated. This demonstrates how the symbolic and economic capital attributed to an author’s name; such as in the case of Gibran, who was perceived as a successful writer and bestseller; can be transferred from one literary field to another and further facilitate the translation and publication of their work. Such capital certainly had an impact on the translation activity in and expanding the boundaries of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, as suggested by the bibliography I have compiled and as illustrated below.

Two of Gibran’s Arabic works appeared in English translation in 1946. These were *الروحان المتمردة* [al-Arwāḥ al-Mutamarrida] and *دمومة وابتسامة* [Damʻah wa-Ibtisāmah], both translated into English by Anthony Rizcallah Ferris and edited by Martin L. Wolf, as *Spirits Rebellious*
and *Tears and Laughter*, respectively. The two books contained poetry and a few of Gibran’s short prose fiction, and were both published by the New York-based publisher The Philosophical Library. The Philosophical Library, founded in 1941 by Dagobert D. Runes, specialised in publishing works by avant-garde intellectuals, many of whom had fled to America in the 1930s (Philosophical Library, 2015)—i.e. it had a niche market with limited competition. Given the fact that *Spirits Rebellious* was retranslated in 1948 and published by another publisher, it appears that it was not as well received and did not earn The Philosophical Library as much economic capital as *Tears and Laughter*, which turned out to be one of The Philosophical Library’s bestsellers to date (Philosophical Library, 2015). This demonstrates how a publisher can invest in an author’s symbolic and economic capital to transform it into their own.

*Image 2*: Kamel’s inscription to Sir Walter Monckton.

Although English translations of Arabic children’s literature are generally excluded from discussion in this study, one unique case that expanded the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and raised awareness of modern Arabic short stories in particular is worth shedding light on. During this sub-phase and the one that follows, modern Arabic children short stories started to appear in English translation. These were all written and translated by Kamel Kilany, the pioneer of modern children’s literature in the Arab world.
Kilany started his Al-Kilany’s Arabic Library for Children project, where his first story appeared in Arabic in 1928 in his own publishing house⁹ (Baheyya, 2010). This appears to have earned him both symbolic and economic capital,¹⁰ which ensured the sustainability of his project and led to the establishment of Kilany’s Tales with their Foreign Version project, where he published children’s stories in bilingual editions: Arabic–English, Arabic–French, Arabic–German and Arabic–Spanish. The aim of the project was primarily language-learning. The back covers of the Arabic–English bilingual stories, for instance, read in both Arabic and English:

ترجمة أمينة سهيلة تواجه الأصل العربي. يسرت درس اللغات الأجنبية على قراء العربية، كما يسرت اللسان العربي على قراء اللغات الأجنبية.

The translation which faces the original Arabic is both easy and accurate. The rendering has made the study of foreign languages easy for Arabic readers; likewise it has simplified the study of the Arabic tongue for foreign readers.

الطريقة المثلى لدرس اللغات وثبيت معاني الكلمات.

The ideal method for studying languages and memorising the meaning of vocabularies.

Although the bilingual Arabic–English stories are undated, Baheyya (2010) contends that they were published in the 1940s.¹¹ It is argued, however, that the publication of Kilany’s bilingual editions project extended into the late 1950s, prior to his death in 1959. Kilany’s Arabic–English bilingual library contains some ten titles.¹² These translations brought more visibility to the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and consolidated its boundaries. This is evident by the reviews included at the end of each of Kilany’s Arabic–English stories, which contained reviews by scholars both in the Anglophone world and Europe.

---

⁹ It was called Dar Maktabat El Atfal (‘Children’s Library House’).
¹⁰ Baheyya (2010) states that between 1929 and 1932, Kilany was involved in the short-lived pan-Arab literary club, The Arabic Literature Association, which included members such as Ahmad Shawqi, Khalil Mutran and Sameh Al-Khalidi, all prominent figures in the Arabic literary field. She also states that it was not long before Kilany’s stories were ‘reprinted over and over and distributed throughout’ the Arab world (Baheyya, 2010).
¹¹ Although the date may said to be a credible start date, there is evidence that some of the Arabic–English bilingual editions appeared in the 1950s. A review of Kilany’s library and one of his bilingual works (i.e. رحلة شنتى ‘Shantah’s Journey’) was written by the famous Arab poet Bayram Al-Tunisi and published in the Egyptian Newspaper Al-Gomhuria on 27 January 1957, assumingly shortly after it was first published.
¹² The ten titles I could find are: Abou Kharboosh ‘The Sultan of Monekys’, The Honest Safroot, Shantah’s Journey, Dimna and Shatraba, Marmar and the Blue Belt, Samson and Delilah, Rayhan’s Lie, Dinidish and the Sparrow’s Friends, Lawlaba the Princess of Gazelles, and Scheherazade the Vizier’s Daughter.
4.3.2 The formative sub-phase (1947–1967)

The structure of the field during this sub-phase, and the volume of translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English that took place in it, was primarily conditioned by external socio-cultural and political factors. Political events both within and outside the Arab world intensified from the mid-1950s onwards and gained interest from the West and the Anglophone world in particular. This attention to the region considerably expanded the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. These events include the aftermath of World War II (WWII); the Suez Crisis; the material growth of the Arab world, especially the discovery of oil and the wealth it generated; the effects of the Cold War, particularly those related to both the creation of Israel (mainly by the United Kingdom and the United Nations) and strengthening its power in the area (by the United States); the National Defence and Education Act in the United States and the Hayter Report in the United Kingdom, all of which are discussed below.

Since 1947, the number of translations of modern Arabic fiction into English started to grow. The second translation of an Arabic novel was Tawfiq Al-Hakim’s 1937 *Yawmīyāt Nāʾib fī al-Arīaf* [یوْمِیْہ نَائْب فی الأَرِیْف]. The English translation was published in 1947 by the London-based publisher The Harvill Press as *Maze of Justice: Diary of a Country Prosecutor*. The publication date of the translation is significant because it coincides with political incidents in the Arab world related to the creation of Israel; in particular, the United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine of 1947 (United Nations, 1947), which arguably led to its translation and publication. It also appears that the social and symbolic capital of the translator, Abba (Aubrey) Eban, ‘who was at that time a British army intelligence officer’ (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.33) and the first UN spokesperson for Israel, led to its publication. It is also remarkable what the bellyband of the translated book reads in uppercase letters and bold typeface:

---

13 The common name of the 1961 *Report of the Sub-Committee on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies*.

14 The Harvill Press was established on 20 February 1946 and derived its name from the surnames of both of its founders, Manya Harrari and Marjorie Villiers, who both worked for the British Foreign Office (Bozicevic, 2004). Harrari and Villiers’ idea was to promote and connect the cultures on the conflicting sides of WWII through translating their literature (Bozicevic, 2004).

15 As indicated above, writing in 1941, Brackenbury recounted how English publishers have ‘steadily refused’ to publish such works as Al-Hakim’s *Maze of Justice* (Brackenbury, 1941, pp.5–6).
A few remarks are in order here. The first sentence in the above quote and, indeed, the nature of the translator’s job when he undertook the translation attest to how modern Arabic works of fiction have been, since the early phases of the field, translated to serve as social documents on the realities of the Arab world rather than being perceived as mere literary works. Moreover, the fact that the publisher states that the translation is introduced by an Egyptian official, Hafiz Affifi Pasha, adds legitimacy to the translation. Given the heated political rhetoric surrounding the creation of Israel at the time of the translation’s publication, having a work that bears the names of an Israeli and an Egyptian, despite all the political tension over Palestine, is arguably a marketing strategy—or one could say a political statement—to make the translation more compelling to readers, which could eventually earn the publisher financial gains.

The role played by Denys Johnson-Davies, or the ‘doyen of translators’, as Allen (2003, p.2) describes him, in expanding the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation during this phase cannot be overlooked. Johnson-Davies is a Muslim convert, who studied Arabic at Cambridge and lived in and travelled to several Arab countries, ‘notable for his numerous, highly successful and well received translations’ (Altoma, 2005, p.55). *Tales from Egyptian Life* was his first translated collection of short stories, written by Mahmoud Taymour, the pioneer of modern Arabic short story (Johnson-Davies, 2006b, xv). The translation was
published in Cairo in 1947 by The Renaissance Bookshop at Johnson-Davies’s own expense (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.30). The collection was published with a short introduction by Abdel Rahman Azzam Pasha, secretary general of the Arab League at the time (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.31), to whom Johnson-Davies was introduced by a friend, Ibrahim Shukrallah (Jonson-Davies, 2006a, p.53). This demonstrates how Johnson-Davies’s social capital aided the expansion of the field. Azzam Pasha’s symbolic capital could also be said to have helped the professional advancement or the consecration of the translator, Johnson-Davies, who was at the time not ‘fully consecrated’, to use Bourdieu’s (1990c, p.7) words, and give legitimacy to the translation.

It appears that Eban’s 1947 translation was a success for The Harvill Press, because in 1948 they published a translated collection of Egyptian fiction into English. The book was entitled *Land of Enchanters: Egyptian Short Stories from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* and contained, as the subtitle indicates, nineteen Egyptian short stories, one of which, “Amm Mitwalli” by Taymour, was modern. It is argued that Johnson-Davies’s previous translations of Taymour introduced the latter to the Anglophone world, which led to the inclusion of one of his short stories in the collection.

The year 1948 also saw the publication of Gibran’s *Nymphs of the Valley* and the retranslation of his *Spirits Rebellious*, originally published with the same title in 1946, both of which were published by Alfred Knopf in translation by Hayim Musa Nahmad. The symbolic capital attributed to Gibran’s name and the expected financial gains of publishing his works (in translation) were once again manifested in his publication by a mainstream New York publisher. This is supported by Bushrui (1996, p.7) statement that the ‘largely favourable critical reviews’ and successful reception of Gibran’s earlier works ‘ensured

---

16 Johnson-Davies (2006a, p.31) notes, however, that Taymour, a descendent of an aristocratic family of Turkish origin, paid him in full following the publication of the collection, even though there was no prior agreement between them to this effect.

17 Stories were translated, as the editor’s preface indicates, from Middle Egyptian, Late Egyptian, Demotic, Greek, Coptic as well as classical, colloquial and modern standard Arabic (Lewis, 1948, ix).

18 This short story was previously translated and published by Johnson-Davies in 1947, which marks the first re-translation of a modern Arabic work of fiction work into English, along with Gibran’s *Spirits Rebellious*.

19 In 2001, a second edition of the book appeared by a different publisher, Marius Wiener, and an added co-editor Stanley Burstein. Two translated modern Arabic stories, ‘The Lawsuit’ and ‘Half a Day’, of the 1988 Nobel Prize winner in Literature, Naguib Mahfouz, were also added to the collection.

20 Prior to publishing the collection of Taymour’s short stories in 1947, Johnson-Davies had published two of his short stories in the literary magazines *International Short Story* and *The Wind and the Ruin* (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.21).
enough sales for Knopf to persevere with him; and Hassan’s (2009, p.65) remark that The Prophet remains ‘Knopf’s best-selling title ever’. Interest in Gibran and his works, in turn, impacted the expansion of translation activity in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

Although a number of English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction were published in literary periodicals during this sub-phase (see Allen, 1969, passim; Alwan, 1972, passim), it was not until 1952 that a translation appeared in book form. That book was Mikhail Naimy’s مذکرات الأرقت [Mudhakkirāt al-Arqash], published by The Philosophical Library in a translation by the author himself21 as Memoirs of a Vagrant Soul, or the Pitted Face. Naimy, a Lebanese writer who immigrated to the United States, was a close friend of Khalil Gibran (Allen, 2010, p.14). It seems that the social capital of Naimy, i.e. his friendship with Gibran, and his symbolic capital, being the vice president of the New York-based The Pen League,22 of which Gibran was the president, helped him to earn the publication of his translation by The Philosophical Library, the same publisher as Gibran. It appears, however, that this book of Naimy, and other ones, did not achieve much (commercial) success in English (translation), as his second translated work of fiction, a collection of short stories, was published by a small-scale, Bangalore-based publisher, the Indian Institute of World Culture, in 1957. This view is supported by Al-Maleh’s (2009, p.3) statement that Naimy’s works, contrary to Gibran, were much more successful in Arabic than in English and were ‘hence geographically confined to readers in the Arab world’. Bell (2010, p.261) also speaks of Naimy’s difficulty of securing a British publisher for another publication of his and notes that he ended up publishing it in Beirut instead. The same year saw the publication of another fictional work by Gibran, The Broken Wings, which was translated by Anthony Rizcallah Ferris and published by Citadel Press in New York.

The late 1950s also witnessed the translation of another modern Arabic work of fiction into English, Muhammad Kamel Hussein’s City of Wrong: A Friday in Jerusalem. Kamel Hussein was a renowned Egyptian orthopaedic surgeon, writer and scholar (Le Gassick, 1971, p.30). When his novel was published in Arabic in 1954, it was well received by critics and won him

---

21 This marks the first self-translation of a modern Arabic work of fiction—excluding Kilany’s self-translated children stories.

22 The first Arab-American literary society which aimed to ‘to lift Arabic literature from the quagmire of stagnation and imitation, and to infuse a new life into its veins so as to make of it an active force in the building up of the Arab nations’ and to give voice to a new generation of Arab writers (Naimy, 1950, p.50).
Egypt’s State Merit Award for Literature in 1957 (Al-Hakim, 2013). Set in Roman Jerusalem, the novel tackles themes of conscience and sin, with particular emphasis on Jesus’s crucifixion (Le Gassick, 1971, p.30). The subject of the novel and the symbolic capital it accrued in Egypt, coupled with the cultural capital of the author, seems to have attracted attention outside of Egypt. In 1959, the novel was translated into English by Rev. Kenneth Cragg, who was a Residentiary Canon of St George’s Collegiate Church in Jerusalem at the time (The Telegraph, 2012). It was subsequently published in Amsterdam by Djambatan, a publishing house created after WWII that prioritised works by authors of nations that had gained independence after the war (International Institute of Social History, no date).

In the wake of the Suez Crisis in 1956 and the embargo imposed on Egypt, President Nasser of Egypt founded a monthly periodical in Arabic, بناء الوطن ([Bināʾ al-Waṭan (‘Building the Nation’)], to present the Egyptian perspectives and views on Arab and global matters, and to publish original Arabic literary works (Enani, 2016). It had a sister magazine in English, The Arab Review, which included modern Arabic fiction translated into English (Enani, 2016). He also encouraged establishing other magazines in both English and French, similar to The Arab Review, such as Prism, and further supported publishing modern Arabic literature translated into these languages through the Afro-Asian People’s Solidarity Organisation in Egypt (AAPSO) (Enani, 2016). In 1961, Nasser initiated what is now known as the General Egyptian Book Organisation (GEBO) to serve the same purposes. It could be said that politics dominated the literary field by employing literary agents as ‘institutionalised instruments of representation’ (Bourdieu, 1985b, p.737), or political agents, to serve its interests both nationally and internationally. This is a clear case of the homology between

---

23 Although Nasser was idolised by many as the ‘Arab hero’ (Ghazal, 2010), his regime imposed restrictions on freedom of expression in Egypt and increasingly suppressed any opposition. In other words, Egypt was a police state under Nasser’s rule (Kenney, 2006, p.152). As a result, many political thinkers and literary figures were imprisoned, as in the example of the fiction writer Yusuf Idris, who was imprisoned for opposing the regime (DiMeo, 2012, p.3). That said, Nasser’s initiative could be thought of as an attempt by the state to ensure the continuous reproduction of the kinds of capital it possessed, and to control and maintain a firm grip both on what is being written in Arabic and, because translations of Arabic literature were being read as social documents representing reality in the West, on translated Arabic literature too. Whatever the motives, Nasser’s initiative did have a positive impact on expanding the boundaries of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

24 It is noteworthy that the Egyptian Cultural Bureaus also published translations during this phase. For instance, the Bureau in London published The Bulletin, ‘a magazine that was a channel for introducing Egypt to the British public’ and where, in every issue, a translated Egyptian short story was featured (El-Din, 2007).

25 When it was established in 1961, it was called الهيئة المصرية العامة للأدب والنشر والتوزيع والطباعة (‘The General Egyptian Organisation for Information, Publishing, Distribution and Printing’) (Abdel-Qawi, 2013).
the field of power and the field of translation, where the latter was deeply affected by
incidents in the former. Nasser’s initiatives, though primarily politically motivated, have had
significant effects on the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, not only in this
phase but in subsequent ones as well.

Nasser was perceived as ‘the godfather of Pan Arabism’, an iconic ‘Arab hero’ (Ghazal, 2010),
and his encouragement stimulated other non-governmental Egyptian and Arab publishers to
publish modern Arabic fictional works in English translation. In 1961, for instance, the
Cairene Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop published a collection of translated short stories by
Egyptian writers, the majority of whom had never before been translated into English.
Moreover, in 1964 the same publisher published another collection of short stories and
essays by the Egyptian scholar and translator Rashad Rushdy (see Appendix A). In 1967, the
state-owned publishing house Arab Writer Publishers and Printers published its first
translation of an Arabic work of fiction in 1967, Mostafa Mahmoud’s philosopiritual novel
الخروج من التابوت [al-Khurūj min al-Tābūt] as The Rising from the Coffin, which was originally
published in Arabic in 1965. The translation was done by David Bishai and revised by Farouk
Abdel Wahab, who in later phases of the field became one of the leading translators of
modern Arabic fiction into English.

Other important translations published during this sub-phase were Abd Al-Rahman Al-
Sharqawi’s Egyptian Earth in 1962, which was published by the London-based Heinemann
Educational Books (HEB), a publisher that assumed a significant role in the next phase of the
field (see section 4.4.3); Mahmoud Taymour’s The Call of the Unknown in 1964; Al-Hakim’s
Birds of the East in 1966; and Naguib Mahfouz’s Midaq Alley in 1966, the first novel of the
Nobel Laureate to be published in English translation. Significant among the publishers of
this period was the Beirut-based publisher Khayats. The publishing house published books
and reprinted classical Arabic works of literature produced by other publishers such as Brill
and Leipzig. It seems that this secured Khayats some social and symbolic capital in the Arabic
literary field. The publishing house was the first to establish a series of modern Arabic fiction
in English translation, Khayats Oriental Translations Series.27 Between 1964 and 1966, it

26 This was a division of what is now known as the General Egyptian Book Organisation (Abdel-Qawi,
2013).
27 Although the name of the series brings to mind publishers’ tendency to feed the Orientalist
stereotypical images about Arabs in the West, its name is quite revealing. It shows why medium- and
large-scale publishers took (and, to some extent, still take) interest in translating modern Arabic fiction
into English and the type of capital they prioritise, i.e. economic capital.
published English translations of four Arabic works of fiction, the last of which was Mahfouz’s *Midaq Alley* (see Appendix A for titles published by Khayats). It was reported by Mahfouz, however, that Khayats reneged on its contract with both him and the translator, Trevor Le Gassick, and that neither of them made any money from the translation (El-Shabrawy, 1992, p.54). It appears that ‘Beirut’s post 1967 War financial and tourism slump’ led to Khayats declaring itself bankrupt; consequently, the *Khayats Oriental Translations Series* was discontinued (Le Gassick, 1971, p.30). This demonstrates how the field was affected, in this case negatively, by external political incidents. Such events did not help Arab writers and/or translators to find publishers, as is later discussed in this study.

One other contribution by Johnson-Davies during this sub-phase was his initiation of a quarterly literary magazine in London in 1961, which he named *Aswat* (‘Voices’) and in which he published in translation ‘many of [his] own favourite writings’ (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.69). Spanning only twelve issues between 1961 and 1963, the magazine was influential in presenting avant-garde Arabic fiction writers, albeit mostly short story writers, to the Anglophone world.

Although he published his first collection of translated short stories in 1947, it was not until 1967 that Johnson-Davies’s second collection was published by Oxford University Press (OUP). This collection was unique in two respects. First, it introduced writers not only from Egypt but also from five other Arab countries: Iraq, Lebanon, Sudan, Syria and Palestine. Second, for the first time, it presented fictional works by Arab women writers in English translation; these were Latifa Al-Zayyat’s short story ‘The Picture’ and Layla Baalbaki’s short story ‘A Space Ship of Tenderness to the Moon’. The publication, as Johnson-Davies (2007) states, was fortuitous. Johnson-Davies’ social capital aided his efforts in progressing the field of modern Arabic fiction translation; it was through one of his friends that he managed to get his second collection published. Johnson-Davies states that he ‘knew somebody who knew somebody’ at OUP (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.46). Social capital, and how agents can deploy their network of relationships to achieve dominance, consecrate their social positions or increase their assets, is manifest in this incident. It is safe to argue that was it not for Johnson-Davies’s social capital, the collection may have not been published, which would consequently have impacted the field’s activity. This illustrates the important role Johnson-Davies played in the development of the field. The anthology, writes Johnson-Davies (2006a, p.46), ‘was accepted for publication as a work of scholarship rather than for
any literary merits it might have; there was also one condition: that a scholar of distinction should write an introduction to it’. This condition was met when Arthur Arberry, a distinguished scholar who translated the Quran in 1955, agreed to write the introduction. This led, as Johnson-Davies (2006b, xviii) states, ‘to some sort of recognition’. This condition highlights the value of symbolic capital and the role it played in the development of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

The mode of circulation and consumption and, subsequently, the growth of the field were affected by external socio-political factors. Johnson-Davies (2007) states that the translation publication coincided with the Arab–Israeli War of 1967, an unfortunate time during which most of the Anglophone world’s sympathies were not with the Arabs. The situation was not helped by the fact that English publishers refused to review the book (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.47). Johnson-Davies (2007) further adds that while ‘sales in England were not particularly good, not a single copy of the book was bought by any Arab government or institution’; hence, OUP was unable to sell the copies they had printed (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.47). This incident impacted the field because OUP refused to publish further translations of modern Arabic fiction, as Johnson-Davies (2006a, p.47) recalls:

Only recently I saw that Oxford had produced a volume of Japanese short stories, so I wrote to them and suggested that, having produced the first ever volume of stories translated from the Arabic, they should, after this long lapse of time, be the publishers to produce a further, up-to-date volume. They answered that volumes of short stories were difficult to sell—it would seem, particularly Arabic ones!

It should be noted, however, that despite the difficulty of selling the book, OUP was later to benefit financially from selling its paperback publishing rights to HEB, which published the book in its Arab Authors Series (see HEB 24/9, passim). Moreover, the book had a positive impact on both the visibility of the field and its recognition in the Anglophone world as well as expanding Johnson-Davies’ symbolic and economic capital. This can be inferred from the correspondence from Johnson-Davies to Currey (HEB 23/8, 30 January 1972), where he states: ‘the OUP volume, while still selling, has done me very well through stories being taken up in the States for anthologies’.

---

28 All citations labelled HEB are from Heinemann’s archives in the University of Reading’s Special Collections.
29 Senior editor at HEB.
The twenty-year gap between the publication of Johnson-Davies’s first and second translated collections ‘illustrate not only the difficulty of finding a publisher for Arabic literary works (...) but, more importantly the marginality assigned to Arabic literature in general’ in the Anglophone world (Altoma, 2000, p.65; see also Ghazoul, 1983, p.84). According to Altoma (2005, pp.54–55), the number of translations at that time was not inspiring. The bibliography presented in Appendix A, which I have compiled for this study, confirms Altoma’s view, because it lists only twenty-one English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction between 1947 and 1967, as a direct result of the reasons previously cited (see section 4.3).

In the 1960s, a considerable number of modern Arabic works of fiction began to appear in English translation. The American National Defence and Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, which was issued against the backdrop of the tensions of the Cold War, helped significantly to delineate the boundaries of the field. Aimed at providing the United States with ‘specific defence oriented personnel’, the NDEA offered federal support to modern foreign language-learning and scholarly research on literature, and it encouraged universities to appoint people with expertise in these areas (Rhoton, 2010, p.291; see also McCarus, 1987, pp.19–20). Arabic was re-introduced as one of these modern foreign languages. Section 602 of the NDEA asserts that:

> The Commissioner is authorised, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialised materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields. (United States Congress, 1959, p.1594)

Arabic was arguably one of the languages critical to the United States because of Nasser’s policies and his alignment with Russia. The Afro-Asian Peoples’ Solidarity Conference (AAPSC) held in Cairo between December 26, 1957 and January 1, 1958 demonstrated worrying ties between Egypt, the leading nation in the Arab world at the time, and the United States’ Cold War opponent, Russia. American commentators on the conference urged the United States not to stand silent and to take practical actions against Russian influence and expansion in the region (on this point, see Jack, 1958, passim). This conference marked the start of the ‘cultural Cold War’, as Saunders’s (1999) describes it. The NDEA
quote and the background against which the Act was issued demonstrate what Bourdieu refers to as the external factors that may affect any social field, in this case, the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, where the needs of the American Ministry of Defence is envisaged to have led to increased activity in the field. This illustrates that the field of translation in general, and the translation of modern Arabic fiction in particular, is informed and influenced by its relationship with the field of power, i.e., the field of politics.

Although Arabic was being taught at some universities in the West before the 1960s, it was considered an ancient dead language and was categorised along with ancient Greek and Latin (Johnson-Davies, 2006b, xv). Despite its aesthetic characteristics, long history and artistic uniqueness, the Arabic language was ‘somehow not respectable [and] consequently dangerous’ language to be studied and/or translated, argues Said (1990, p.278).

The influence of American policy in general and the NDEA in particular on translation was not confined to the United States; it also affected other countries, such as the United Kingdom. The signing of the NDEA into law in the United States in 1958, and its associated National Defence Foreign Language programme, spurred similar academic reforms in the United Kingdom. In 1961, the sub-committee of the British University Grant Committee, led by Sir William Hayter, published a report on its visit to twelve universities in North America, ten in the United States and two in Canada (Hayter et al., 1961, p.1). The purpose of the visit was to see the ‘developments in Oriental African and Slavonic Studies which have been taking place there’ following the implementation of the NDEA (Hayter et al., 1961, p.1). In other words, it aimed to ‘investigate the university teaching of “hard languages” and the degree to which students at British universities were being equipped to meet Britain’s responsibilities overseas’ (McLoughlin, 2002, p.147).

The Hayter Report encouraged the study of languages, which it described as being in ‘growing demand’ and ‘of outstanding importance scholastically and politically’ to the United Kingdom; these languages included ‘Russian, Arabic, Chinese and Japanese’ (Hayter et al., 1961, p.93). The report, however, recommended studying these languages not on their own but in relation to the modern history, literature, economics and culture of their respective regions. For instance, among the principal recommendations of the sub-committee was to support the creation of centres of ‘area studies’ in a number of British universities that would focus on bringing ‘together teachers and research students from different disciplines to specialise in studies related to the same area or region’ (Hayter et al.,
The report endorsed designating funds for these universities, among which were Cambridge and Oxford, to facilitate the implementation of the sub-committee’s recommendations. The report was instrumental in that a number of universities in the United Kingdom started offering courses on modern languages and cultures. For example, based on the report’s recommendation to provide support for ‘modern Middle East’ studies at Oxford (Hayter et al., 1961, p.86), in 1963, the university appointed Mohamed Badawi as its first specialist in modern Arabic literature (Allen, 2009, p.6; for more discussion on this point, see McLoughlin, 2002, pp.147–150).

The need for English translations of modern Arabic literature for these newly introduced courses, in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom, persuaded academic publishers in the Anglophone world to produce their own translations. Moreover, this need led to the establishment of programmes for acquiring published materials from the Arab world, translated Arabic literature included. Examples of such programmes are the American Public Law 480 Book Acquisition Programme of 1961 and its subsequent English-Language Programme of 1964. These two programmes ‘attempt[ed] to secure “important” English-language publications’ available in India, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic (UAR) and Israel (Jay, 1967a, p.7; see also Patterson, 1969, passim); and made the great majority of works of translated modern Arabic literature (including fiction) available in the United States (Le Gassick, 1969, p.5). Although the Public Law 480 Programme’s office was based in Cairo and confined to acquisitions from the UAR, it also acquired ‘material that [came] from other parts of the Arab world but which [was] for sale in Cairo or Alexandria’ (Jay, 1967a, p.5). The strong demand for books from the Arab world, including modern Arabic literature translated into English, induced some publishers in the Middle East to produce pirated editions of certain books and to sell them in Cairo, to cater to the demands of the Programme (Jay, 1967b, p.38).

The above factors led to an increased market demand that enticed publishers to produce more English-language translations of modern Arabic literature. This impacted the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation accordingly and resulted in expanding and strengthening its boundaries.

---

30 A short-lived union between Egypt and Syria, beginning in 1958 and ending in 1961.
4.3.3 The characteristics of the field: The initial phase (1908–1967)

As explained above, very few agents were involved in translating and publishing modern Arabic fiction into English during the initial phase. Publishing was dominated by small-scale publishers and a couple of medium- and large-scale ones. Based on the analysis above and the bibliography appended to this thesis (see Appendix A), the field was in a haphazard state and was apparently without publishing or marketing policies. Then as now, translation production was primarily triggered by political incidents falling outside the realm of the Arabic fiction literary field itself; hence, the expansion of the field was impacted, both positively and negatively, by political events. However, translation production was low, sporadic and at long intervals (Le Gassick, 1971, p.28, see Graph 2). Because publishing was dominated by small-scale (mainly individual) publishers, with some writers self-publishing their own work, the production output was also small in scale. Moreover, the majority of translation publishing houses were in the Arab world; given the political tensions therein, its complicated relationship with the West and the lack of publishers’ marketing plans outside the Arab world, copies of translations during this phase were hard to obtain in the Anglophone world (Le Gassick, 1971, passim). Because copies of translations were difficult to find and the Anglophone reading public and publishers showed a general lack of interest in translated modern Arabic fiction, such translations were under-reviewed, which did not help to expand the field. These reasons, coupled with the lack of interest in Arabic literature and fiction for the reasons previously cited (see section 4.3), may explain why it took over half a century for the boundaries of the field to take shape and for the field to reach its expansion phase.

Below are the active properties\textsuperscript{31} that characterised the field during its initial phase.

1- The majority of translations during the initial phase invoked the legacy of Arabian Nights, either implicitly (through visual illustrations and the use of Arabic calligraphy)\textsuperscript{32} or explicitly (such as in translators’ introductions). This can be attributed to the popularity and successful reception of the Arabian Nights in the Anglophone world and the West, as well as publishers’ desire to meet the expectations of Anglophone readers. Linking any translated modern Arabic work of

\textsuperscript{31} According to Bourdieu (1985b, p.724), ‘active properties’ of a field are the principles and powers current in it and which shape its (trans)formation.

\textsuperscript{32} The majority of translations contained illustrations that could be described as “Orientalist” in Edward Said’s sense of the term.
fiction to the *Arabian Nights* was perhaps intended to elicit popular reception and hence financial gain, i.e. economic capital, for the publisher and/or translator.

2- English translations of modern Arabic fiction during this phase were primarily perceived as social documents rather than literary works. A pertinent example is Al-Hakim’s *Maze of Justice*, translated by Eban. Significantly, on the top part of its dust jacket we read:

   This translation from the Arabic has three assets ; [sic] it is a good story, an *important social document* and the first work of one of Egypt’s leading authors to be published in English. (my italics)

   Attempting to distinguish this translation by discrediting all previous translations clearly shows how the novella was published as an exposé rather than as a literary work. It is noteworthy that while I was compiling the appended bibliography of modern Arabic fiction translations into English (see Appendix A), this translation was consulted at the Afrika-Studiecentrum (African Studies Centre) in Leiden. Tellingly, the book was not catalogued among literary works but among social studies works. Similarly, in his introduction to *Modern Arabic Short Stories* Arberry (1967, vii) notes that this collection of stories ‘illustrate many aspects of the Arab outlook and Arab sociology’. In Johnson-Davies’ (1967, x) preface to the same book we read:
These stories give, as it were, an opportunity to eavesdrop on a part of the world and a people with whom the British have been very closely associated but with whose culture and literature only a few specialist scholars are familiar. (my italics)

3- Few Arab women fiction writers in translation were represented during this phase, the exceptions being the two short stories in the collection translated by Johnson-Davies and published in 1967\(^{33}\) (see Graph 3 on the translations of works by individual authors\(^{34}\) and multiple authors\(^{35}\)). This could be related to the fact the illiteracy rate among Arab women was very high until the 1960s (Al-Qazzaz, 1979).\(^{36}\)

Fictional works by Arab women writers did, however, exist during this time (for a thorough account thereof, see Ashour et al., 2008, passim). Nevertheless, the majority of women writers wrote under pseudonyms, as in the example of Aisha Abd Al-Rahman, who wrote under the name Bint Al-Shati (which means ‘daughter of the riverbank’) (Zeidan, 2001, p.39). That is because in some Arab countries, it was even ‘forbidden for a girl to appear in a public place, and her voice was a taboo’ (Al-‘ld., 2008, p.15).\(^{37}\) Later phases of the field saw changes to this trend, as is demonstrated in subsequent sections.

4- The majority of translated Arabic works were by Egyptian fiction writers (fifteen in total). Lebanese authors were the next most common, with ten works, all of whom were diaspora writers. There was one work by a Saudi writer, The Price of Sacrifice, which was hailed as the first Saudi novel (Jayyusi, 2006, p.277), and two published translations that included works by fiction writers from a number of countries in the Arab world (see Graph 4). The prominence of Egyptian writers could be explained by, among other factors that are explored later (see section 4.4.1), due to the

\(^{33}\) The scarcity of women writers in English translation seems to have been a worldwide phenomenon until recently (see Gordon, 2008; Anderson, 2013 for a discussion on the marginalisation of women writers in [English] translation).

\(^{34}\) By individual authors, I refer to translations published in book format that include works by one single author.

\(^{35}\) By multiple authors, I refer to translations published in book format that include works by more than one author (e.g. anthologies and short story collection).

\(^{36}\) Al-Qazzaz (1979) states that the ‘illiteracy rate was 96% in Tunisia in 1956, and over 90% in Algeria in 1962’

\(^{37}\) Although only a small number of women received educations in the early 1990s, social reforms in the Arab world in the mid-1990s, particularly concerning the education of women, started ‘opening the gates for (women) to participate more actively in public life and to express themselves more freely in writing’ (Samaan, 1994, p.5).
country being one of the first Arab nations to have gained independence.\textsuperscript{38} Egypt has also long been the dominant force in Arab culture and was the central stage for Arab politics during this phase (Khalifa, 2016, p.95).

5- The field was dominated by individual agents and small-scale publishers, rather than mainstream or large-scale ones. Moreover, interest in taking part in the field was mainly to accrue symbolic and/or cultural capital to achieve greater consecration for the text, author, translator or publisher, which could later be transformed into economic capital.\textsuperscript{39} This was not, however, the case with the translation of Gibran’s works, where the interest in translating his works of fiction in Arabic was primarily motivated by expected financial gains, i.e. economic capital (see section 4.3.1).

6- Because production was on a small-scale, the majority of translations produced during this phase are currently out of print and are hence difficult to find. For example, El-Din (2007) refers to a collection of translated Arabic short stories into English titled, \textit{Modern Egyptian Short Stories}, which he translated and published during this phase with Farleigh Press in London. Every effort has been made to locate a copy of this publication; while unsuccessful, it demonstrates the haphazard state of the field during this phase. As previously mentioned, that English translations of
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\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Gender & 0 & 5 & 10 & 15 & 20 & 25 & 30 \\
\hline
Male & 14 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
Female & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
Mixed Gender & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{tablenotes}
\item[38] Egypt gained its, rather nominal, independence from British rule in 1922, following the issuance of the Unilateral Declaration of Egyptian Independence.
\item[39] Sapiro (2008, p.155) speaks of how this process of transforming symbolic capital into economic capital is long, which explains why large-scale publishers almost always opt for publishing works that will ensure more economic gains or capital.
\end{tablenotes}
modern Arabic fiction were seldom reviewed in literary magazines in the Anglophone world did not help to expand the field and its boundaries.

7- The above analysis suggests the existence of an underlying intermediary homology between the field of power, i.e. field of politics, and the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. Whether or not the practices of the field of power were (mis)recognised by participating agents in the field during this phase, they did positively impact the volume of translation activity of Arabic fiction into English and hence the expansion of the field.

8- Apart from translations produced in the United States of works by Gibran and Naimy, the majority of translations of modern Arabic fiction into English during this phase targeted British readers. This is evident in many of the introductions to translations produced during this phase, in which translators clearly refer to their target readers, i.e. British readers (see for example, Brackenbury, 1941, pp.5–6; Johnson-Davies, 1967, ix–xi). That is perhaps due to the more significant British
presence in Arab countries at this time, particularly Egypt, most of which were British protectorates.

4.4 The expansion phase (1968–1988)

Altoma (2005, p.55) refers to the period from 1968 to 1988 as the ‘expanding phase’, which commences with what could be described as a mini-boom in the academic translation of modern Arabic fiction into English. Translation activity in this period aimed mainly at enriching the content of modern Arabic literature courses, which had begun to emerge rapidly across the Anglophone world. This trend was primarily instigated by the NDEA in the United States and the Hayter Report in the United Kingdom, as explained above (see section 4.3.2). This increased activity helped the dissemination and appreciation of modern Arabic fiction in translation, despite the lack of specialists during the early years of this phase, which led to the continuity of the field’s relatively haphazard state.

Outside the academic realm, translated modern Arabic fiction was still considered rather insignificant and had a very limited public readership. Two possible reasons can be cited for this. First, there was a lack of specialists in terms of both marketing locally produced translations in the Arab world in the Anglophone world and publishing critical reviews of English translations of modern Arabic fiction in publically accessible journals or literary magazines. For instance, Le Gassick (1969, p.4) notes that, in general, reviews of modern Arabic literature published in the Anglophone world tended to be rudimentary, ‘cursory or misleading’ and lacking descriptions of its richness and complexity. Second, a vast body of fiction in English was already readily available to the Anglophone reading public and hence there was little, or no need, for fiction works published in English translation. Before citing his reasons for translating Halim Barakat’s 

rendered into English as *Days of Dust*, the translator, Trevor Le Gassick, opens his foreword to the translation by stating that:

The English-speaking world so abounds in talented fiction-writers that it seems necessary to justify the translation of novels from other languages into English. (Le Gassick, 1974, xxxv)

4.4.1 Translations and geographical representation

Nevertheless, the number of translations produced during this phase was considerable (113 translations) compared to the previous phase (28 translations; see *Graph 5*). However, these translations did not receive wide acclaim, and the quality of most of them was subject to
question. The bibliography I have collected and presented in Appendix A lists 62 modern Arabic novels and novellas, and 51 anthologies and short story collections published in English translations during this phase (see Graph 6). The list, however, as in the initial phase, shows a predominance of Egyptian writers in lieu of other Arab writers. Altoma (2005, p.58) suggests that Egypt played a central role in the development of the field of translation of Arabic literature since the nineteenth century. He also argues that the activity of translating Egyptian fiction in particular has increased as a result of the support of Egyptian and Anglo-American institutions operating inside and outside Egypt. Büchler and Guthrie (2011a, p.20) and Allen (2015, p.160), however, cite the West’s long colonial links with Egypt and its dominance over other realms of cultural activities in the Arab world as possible reasons for Egyptian dominance (on this point, see also Salem, 2000–2001, p.86). Moreover, Allen (2015, pp.160–161) mentions the establishment of such American institutions in and cultural links with Cairo as the American University in Cairo (AUC) in 1927, the American Research Centre in Egypt (ARCE) in 1948, and the Centre for Arabic Studies Abroad (CASA), the United States’ premier programme for the advanced study of Arabic language and culture, in 1967 as another possible reason. He maintains that graduates of the latter programme, for instance,

populate a large number of academic positions in all fields, not to mention governmental ones, and their familiarity with the country and its people, coupled with, it must be admitted—at least up till now—fruitful contacts with the local cultural establishment, has led to the publication of a substantial and varied library of modern Egyptian fiction in English. (Allen, 2015, p.161)

Another possible explanation for the prevalence of Egyptian works and writers is Egypt being the central stage for both Arab culture and politics at the time, and to the Egyptian government’s support, as with the example of Nasser mentioned above (see section 4.3.2), for translating Egyptian fiction in Arabic into English.

4.4.2 Translating Arab women writers
One of the noteworthy changes in the field during this phase was the Anglophone world’s increased interest in translating modern Arabic works of fiction written by young women writers. Three factors coincided to instigate the surge of this mode of translation. First, the rise of the feminist movement in the West. Second, the emergence of works by talented Arab women writers who sought an outlet for their views and concerns in writing fictional works. Third, the general desire in the Anglophone world to propagate the opinions of these
Arab women writers and to gain insight into their ‘perspectives about other political and social issues in their respective countries’ (Altoma, 1996, p.138).

Graph 5

Nawal El-Saadawi was, and still is, the most translated and bestselling Arab woman writer. Although El-Saadawi ‘is by no means the best female Arab writer’ (Hafez, 1989, p.188), her predominantly feminist fiction literature received wide acclaim in the West, especially in the Anglophone world. This is chiefly due more to her ‘radical and outspoken portrayal of women’s conditions in Egypt and Arab societies than to the intrinsic literary value of her works’ (Altoma, 2005, p.56). El-Saadawi’s prominence in English translation may have also been aided by the fact that her early works were translated by her husband, Sherif Hetata. Hetata was born in Britain to an Egyptian father and a British mother, and was also a novelist and a translator (Frangieh, 2014). His background and experience appear to have provided him with an understanding of what would appeal to English readers. As Rooke (2011, p.137) argues, Hetata’s close relationship with El-Saadawi gave him the liberty, with her consent, to substantially manipulate her original works, paraphrasing and adding information to

40 For instance, commenting on El-Saadawi’s sales in Sweden, Stagh (2000, p.41) states that she is the ‘best-selling Arab writer on the Swedish book market’. She further reveals that El-Saadawi’s five works translated into Swedish have sold more copies than all the works of the Arab Nobel Laureate Mahfouz combined (Stagh, 2000, p.41).
41 As Hafez (1989, pp.188–189) and Altoma (2005, p.56) rightly argue, there are other Arab women writers whose literary calibre, while of international standing, have not received as much attention, in terms of translations or reviews, in the West, as is the case with El-Saadawi.
make them more compelling to Anglophone readers. Rooke (2011, p.137) further contends that it ‘is because of his translations that she is widely read and has become a well-known name in the West’.

Six works of El-Saadawi appeared in English translation during this phase (see Appendix A for the details thereof), and her work was also featured in (inter)national anthologies. Other women writers also had their works published in English translation during this period. Second to El-Saadawi was the Shiite-Iraqi writer and educator Amina Al-Sadr, also known as Bint Al-Huda (Arnold, 2012, p.142), who had five of her works translated into English during this phase. In 1980, Al-Sadr was executed, along with her brother, by Saddam’s regime because she had urged Shiites (and Iraqi’s in general) to demonstrate against it (Al-Bayati, 2014, p.20). Following her execution, the Tehran-based Islamic Thought Foundation started translating her literary works into English, as it wanted to ‘acquaint (…) English readers with this brave woman who confronted tyrants and achieved martyrdom for the sake of Islam’ (Islamic Thought Foundation, 1987, p.3). The motivations that resulted in the translation of Al-Sadr’s works are significant, as they demonstrate the rise of new positions in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation related to the consecration of a source author because of socio-political factors in their culture. Other Arab women writers published in English translation during this phase include the Palestinians Najwa Farah and Sahar Khalifeh, Egyptians Alifa Rifaat and Huda Shaarawi, the Lebanese Hanan Al-Shaykh and the
Palestinian-Jordanian Emily Nasrallah. The phase also witnessed an increase in the number of (inter)national anthologies thematically related to the status of Arab women through literary works in translation. With the rise of Arab women writers in translation, women translators started to emerge in the field too.

4.4.3 Heinemann’s Arab Authors Series

A number of translatorial agents occupied substantial positions in the field during this phase. These agents were mainly translation initiatives, publishers and individuals who made tremendous efforts to introduce modern Arabic fiction to a wider Anglophone readership.

Following the success of its African Writers Series (AWS), which was launched in 1962 and included some works by Arab authors who happened to come from countries in Africa, the London-based Heinemann Educational Books (HEB), on recommendation by Johnson-Davies, made a decision in the 1970s to establish a new Arab Authors Series (AAS) (Currey, 2008, p.170). It was Johnson-Davies’ personal relationship with James Currey, who was in charge of the AWS, that led to the introduction of the work of some Arab writers in that series (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.47). Subsequently, this led into the founding of the AAS with the aim of introducing new non-African Arab authors to the Anglophone world through translation into English.

Currey and Johnson-Davies met at OUP, where the former was responsible for the Three Crowns Series, in which the latter’s translation of Al-Hakim’s play The Tree Climber was published in 1966 (Currey, 2008, p.171; see also Bejjit, 2009, p.200). Johnson-Davies (2007) states that when he learned of the AWS, he suggested that Currey include authors such as Alifa Rifaat, Tayeb Salih, Tawfiq Al-Hakim and Naguib Mahfouz, all of whom were African-Arabs. His suggestion was taken, which again demonstrates how his social capital helped to increase the volume of activity in the field modern Arabic fiction translation into English.

From 1968 to 1971, three English translations of Arabic works of fiction were published by HEB in the AWS: The Wedding of Zein and Other Stories and Season of Migration to the North by the Sudanese Tayeb Saleh, and The Smell of it and Other Stories by the Egyptian Sonallah Ibrahim, all of which had been translated by Johnson-Davies. One cannot help but notice

---

42 It appears that Johnson-Davies suggestion to HEB came at a fortuitous time. The first modern Arabic fiction work to be published by HEB in English translation was Tayeb Salih’s The Wedding of Zein, which ‘had been turned down for the Three Crowns at OUP’ (Bejjit, 2009, p.200). Currey reveals to Bejjit (2009, p.203) that HEB was ‘short of manuscripts at that time and Tayeb just stood out’ and hence was the decision to publish the translation.
the emergence of new positions in the field related to the genre of the source text: the dominance of the short story and its popularity in the Arab world led to its prevalence and preference in translation too (on this point, see Ghazoul, 1983, p.89).

HEB had a standard distribution system for the AWS and, as part of its marketing strategy, sent reviews and complimentary copies of books in the series to literary journals and academicians to ensure greater visibility for its publications. For example, in a letter from Currey to Johnson-Davies (HEB 1/8, 5 November 1969, p.2) the former reveals to the latter the names of the journals and literary magazines he had contacted to review *Season of Migration to the North*. Currey concludes the letter by stating that these reviews ‘will all help sell copies of the paperback and keep it selling’. Subsequently, after being under-reviewed, translations of modern Arabic fiction began to be reviewed in such journals as *The Observer*, *The Sunday Times* and *The Times Literary Supplement*. In other words, the field witnessed its first systematic marketing strategy for promoting translations of modern Arabic fiction in the Anglophone world, and a change in the logic underlying agents’ practices, which expanded the boundaries of the field, increased the volume of activity and gave rise to new positions.

It is worthwhile to note that Johnson-Davies was working for the Foreign Service, and specifically The Political Agency stationed in Dubai, from which he resigned in the mid-1970s (Johnson-Davies to Currey, HEB 23/8, 11 January 1970). This seems to have endowed him with social capital with Arab government officials, which he later used to accrue other forms of capital and to also market his translations in the Arab world. The translations he undertook and the cultural capital he accumulated seem to have facilitated the process of capital conversion too. For instance, in a letter to Currey (HEB 23/8, 12 October 1969), Johnson-Davies relays how ‘somebody’s trying to get me a Doctorate from Cambridge’ based on his published translations; and admits that ‘I certainly wouldn’t take one the hard way!’ Another example is an undated personal letter from Johnson-Davies to Ann Scorgie, one of the editors at HEB, in which he states:

I have got a great project going, which is to get one of the oil Sheikhs [sic] to finance a scholarly work. If it comes off it will guarantee me my living for the next three years as well as giving me an interest: I would then be able to ‘Live [sic] dangerously’ without any risk! (HEB 28/1, no date)
The aforementioned examples demonstrate how social capital can be transformed into economic capital and/or cultural capital (see section 3.4.2; Bourdieu, 1986, p.243). Johnson-Davies could, for instance, translate his social connection with an oil sheikh into cultural and, later, economic capital. Capital transformation is also evident in another letter from Johnson-Davies to Currey (HEB 23/8, 11 January 1970), in which he confers to him that

I resigned from the Foreign Service and shall be leaving here [Dubai] either at the end of May or the end of July. As from then I shall be speaking as a free-lance [sic] from Beirut mainly in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf. I shall be engaged mainly with negotiation work with governments, but am [sic] also interested in picking up one or two non-conflicting companies to represent in the area (...). Would Heinemann be such a person?

This illustrates the process of capital ‘transubstantiation’, as Bourdieu (1986, p.242) calls it; that is, the transformation of one form of capital to another. For example, nothing could have served Johnson-Davies’ efforts to undertake, for example, negotiations with Arab governments as a representative of publishers as much as the social, cultural and symbolic capital he had accrued from studying at Cambridge and working both at the Foreign Service and as a translator, which he could later transform to even larger symbolic and economic capital. The letterheads marking Johnson-Davies’ letters and his addresses, for instance, show that he resided in luxurious hotels such as Al-Ain Palace Hotel and Khalidia Palace Hotel in the United Arab Emirates in the 1970s, which further illustrates the economic capital he had accumulated over the years. Though this capital benefited Johnson-Davies himself, it did indubitably benefit the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as well. The exchanges between Johnson-Davies and HEB reveal his ability to deploy his different kinds of capital, to induce Arab governments and officials to buy considerable quantities of translations from both the AWS and the AAS, which encouraged HEB to publish more translations of Arabic literature and fiction.

After including the above works in the AWS, Johnson-Davies was soon faced with the problem of where to place works by non-African Arab writers, especially Palestinians and Iraqis (Johnson-Davies, 2007). He wrote to Currey, asking him if he had ‘thought any more about producing an Arabic Writers [sic] Series’ (Johnson-Davies to Currey, HEB 23/8, 09 October 1970). The letters between Johnson-Davies and HEB suggest that it was set to be launched around late 1973 (see HEB 23/8, passim). However, developing the series took longer (Currey, 2008, p.170) for both marketing and political reasons. For instance, the October War erupted on 6 October 1973, the same year in which the series was to be
launched. Arguably, this resulted in the series’ publication being temporarily suspended, given the uncertainty of the market; there was a general lack of sympathy with the Arabs who imposed an oil embargo on the United States as a retaliation against its support of Israel in the war, which led to a 400% increase in worldwide oil prices (Blumenthal, 1973; Mieczkowski, 2005, p.203). This is another example of how external socio-political factors formed and conditioned the structure and dynamics of the field. It appears that there were plans to cancel the publishing of the AAS following the war. For instance, Currey wrote to Johnson-Davies (HEB 23/8, 17 June 1975) that HEB was uncertain about the AAS, mentioning that the ‘publishing situation has changed so drastically’ since they had made the initial launch decision.

Nevertheless, with the rise of Arab national identity and people in the Arab world being ‘snobbish about the African label’ (Bejjit, 2009, p.200), it seemed to HEB that the descriptor ‘African’ was unmarketable in the Arab world. Hence, a decision was made by the publishing house to establish the AAS in 1976 as an experimental venture (Currey, 2008, p.171). In an undated/untitled document in HEB’s archives (see HEB 23/8), we read:

Arab Authors: For the most part these will be books which are undertaken for the African Writers Series. But the label African Writers Series is not good for sales in the Middle East it seems to be desirable as an experiment to launch this new series which will have different prelims and different covers. (my italics)

Changing labels on translations’ book covers attests to the powerful nature of paratextual elements in influencing buyers and readers’ decisions. Repackaging the translations also highlights HEB’s interest, in taking part in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, i.e. its expected financial gains (on this point, see Bejjit, 2009, p.200). Other factors also encouraged HEB to launch the AAS. The oil wealth in the ‘boom parts of the Arab world’ seem to have attracted Europeans to go and work there, which in turn increased the demand for modern Arabic works in English translation (Currey, 2008, p.170). HEB’s experimental venture paid off and ‘by the beginning of the 1980s Arab Authors came to occupy the key space of fiction shelves in the Gulf’ (Currey, 2008, p.170). Other factors include the partnership that HEB established with Three Continents Press in the United States (see section 4.4.4.2) and the support HEB received from the UNESCO Literature Translations Programme, also known as the UNESCO Collection of Representative Works programme. This initiative, which was called off in 2005, was:
a direct subsidy programme launched in 1948 by UNESCO in order to encourage translation, publication and the distribution of texts significant from the literary and cultural point of view, in spite of being little known beyond national boundaries or beyond the frame of their linguistic origin. (UNESCO, 2008)

Although the programme started in the late 1940s, it only started publishing translations of modern Arabic literature in mid-1970s. In the document outlining the information about the UNESCO programme, appended to the letter sent from Milton Rosenthal from UNESCO’s Division of Cultural Studies to Currey (HEB 24/7, 16 February 1975, p.2), we read that: ‘Unesco [sic] will, in most cases, purchase a goodly number of copies from the publisher for official distribution’.

We further read that:

If a publisher who is interested in a given translation indicates that he finds that the book is an important one, but one which nevertheless involves a considerable commercial risk, Unesco [sic] can provide assistance to the publisher in the form of an advance against production costs, reimbursable at so much per copy sold. This form of assistance has made it possible for Unesco [sic] to arrange for publication of its translated works, no matter how specialised its character, without undue delay, and by publishers of high standing. (appended document to the letter from Rosenthal to Currey, HEB 24/7, 16 February 1975, p.3)

The production costs subsidies received for two of the very first translations in the AAS were instrumental in encouraging HEB to continue with launching the series. This is evident in a letter from Currey to Mr Rubinstein from the UNESCO office in Paris (HEB 24/7, 25 July 1975) concerning the agreement between both parties on their first cooperation on the publication of a translation from Arabic into English, Death in Beirut:

The welcome backing of UNESCO was certainly a major factor in enabling us to take this on and to venture into, what is for us, a new area of publishing. (my italics)

The timing of UNESCO’s support of the publication of Death in Beirut and the approval of this particular work are significant. As the dates of the letters reveal, this coincided with the rising demographic tension and unrest in Lebanon, shortly after which the Lebanese Civil War erupted (see Khalaf, 2003, pp.227–231 for details on the early stages of violent outbreak in Lebanon). The novel was itself written in Arabic by the Lebanese diplomat and

43 For example, the Bibliography of Publications Issued by UNESCO or Under Its Auspices, published by UNESCO in 1973 (pp.263–264), does not list under translated Arabic literary materials any work of modern Arabic literature.
writer Tawfiq Yusuf Awwad, who predicted the war and its causes. The emergence of new positions in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation were mainly motivated by target readers’ demands, given the socio-political events in the Arab world. It is noteworthy that in the document appended to letter from Rosenthal to Currey (HEB 24/7, 16 February 1975, p.3), we read that:

approximately 80% of our translations programme is concerned with classics; funds available for the translation of contemporary works are normally fairly limited, though the situation varies depending on the given literature.

The cooperation between HEB and UNESCO also added symbolic value to HEB’s publications through consecrating both the AAS and the AWS, having been featured ‘as a UNESCO expert on publishing in Africa’ and, indeed, the Arab world (Henry Chakava\(^{44}\) to Bob Markham,\(^{45}\) HEB 24/7, 7 June 1976).

The above factors imply that expected financial gains, through making use of political and cultural incidents both in the Arab and Anglophone worlds, were one of the driving forces behind founding the AAS. This is also supported by the fact that although HEB had launched the AAS at the Cairo International Book Fair in January 1976, they relaunched the series again in London on 3 May that same year in synchronisation with the World Festival of Islam to ‘capitalise on the international market in Islam’\(^{46}\) (Sambrook\(^{47}\) to Johnson-Davies, HEB 23/8, 10 March 1975). Specifically, HEB believed that the festival—which, to use Currey’s (2008, p.170) words, ‘used the new oil wealth to introduce people in the West to the art, architecture and culture of a whole part of the world of which they remain so arrogantly dismissive’—would give their new AAS ‘a very auspicious and profitable start’ (Sambrook to Johnson-Davies, HEB 23/8, 10 March 1975). The reviews following the launch of the AAS attest to how HEB’s marketing strategy appears to have worked in gaining them both symbolic and economic capital in the field (see, for example, Neville, 1976). This is also evident in a letter sent from Currey to a literary agent called Michael Thomas (HEB 29/3, 5 May 1978) advising him that, ‘we have got our series Arab Authors off to a great critical acclaim and gradually growing sales’. Moreover, Currey spoke of the success of the AAS in

\(^{44}\) Managing director of HEB, East Africa (Currey, 2008, xxxi).

\(^{45}\) Manager of the Heinemann-Cassell Nairobi sales office (Currey, 2008, xxx).

\(^{46}\) The actual aim of the festival was outlined in the invitation letter that was distributed at the time (see Image 4, personal copy).

\(^{47}\) Senior editor at HEB.
an interview with Bejjit (2009, p.200): ‘I remember one Penguin rep said we were soon selling better in the Gulf than Penguin was selling their fiction in English’.

Johnson-Davies was the consultant editor to the AAS, and most of the translations were either done by him or conducted under his supervision. The translations were primarily marketed as educational, as suggested by the name of the publisher (i.e. Heinemann Educational Books) and several other exchanges in the University of Reading Special Collections (see, for instance, HEB 1/2, passim; see also Bejjit, 2009, p.199). However, the AAS also targeted ‘ordinary’ Anglophone readers and sought to present the Arab authors’ writings ‘as works of literature, rather than as academic documents or works of anthropology’ (Tresilian, 2010). This represents a canonical shift in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, as a result of the emergence of a new mode of production. English translations of modern Arabic fiction started to be read as works of literature rather than as scholarly documents. The only criticism levelled against the AAS, argues Young (1980, p.149), was that ‘its title “Arab Authors” claims rather too much’, for most of the writers represented in the series were Africans, especially Egyptians and Sudanese, and that some of the works had been previously included in the AWS. In an interview with Ghazoul (1983, p.90), Johnson-Davies concurs with Young’s view regarding the dominance of Egyptian writers in the AAS and attributes the reason to the fact that interest primarily focused on Egypt to the exclusion of other Arab countries. In addition to the reasons previously cited (see section 4.4.1), the attention Egypt received following the October War, Sadat’s visit to Israel and the signing of the Camp David Accords may have ensured the existence of such continued interest from the Anglophone world in Egypt and its literature.

Following a takeover of Heinemann in the late 1980s and the rise of a new management, whose mantra was to ‘cut jobs, increase profits’ (Bejjit, 2009, p.194), and given that the AAS ‘did not match the commercial success’ of the AWS, the new owners discontinued the AAS (Clark, 2000, p.11). Furthermore, Heinemann cited the lack of market success and profits as reasons for the series’ suspension (Tresilian, 2010; Allen, 1988, p.202). On the basis of these statements, one could argue that economic capital influenced both the growth and contraction of the field of modern Arabic fiction translation. Decisions of what and what not to translate were based not on the work’s literary value but rather on its anticipated economic value. That is to say, the decision as to which authors to include and which authors...
to exclude in the AAS seems to have been based on the anticipated economic yield of their translated works for the English reading public. This is supported by Currey’s statement, in an interview with Bejjit (2009, p.200), that HEB republished translations that had initially appeared in the AWS in the AAS, and gave them ‘fresh covers and marketed them differently’, both to reduce costs and to appeal to a wider Arab market, to whom the African label was not appealing, as previously explained. Although it was discontinued, HEB’s AAS helped to bring about some awareness of modern Arabic literature in general and modern Arabic fiction in particular. It also helped to put modern Arabic literature on the world literary map.

4.4.4 The emergence of niche publishers in the United States

HEB occupied a dominant position in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation in the United Kingdom. Similarly, two publishers dominated the field in the United States: Bibliotheca Islamica and Three Continents Press. The newly introduced courses in North American universities following the NDEA and the difficulty of obtaining translations of literary and historical works from/on the Arab world and the Middle East gave rise to these small-scale specialised publishers that endeavoured to fill this gap. Both publishers were relatively new to the publishing field in the 1970s but expressed willingness to publish the works of Arab authors in English translation and to invest in that niche market, despite the unpredictability of translated modern Arabic fiction at that time in the United States. However, their enthusiasm convinced them ‘that works from the literary tradition of such a large part of the world should be a subject of interest to the scholarly reading public and, it was hoped, to a still broader market’ (Allen, 1994, p.165). The publishing practices of both agents can be interpreted, in the Bourdieusian sense, as an attempt to adopt a more autonomous position from the dictates of the corporate publishing market by targeting a niche readership and prioritising cultural and symbolic capital, which could later be transformed into economic capital.

4.4.4.1 Bibliotheca Islamica

Bibliotheca Islamica started publishing material on the Middle East through its series, arguably to address the dearth of materials on the Middle East and to cater to the newly founded area studies courses in American universities. Among these was the Studies in Middle Eastern Literatures Series, started in 1972. The series published a collection of short stories and a novel by the Egyptian Naguib Mahfouz in translation, and another collection of short stories by the Egyptian Yusuf Idris. These works were either translated (partially or in full) or edited by Roger Allen, who was then a recently appointed assistant professor in Arabic studies at Pennsylvania University (Allen, 2009, p.6) and one of the key agents in the field during this phase (and beyond). Allen (2009, p.6) states that his ‘specific brief’ when he accepted the position at Pennsylvania University ‘was to introduce modern Arabic into the expanding curriculum of a traditional program of philology and archeology [sic]’. It could therefore be argued that Allen undertook these translations to consecrate himself both in his new position and as a translator in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English.

48 Another key agent who contributed significantly to opening up the field of modern Arabic fiction (and literature) translation into English in the United States and beyond, is Trevor Le Gassick.
translation. Few as they were, the translations produced by Bibliotheca Islamica
nevertheless played a pivotal role in consolidating and expanding the field’s boundaries and
in bringing modern Arabic fiction to the attention of the American readership.

4.4.4.2 Three Continents Press
Since it started publishing translations of modern Arabic fiction in the late 1960s, HEB was
keen to sell publishing rights and/or to create a joint imprint with a publisher in the United
States, both to reduce publishing costs and risks and to maximise its financial gains.
However, the process proved arduous. A letter from Currey to Johnson-Davies (HEB 1/8, 6
June 1969) regarding the search for a publisher in the United States for Tayeb Salih’s Season
of Migration to the North reveals that the work was turned down by Houghton Mifflin in
Boston, a mainstream American publisher. Moreover, in a later correspondence from Currey
to Johnson-Davies (HEB 23/8, 4 February 1970) about attempts to promote Salih’s work in
the United States, he says:

We have tried several American publishers, but no luck so far. I hope somebody
will latch on to it. The big American publishers are really a bit of a pain about
African [and Arab] writing.

However, the situation gradually started to change with the establishment of Three
Continents Press (3CP) in 1973. In a letter from Currey to Le Gassick (HEB 14/2, 16 December
1975) about promoting his translation of Mahfouz’s Midaq Alley, he states:

After trying many US publishers we have found that Three Continents Press are
[sic] not only interested but very keen on taking it. Donald Herdeck is concentrating
his publishing on African, the Caribbean and the Arab world. He already has in
proof Boulata [sic]: Modern Arab Poets and we are taking this from him for Arab
Authors. He hopes to take Johnson-Davies (Editor): Modern Arab [sic] Short
Stories. So he would be the ideal person to push Mahfouz in a positive way.

One of 3CP’s objectives was to ‘carve (...) out a niche for itself’ (Herdeck, 1998, p.9). Donald
Herdeck, one of the founders of the press, was teaching African Studies and Third World
Literature at Georgetown University (Baizer and Peabody, 1980) and established 3CP ‘partly
to provide texts’ for the courses he was teaching therein (MacPhee, 2015, p.48). The press,
according to Herdeck (1998, p.2), aimed to ‘publish unique works from the non-Western
world’ with a view of discovering such works that may not be ‘seemingly instant world
classics, but original, and, potentially, works which could “grow” into classics, the world
over’. Although the press was founded and administered by Donald and Margaret Herdeck, it had other stockholders who lived in countries on three different continents—i.e. Africa, Europe and North America—constituting the world of 3CP. These stockholders, argues Donald Herdeck (1998, p.10),

were not insistent on dollar profits because there were none. What they appreciated was the qualitative difference their investment was bringing to the world of late twentieth century literature. (my italics)

Bourdieu (1996a, p.255) avers that the initial phase in the life cycle of any small-scale producer, or agents venturing into new field of cultural production, consists of the accrual of symbolic capital and the renunciation of economic capital. This is often followed by a phase marked by the exploitation of symbolic capital, with the goal of ensuring and accumulating economic capital (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.255). Herdeck’s aforementioned statements could be interpreted, in the Bourdieusian sense, as an effort on 3CP’s part to attain distinction. The press could achieve that distinction by flagging its work as unique in relation to other works in the field, differentiating itself from the then prevalent mainstream modes of production and tastes by disavowing economic gain. In effect, this led to the emergence of a new niche group of consumers, with a distinctive taste and interest in modern Arabic fiction in English translation. This appears to have helped to diversify the range of English available translations of modern Arabic fiction, which, in turn, helped the field to evolve.

Altoma (2005, p.57) states that 3CP played a ‘pioneering role in promoting the translation of modern Arabic literature’. The publishing company’s efforts were aided by the fact that Herdeck had an academic background and had accumulated social capital, which arguably facilitated his marketing of books published by 3CP. Herdeck, argues Burness (1992, p.101), believed that there was ‘a lot of prejudice in this country [the United States] against blacks and against Arabs, against Islam. There is a lot of crookedness in covering the whole idea of writing that comes from the Third World’. Herdeck wanted to correct this misconception and fill that void (Herdeck, 1998, p.2; Burgess, 1982, pp.451–452). He frequently criticised American attitudes and the country’s publishing policy towards translations. He described America as ‘mono-cultural linguistically’ and the publishers as ‘notorious for avoiding much investment of time and dollars in translations’ (Anderson, 1999, p.35). He further argued that ‘unless there is a Nobel Prize involved, there is not much interest overall and even surprise if the author is not European’ (Herdeck, 1998, p.15; Anderson, 1999, p.35).
Herdeck’s statements illustrate some of the external factors that affected the structure of the field in ways that did not help the production, dissemination and consumption of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, especially in the United States. That is, the American mindset and publishing policies, which were primarily motivated by economic capital, restrained the activity in the field.

4.4.5 Other independent publishers and university presses

Niche publishers that emerged during this phase, both in the United Kingdom and the United States, were also instrumental in introducing modern Arabic fiction to the Anglophone world. The London-based Quartet Books and Saqi Books, both owned by individuals from the Arab world, published translations of important modern Arabic works of fiction, some of which were authored by previously unknown writers (Clark, 2000, p.12). In the United States, it was 3CP and Bibliotheca Islamica who contributed significantly to establishing the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, as previously explained.

This phase also saw university presses in both countries starting to produce translations, and studies on the Arab world in general, from modern Arabic fiction into English. Among these presses were New York University Press (through its New York University Studies in Near Eastern Civilisation Series) and the University of Texas Press (through its Dan Danciger Publication Series and, later, through its Modern Middle East Literatures in Translation Series) in the United States, and Leeds University Oriental Society (through its Monograph and Occasional Series) in the United Kingdom (see Appendix A for the details thereof). Although translation numbers were not particularly high in this phase, they paved the way for a much larger and more organised translation production and circulation of modern Arabic fiction in English translation in the following phases.

4.4.6 Agents outside the Anglophone world

4.4.6.1 The General Egyptian Book Organisation

The field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation was also influenced by agents located outside the Anglophone world. The contributions of Arab governmental publishers and initiatives in particular were noteworthy in terms of the development of the field. For example, the Egyptian Ministry of Culture, through its several institutions and initiatives following the Suez Crisis and beyond, published considerably more translations during this phase (14 in total) than in the previous one (one translation in 1967). Among these initiatives were the Prism Supplement Series, the Prism Literary Series and Prism magazine (subtitled
Quarterly of Egyptian Culture), which aimed to introduce Arab, albeit mainly Egyptian, culture and literature to the world and which also published translations of modern Arabic fiction into English and French. Notable among these initiatives, however, was the General Egyptian Book Organisation (GEBO), a state-owned and run publisher, which started publishing translations in 1967, as previously explained (see section 4.3.2). Perceiving translation as a means of ‘understanding the other’ and a way of promoting a better understanding of the Arab culture, GEBO revitalised its Thousand Books Project and expanded its activities with the launch of its Contemporary Arabic Literature Series in 1986, in which several works of modern Arabic fiction were published in translation (GEBO, no date). The first Thousand Books Project was established by Nasser in 1955 ‘with the explicit purpose of allowing the Egyptian audience to read the most essential books of modern world culture in cheap, subsidised paperback editions’ (Jacquemond, 1992, p.144). However, the project was abruptly suspended in 1967 following Egypt’s traumatising defeat in the Six-Day War and remained inactive due to the state’s apathy towards literature and its ‘general withdrawal (...) from cultural affairs during Sadat rule’ and ‘the general boycott imposed on Egypt’s exports [including books] by other Arab countries after the peace treaty with Israel (1979)’ (Jacquemond, 1992, p.144). The project was, nevertheless, restored in 1986 as an attempt to reaffirm Egypt’s national cultural identity and as a means of distinguishing Egypt cultural/literary position in the region (Jacquemond, 1992, p.146). That was reflected in the fact that most of the translations produced by GEBO were of Egyptian fiction writers, and the translations themselves were primarily carried out or revised by Egyptians as well. This once again highlights how external historico-political factors impacted the volume of activity in this field of cultural production.

In his introductory note to the Contemporary Arabic Literature Series, Enani’s (1986, p.8), the general editor, states that it was ‘designed to introduce the English reader to the contemporary Arabic literature in translation’ (emphasis in original). He reveals that the selection criteria for the inclusion of Arabic works in the series was not primarily based on literary merit but on ‘popularity, influence and modernity’; that is, on the work being a ‘bestseller’ amongst the Arab reading public (Enani, 1986, p.8). His comments highlight the emergence of new positions in the field of modern Arabic literature and fiction translation

---

50 Generally referred to as the ‘second Thousand Books Project’—although the first Thousand Books Project did not reach the publication/translation of a 1000 books (on this point, see Jacquemond, 2009, p.25).
into English related to the status of a source text. The series was a relative newcomer to the field, and Enani proceeded to discredit other translations of Arabic literature, describing them as outmoded to claim distinction for GEBO’s newly established series. Enani states that

The present series should fill a gap, as most translations of Arabic literature are either confined to classical literature (pre-Islamic or early Islamic) or, if they cover ‘modern’ literature, stop somewhere in the 1950’s [sic]. (Enani, 1986, p.9)

The struggle for distinction and legitimacy in the field continues when Enani (1986, p.9) invokes the fact the series’ ‘translators and revisers are mostly university lectures and professors, strictly specialised in modern literature’. What Enani seems to infer is that a good translation is one that is produced by specialists endowed with the necessary cultural capital, such as university lecturers and professors. Enani’s heterodoxic discourse could be interpreted as a subversion strategy, to use Bourdieu’s (1993b, p.73) words, to mitigate or completely transform the field’s existing rules of membership and unsettle its dominant positions. Although the initiative was called off in 2002, and the translations were hard to obtain outside Egypt, the 33 fiction titles (out of a total of 75 literary titles produced by the series) published by GEBO constitute a significant addition to the repertoire of translated modern Arabic, albeit mostly Egyptian, fictional works available in English.

4.4.6.2 The Journal of Arabic Literature’s Arabic Translation Series

The Leiden-based Journal of Arabic Literature (JAL) in the Netherlands established two related projects during this phase: the Arabic Translation Series and the Studies in Arabic Literature Supplements (Ostle, 1973, p.740). As their names imply, while the latter included critical studies on Arabic literature, the former included English translations of Arabic literary texts. Spanning from 1972 to 1980, the Arabic Translation Series published five translations, four of which were works of fiction. These were Yahya Haqqi’s The Saint’s Lamp and Other Stories in 1973; Mikhail Naimy’s A New Year in 1974; Taha Hussein’s A Passage to France in 1976 and The Call of the Curlew in 1980.

4.4.6.3 The American University in Cairo Press

Another agent located outside the Anglophone world was the American University in Cairo Press (AUCP). Through its project Arabic Literature in Translation, the AUCP produced a stream of translations of fictional works from across the Arab world. The influence of the AUCP on the field was not restricted to the process of selecting works for translation; it also
influenced the translation process itself. The AUCP had its own translation methodology which demanded that ‘four different translators engaged in translating a single book. An Arab translator would do a preliminary rendering, which would be followed by other translators with different degrees of experience adding their own alterations’ (Johnson-Davies, 2007). This new mode of production caused tension in the field and was contested by other agents. Johnson-Davies challenged AUCP’s approach by arguing that, ‘I feel that since it took one writer to write a book, it should not require more than one translator to translate it’ (Johnson-Davies, 2007).

The AUCP was established in 1960 to offer ‘the University staff and other scholars ... with an instrument by which reports on research and other creative work in the various fields of knowledge may be disseminated’ (Rodenbeck, 2000, viii, ellipsis in original). Although the AUCP started its Arabic literature translation project, albeit its Mahfouz Project (see section 5.2.1), in 1972, it did not possess the means to produce books. It was, therefore, forced to forge partnerships with other publishers both in the United States and the United Kingdom (Murphy, 1987, p.262). Notable among these were HEB and 3CP. It is argued here that due to the internal dynamics of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, key players, including HEB, 3CP and the AUCP, had to resort to cooperating amongst themselves and consolidating their efforts to strengthen and expand the boundaries of the field. This may be interpreted as a critique of Bourdieu’s concept of field, which is premised on the idea of struggle between agents, and consequently raises the question of whether cooperation, rather than confrontation, could affect or determine the dynamics of a field of activity. However, this trend changed after the Nobel Prize in 1988, which, in turn, led to the rise of new forms of capital in the field, as is discussed in section 5.2.2.

The first outcome of this cooperation was the publication of Naguib Mahfouz’s *Miramar* (1978). The novel was translated by Fatma Moussa and revised by Maged El-Kommos and John Rodenbeck, who was then the director of the AUCP. In order ‘to get the book sold’, and to add some symbolic value to the translation, Rodenbeck asked the British novelist John Fowles to write the introduction to the translation (Jobbins, 2002; Currey, 2008, p.181). The exchanges concerning the publication of *Miramar* between the three publishers, however, illustrate an underlying, rather covert, tension over the translation, publishing rights and legitimacy in terms of who represents the field of modern Arabic fiction in general.
and Mahfouz in translation in particular, despite their seeming cooperation (see HEB 14/6, passim).

Despite the many questions currently surrounding its monopolisation of the market of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, the AUCP played a pivotal role in shaping the field and is now one of its publishing giants, if not the biggest one: it owns exclusive worldwide publication rights of all works penned by Mahfouz and whoever wins the AUCP Mahfouz Medal for Literature (see section 5.2.6). Büchler and Guthrie (2011a, p.24) quote Paul Starkey, a prominent translator and professor of Arabic at Durham University, who states:

AUCP—a frustrating organisation to work with in some respects, and with miserable rates of pay, but still commendable in many respects, in terms of making available a body of literature that they can’t really be making any money out of.
modern Arabic fiction in English translation. In the early 1970s, the AAPSO established a new literary series called The Afro-Asian Literature Series. Both Lotus and the series published translations from Afro-Asian literatures, including modern Arabic fiction. The inclusion of translated modern Arabic, albeit mainly Egyptian, fiction writings in both platforms was aided by the fact that two of Lotus’s earliest editors-in-chiefs were Egyptian literary figures. The first editor-in-chief is quite remarkable too. El-Sibai was an army officer turned fiction writer and journalist who became Egypt’s Minister of Culture in 1973 and who was later assassinated in 1978, while attending the AAPSO Conference in Cyprus, because of his support of Egyptian political views and for having supported Sadat’s peace with Israel (Al-Mustafa and Ragab, 2008). Halim (2012, p.581) questions the appointment of El-Sibai’s as editor-in-chief and describes his editorials as being ‘set pieces of propaganda’. This implies that the field of power dominated, to an extent, the Arabic literary field, insofar as selection criteria for translations into English were concerned. Against this background, English translations of modern Arabic fiction not only should be perceived as mere translations but also should be interpreted against the backdrop of the political and socio-historical conditions under which they were produced and read. Although the translation of fiction may be thought of as literary work, the field of translation itself and the actual process of translating are informed and conditioned by external factors.

Sadat’s visit to Israel and the signing of the 1979 peace treaty with Israel had repercussions in Egypt: the AAPSO moved its headquarters from Cairo to Beirut, (Ghouse, 2014) and Arab countries, as previously mentioned, severed their relationship with Egypt, which led to the ‘decline of Egypt’s position in the global Arab publishing industry’ (Jacquemond, 1992, p.144). Arab countries started emulating the Egyptian model of actively engaging with and introducing themselves to the Anglophone world through translations published by their representative cultural bureaus in the west (see footnote no. 24). Examples include UR Magazine published by the Iraqi Cultural Centre in London; Azure magazine edited by the Libyan Culture Attaché in London; and the two literary series, Selections from Sudanese Literature Series and Sudanese Publications Series, published by the Washington-based Sudanese Office of the Cultural Counsellor (see Appendix A for the details thereof). These helped to diversify the output of modern Arabic fiction translated into English and in turn consolidate the boundaries of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation by introducing non-Egyptian works of fiction to the Anglophone world.
This phase also witnessed the birth of the first ‘organised project devoted to a systematic process of translation’ from Arabic into English (Allen, 2003, p.4). Based in Boston and London, and founded and directed by the prominent Palestinian poet and critic Salma Khadra Jayyusi, the Project of Translation from Arabic (PROTA) was launched in the late 1970s. PROTA was tasked by Columbia University Press to prepare a large anthology of modern Arabic literature, and the project was funded by the Iraqi Ministry of Information and Culture. Dissatisfied with the paucity of translations from Arabic into English and with the modes of production, PROTA implemented a new translation methodology and made its mission ‘the dissemination of Arabic culture and literature abroad’ (Allen, 1994, p.166). According to Allen (2003, p.4), PROTA’s translation methodology encompassed a two-fold procedure: ‘the first is that of rendering the source text into a readable English version, the second the use of an Anglophone litterateur to adapt the intertext to styles and structures of contemporary Anglo-American readerships’ (on this point, see also Al-Shukr, 2014, pp.12–13).

The efforts of PROTA’s small group of editors, translators and advisors bore fruit in the publication of a considerable number of studies on Arabic literature and culture as well as translations in the form of anthologies and individual works, both in the United States and the United Kingdom. In 1992, Jayyusi initiated the East–West Nexus Project to work hand in hand with PROTA to disseminate the history, literature and culture of the Arabs in the Anglophone world (Jayyusi, 2006, p.525; Al-Shukr, 2014, p.21). The primary goal of this initiative was to allow PROTA to focus exclusively on translating Arabic literature. During this phase, PROTA sponsored the translation of three Arabic works of fiction. The project’s list of translated Arabic fiction extended in later phases to more than 15 other translations (see Appendix A). Among PROTA’s publications were sizeable anthologies of translated modern Arabic fiction, which benefited from the financial support of both Arab individuals and institutions. However, in the first decade of the twenty-first century, Jayyusi attempted to launch a new project for translating Arabic literary/cultural material into 10 languages (Al-Shukr, 2014, p.11). Nevertheless, she was unsuccessful in ‘convinc[ing] the people responsible for culture in the Arab world to establish’ such a venture, despite the fact that her other projects ‘had won great credibility in the West, and a good name among the Arabs’ (Al-Shukr, 2014, p.11). Jayyusi attributes this lack of support towards her project to the fact that she is a ‘woman’. In her words to Al-Shukr (2014, p.18):
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Had I been a man, those in power who have often supported me, but within limits, would have always adopted that successful project and without limits; it would have deserved that adoption in their eyes.

The lack of support for Jayyusi’s project, despite her social, cultural and symbolic capital, had not only impacted the potential expansion of the field of modern Arabic fiction translation but also raises the question of whether or not an agent’s gender could impact the acceptance and effectiveness of their forms of capital at any time.

4.4.8 The characteristics of the field: The expansion phase (1968–1988)

This phase witnessed the continuation of certain trends from the previous one, along with some changes and the emergence of new features in the field. Below is an outline of the important active properties that took place in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation during its expansion phase.

1- Evoking the legacy of Arabian Nights continued during this phase, though perhaps to a lesser extent than the previous one. Titles, covers and reviews of some of the English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction, as well as their illustrations, could be described as “Orientalist”. By way of illustration, Huda Shaarawi was a pioneering Egyptian writer and feminist, and the title of her memoir, مذكرات هدى شعراوي in Arabic (i.e. the memoirs of Huda Shaarawi), was changed to Harem Years in the English translation, a title which reflects the Orientalist imagery of harem life found in the Arabian Nights. Kahf (2000, p.165) rightly notes how the word “harem” was only used once in Shaarawi’s 457 pages Arabic source text and 25 times in the translation’s introduction alone (on this point, see also Baker, 2006, pp.63–64). Moreover, when Tayeb Salih’s Season of Migration to the North was published in English translation in 1969, it was described in a review by The Observer as ‘an Arabian Nights entertainment—but in reverse’ (see HEB 1/8; and Currey, 2008, p.177).

2- Reading English translations of Arabic works of fiction as social documents rather than works of literary merit continued from the initial phase into the expansion phase. This primarily anthropological interest is evident in a letter from Le Gassick to Currey (HEB 14/2, 9 December 1975), where he advises him that

I was recently at the annual convention of the Middle East Studies Association held in Kentucky and did all I could to draw attention to the new availability of Midaq Alley; the response was very favourable. Perhaps you
are now receiving new orders as a result. The many nice remarks made, particularly from Anthropologists and Sociologists who need such works, convinces me that it would be a very good investment to send presentation copies or at least an announcement to certain people. (my italics)

Hence, the rising interest evidently had an impact on the volume of activity in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. For instance, later correspondence from HEB to 3CP (Currey to Herdeck, HEB 14/6, 3 October 1977) reveals how the sales of *Midaq Alley* increased in the United States and how Herdeck had ‘ordered a second thousand’ of Mahfouz’s work ‘quite quickly’. Moreover, the introductions to both *Women and the Family in the Middle East* and *Middle Eastern Muslim Women Speak*, which contain short stories, novel extracts and autobiographical accounts of works by (and on) Arab (and other Middle Eastern) women writers, describe these works as ‘documents’ rather than literary works. In his forward to the latter, Mahdi (1977, xi) writes:

> One may hope that the present collection of documents will provide educated western [sic] readers with a somewhat clearer view of the conditions, aspirations, struggles and achievements of Middle Eastern Muslim women.

3- Whereas the previous phase marked the publication of the first English translation of one of Mahfouz’s works of fiction in book format (i.e. *Midaq Alley*), it was during this phase that the AUCP initiated its 1972 Mahfouz Project to translate the works of the latter, who would become the 1988 Nobel Laureate. Despite its motives, which are critically discussed in section 5.2.1, the project led to the appearance of a number of Mahfouz’s works in English translation and influenced the processes of the field’s expansion and evolution.

4- Although most English translations of modern Arabic fiction were of works by Egyptian writers, a larger number of other Arab countries started featuring in translation during this phase (see *Graph 7*). This diversification of geographical representation was primarily due to socio-political factors that saw Egypt losing ground as the Arab world’s cultural centre due to Sadat’s policies and the country’s peace treaty with Israel, as explained above (see section 4.4.7). Moreover, emerging Arab countries, as Johnson-Davies calls them in an interview with Ghazoul (1983, pp.90–91), wanted to promote their writers merely for ‘the prestige of being
thought “cultured”. This seems to have also helped the increase in the number of English translations of works by writers from Arab countries other than Egypt.

5- This phase witnessed an expansion of the number of reviews of English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction published in Anglophone mainstream journals and literary magazines. The publishers who took part in the field in this phase, such as HEB and 3CP, through their marketing strategies and connections, as well as through the efforts of individual translators, aided the process of acquainting the Anglophone public and mainly academic readers with the existence of translated modern Arabic works of fiction of literary merit. Arab embassies and cultural centres in the Anglophone world sought to promote their cultures by organising literary receptions for translations of works by their writers too. This, along with the accompanying media coverage, aided the dissemination of English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction in the Anglophone world. To illustrate, in a letter from Currey to Mr Ali Abu Sinn, the Press Attaché at the Sudanese Embassy in London (HEB 1/2, 2 July 1968), we read:

Mr Johnson-Davies has told me the very good news that you would like to give a party for the launching of The Wedding of Zein by Tayeb Salih. I am sure that this will help to draw attention to the book. (my italics)

Another example can be drawn from an invitation letter (HEB 14/2, no date) sent from the London-based The Arab Cultural Trust to Currey in 1978 in which we read:

THE ARAB CULTURAL TRUST has the pleasure in inviting Mr James Currey to attend a reception in honour of Mr Yusuf Idris, whose book ‘The Cheapest Nights and Other Stories’ has just been published by Peter Owen.

6- This phase witnessed the emergence of several English translations of works by Arab women writers (reasons discussed in section 4.4.2). The appended bibliography (see Appendix A) suggests a striking departure from the last phase, where no translations of works by Arab women writers were published, apart from two short stories which appeared in the collection Modern Arabic Short Stories (see Graph 8). There were, however, concerns amongst Arabic literary scholars about the motivations behind the translations and the types of reviews written of them. For instance, Amireh (1996) maintains that

Reviewers of Arab women’s books seem to take their cues from the titles and covers. Unfailingly, they read these novels as sociological and
anthropological texts that ‘reflect’ the reality of Islam and the Arab world and ‘lift the veil’ from what one reviewer called the ‘unimaginable world of Arab women’.

It is also noteworthy that this phase also saw women translators producing translations in book format in the field for the first time since its genesis.

**Graph 7**

7- American publishers, other than those that were publishing translations of Arab diaspora writers living in the United States, started taking part in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, especially from the mid-1970s. As demonstrated above (see sections 4.4.4 and 4.4.5), these publishers took part in the field following the NDEA to cater to newly introduced university courses. The contributions of United States-based publishers, such as 3CP, Bibliotheca Islamica and other American university presses, helped the field to evolve and consolidate its boundaries. The American public, but primarily academic, readership started being acquainted, perhaps for the first time, with translated works of fiction from the Arab world other than those of Gibran and Naimy.

8- The advent of newcomer agents with new logics of practice to the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, and the changes they brought in the volume of
this field’s activity and, in turn, structure, led to the emergence of a number of new positions. This contributed to the field’s evolution into a fully-fledged field of cultural production, in the Bourdieusian sense, in its own right (see section 5.3.4 for an in-depth analysis of the positions available in the field).

Graph 8

9- As in the previous phase, the above analysis suggests an increasing underlying isomorphic relationship between the field of power and the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. The intermediary homology between the two fields meant that new forces exerting influence on one of them inevitably affected the other field and its activities. In other words, some of the events that occurred within the field of power, especially the field of politics, during this phase impacted the volume of activity in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, its positions and structure, and the dynamics of its agents’ practices. Hence, fiction translations should not be examined in isolation from the socio-cultural and historico-political contexts governing the different cycles of their production and consumption.
4.5 Concluding remarks

This chapter investigated the genesis and social history of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and the positions during its early phases, these being the initial phase and the expansion phase. Pierre Bourdieu’s sociological concepts of field, capital, positions and position-takings offered us the opportunity to perceive this cultural product as a ‘socially regulated activity’ (Hermans, 1997, p.10). They also enabled us to understand the internal and external determinants that informed and conditioned the formation of this field of cultural production during its early stages. This chapter accurately traced the first translation of modern Arabic fiction into English back to 1908. Although Altoma (2005, pp.54–55) mentions that prior to 1947 there were very few translations of modern Arabic fiction, he does not provide a specific date. This means that we can now set the initial phase as being between 1908 and 1967, in contrast to the previous known range of 1947–1967.

Moreover, the analysis above demonstrates the emergence of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as an international field of cultural production that extends beyond national boundaries. The expansion phase in particular saw a number of publishers, both from within and outside the Anglophone world, showing a willingness to take part in the field, which attests that the field’s boundaries are dynamic and in a constant state of flux. This is in opposition to Bourdieu’s conception of a field as being national (see section 3.6.2). This chapter’s analysis of the field’s social history also gave rise to two important questions. The first is whether or not cooperation rather than confrontation could provide the dynamics of the activities in a field of cultural production; the second is whether or not an agent’s capital resources may become ineffective along gender lines.

The next chapter continues the analysis of the social history of the field during its last two phases, the post-Nobel phase and the post-9/11 phase, to further explain the dynamics and nature of the practices in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.
5.1 Initial remarks

Chapter four examined the socio-historical trajectory of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation during its early phases. It identified the field’s dynamics, volume of activity, positions as well as the practices of agents occupying those positions and the forms of capital surrounding them. From the genesis of the field in 1908 to 1987, the number of English translations of modern Arabic fiction was not voluminous, and these translations were predominantly read by specialists. Naguib Mahfouz’s win of Nobel Prize in Literature in 1988 marked a turning point in the history of the field. The award brought unprecedented international attention to Arabic literature in general, and for the first time since the emergence of the field, modern Arabic fiction was the focus of worldwide interest. It also led to a quantum leap of public interest in translated modern Arabic fiction, which gave rise to new positions, new stakes, new agents and new forms of struggle as well as new modes of translation selection, production and consumption in the field. In addition to investigating the socio-cultural and historico-political dynamics and diversification of positions in the field, this chapter also aims to identify and interpret the prominent developments during the field’s post-Nobel (1988–2001) and post-9/11 phases (2001–present).

5.2 The post-Nobel phase (1988–2001)

According to Altoma (2005, p.57), the post-Nobel phase was ‘a striking departure from earlier phases’. The number of new English translations of modern Arabic fiction, as well as reprints of existing works, rose rapidly and consistently as a result of the increasing market demand. Based on the appended bibliography I have compiled (see Appendix A), this study concurs with Altoma’s statements: English translations of modern Arabic fiction increased in number by nearly 45% from the two earlier phases, (i.e. 204 translations from 1988 to 2000, compared to 141 from 1908 to 1987). The field also witnessed a change in the modes of production, circulation and consumption during this period. After the initial period, when the translation of modern Arabic fiction was entirely dependent on individual enterprises and personal contacts, mainstream publishers started to become aware of the significant literary merit and potential commercial value of modern Arabic fiction translated into English. This realisation resulted in new struggles in the field in the form of competition over securing the publishing rights of modern Arabic works of fiction, needless to say, especially those of Mahfouz’s works. The Nobel Prize seems to have reignited the interest of many
university presses in the Anglophone world in this developing intellectual field. Perceiving it as a field worthy of investment, new niche publishers competed for a share and began promoting and publishing modern Arabic fiction in English translation themselves.

Prior to winning the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1988, Mahfouz’s reputation was unrivalled in the Arab world (Agamieh, 1991, p.369). He was also the Arab fiction writer most represented in English translation. As the appended bibliography suggests (see Appendix A), prior to 1988, there existed (re)translations of 15 of his novels and novellas in addition to two collections of his short stories. Moreover, selections from his works featured in some 40 Arab and international anthologies of works of fiction in translation as well as other literary periodicals and magazines. Nevertheless, outside the Arab world, he was mainly known to specialists in Arabic literature (Altoma, 1990, p.128). These translations were, however, instrumental in helping Mahfouz to win the Nobel Prize and therefore to reach wide international recognition. Mahfouz himself testifies to this fact by admitting that it was ‘through these translations that publishers became acquainted with my works, translating them to other languages. I am certain they were among the most important factors contributing to my being awarded the Nobel Prize’ (Rakha, 2002).

5.2.1 The Mahfouz Project

In the 1970s, Kennett Love, an ex-US Navy pilot turned lecturer in journalism at the American University in Cairo (AUC), proposed the idea for the Mahfouz Project to the Publications Committee of the American University of Cairo Press (AUCP) (Love, 1989, passim). The idea was to translate Mahfouz’s works into English to earn legitimacy for the AUCP in Egypt, not to mention prestige and long-term financial gains. Love (1989, p.21) argued that even ‘mediocre’ translations of Mahfouz’s works have the prospect of winning him the Nobel Prize, which would in turn ‘make the relatively obscure press itself famous, and would surely help university fund raising [sic]’. The AUCP adopted the project and started commissioning translations of Mahfouz’s works soon afterwards. Love’s accounts

---

1 The importance of translations as a catalyst for awarding a non-European author the Nobel Prize is highlighted in Bo Svensén’s (2001), Private Secretary to the Permanent Secretary of the Swedish Academy, account on the nominations to the Nobel Prize in Literature between 1901 and 1950. He states that from 1901 to 1950, there were only a few Nobel Prize nominees who wrote in non-European languages. Of these, Taha Hussein was the only author from the Arab world, nominated twice in 1949 and 1950. According to Svensén (2001, p.402, p.418, my translation), an expert’s report stated that the ‘suggestion deserves serious consideration’; however, given the lack of available translations of Hussein’s works at the time, the Nobel Committee could not advocate him for the prize (on this point, see also Rooke, 2010, p.94).
are supported by a letter from Currey to Johnson-Davies (HEB 23/8, 27 March 1973) advising him about the AUCP’s project and questioning the quality of translations:

The American University in Cairo’s Mahfuz [sic] project churns away and they seem to be getting translations done. Unfortunately the translation of the Quail and the Autumn rather confirms one’s worst apprehensions. I was rather put off on reading it the first time through but I found that the book stays with me. Perhaps it is the translation that put me off. Perhaps it’s the fault of Mahfuz [sic].

Reservations about the English translations of Mahfouz are echoed by Said’s (2000, p.46) who perceives them as ‘an unliterary, largely commercial enterprise without much artistic or linguistic coherence’.

It should be noted that prior to Mahfouz being awarded the Nobel Prize in 1988, the AUCP did not take an active interest in translating modern Arabic fiction into English. Rodenbeck was once quoted by Christopher Wren (1980, p.22), commenting on the genre’s ‘limited appeal’ in the Anglophone world and wondering ‘why should you bother to translate something that is going to be read by specialists anyway?’ One cannot help but wonder why, if that was the AUCP’s perception on translating modern Arabic fiction, they agreed to Love’s Mahfouz Project. To answer this question, it is instructive to provide a brief account on the situation in Egypt at the time and how that may have affected the AUCP’s decision to translate Mahfouz, its only translated Arab author since its inception and until 1988.

The Six-Day War of 1967 saw the United States supporting Israel with advanced weaponry, which was one the main reasons behind the defeat of the Arab forces (Milstead, 2008; Golan, 2016, p.14). Egypt’s relationship with the United States became severely strained, which eventually led to severing diplomatic relations between the two countries (Murphy, 1987, p.186). The Six-Day War was directly followed by the War of Attrition between Egypt and Israel, which lasted from 1967 to 1970 and witnessed political interventions from both the United States and Russia (Golan, 2016, p.14; Oren, 2002, p.319). Following Nasser’s death in late 1970, Sadat ascended to power in Egypt, which ushered the country into a state of ‘no peace, no war’ with Israel until 1973 (Gawrych, 2000, p.127). Egypt’s economy

---

2 The only other work of fiction that was published by the AUCP before 1988 was a collection of Egyptian short stories (1977), in which Mahfouz’s works were also featured.

3 The AUCP published a short stories collection by Magid Tubia in English translation by Nadia Gohar in 1988. The stories were originally translated as part of Gohar’s MA thesis at the AUC in 1980. The next English translation of an Arabic work of fiction by another author, beside Mahfouz, was published in 1992 (see Appendix A for details thereof).
wars and their aftermath had significantly exhausted the country financially and, hence, severe austerity measures were imposed to address the budget deficit, which, in turn, caused internal unrest. Operating in Egypt as an American institution, the AUC was affected by such events (Murphy, 1987, p.186). Egyptian media outlets blamed the United States for the impasse, ‘and not a few Egyptians wanted to make it difficult for the AUC to operate’ (Murphy, 1987, p.186). This resulted in questioning the legal status of the AUC in Egypt and a ‘search for documents’ approving its establishment, which ‘yielded nothing’ (Murphy, 1987, p.188).

Nasser’s Egypt had enacted the Law 160 in 1958, which aimed to free the Egyptian educational system from external influences and place ‘foreign schools under government control’; however, it was never enforced on the AUC (Murphy, 1987, p.188; for a thorough discussion on Law 160 in relation to the AUC, see Lane, 2012, passim). Nevertheless, in 1970, another law was passed by the Egyptian National Assembly to regulate and manage higher private institutions operating in the country, i.e. Law 52. Murphy (1987, p.188) states that Law 52 ‘put schools like AUC under strict supervision of the [Egyptian] Ministry of Higher Education’. Later on the same year, given the United States administration’s intervention and Egypt not wanting to worsen an already strained relationship, the Egyptian government expressed its willingness to not apply the new law to the AUC if the university would negotiate an agreement (Murphy, 1987, p.188). As a result, an agreement was signed by the AUC and the Egyptian government on December 20 1971 (Murphy, 1987, p.189). The agreement provided for a joint committee from AUC and the Ministry of Higher Education to consider the recognition of degrees. Six specifically designated chief administrative posts, including the presidency, were reserved for Americans, as were forty-five percent of the academic positions. No fewer than 75 percent of students would be Egyptian, and the university would maintain an Arabic Language and Literature Department offering study to both Egyptians and foreigners. (Murphy, 1987, p.189; my italics)

The last point in the agreement, about offering Arabic language and literature courses to Egyptians and especially foreigners, and the date of signing the agreement (i.e. late 1971) are arguably relevant to the AUCP Publications Committee’s approval of Love’s Mahfouz Project. Translating Mahfouz seemed reasonable for two reasons. The first reason was the agreement and laws that preceded it allowed the Egyptian government to supervise the
activities of the AUC, including the books it produced and taught. For example, Lane (2012, p.44) speaks of how, following the enactment of Law 160, the Egyptian Ministry of Education requested a list of the curriculum and books taught at the AUC to ‘check them and to be confident of the national spirit of the graduates of this institution’ (my italics). Teaching the works of Egypt’s most celebrated author, who ‘espoused Egyptian nationalism in many of his works’ (Abdullah, 2013), in the Arabic literature courses may have appeared to be unassailable. Mahfouz had also just won the National Prize for Arts under Nasser in 1970 and the Collar of the Republic, the highest of Egypt’s national honours, under Sadat in March 1972 (Prism Supplement V, 1972, p.5; Agamieh, 1991, p.369). It could thus be argued that having the AUC’s name on translations by a leading Egyptian author who was honoured by the state would give the AUC both legitimacy and recognition as a promoter of Egypt and its national ideals at a time when the United States government was accused of the doing the opposite. The second reason why the project may have been approved was that Mahfouz was perceived at the time as the ‘chronicler of Egypt’s modern history’ (Altoma, 1990, p.131; Sfeir, 1966, p.948), and his works were being studied in the United States more as important anthropological/historical documents than literary ones (see Nelson, 1986, pp.62–64, 1971, p.196; Le Gassick to Currey, HEB 14/2, 9 December 1975). Moreover, there was a growing need at that time for translations of modern Arabic literature to cater to the demands of the newly introduced courses in the United States and United Kingdom following the National Defence and Education Act (NDEA) and the Hayter Report, as previously explained (see section 4.3.2). Given the existing markets in the United States and United Kingdom, it could therefore be safely argued that, in translating Mahfouz, the AUCP saw an opportunity for some financial gains through, for example, selling rights to his translations to educational or niche publishers, as it did with Heinemann Educational Books (HEB) and Three Continents Press (3CP). Moreover, there was a local market for these translations in Egypt for people who could not read Mahfouz in Arabic or preferred to read him in English (on this point, see Alkhawaja’s (2014, Vol. 2, pp.44–45) interview with Atef El-Hoteiby, then the AUCP’s Special Sales and Marketing Manager).4 There was therefore a market for Mahfouz’s translations which, although perhaps not particularly large, could earn the AUCP both symbolic and

4 Speaking at the Dubai International Publishing Conference 2017, Trevor Naylor, the AUCP’s current Sales and Marketing Director, stated that 80% of the AUCP’s ‘business was settled in one market’, i.e. Egypt, and that after the 25 January revolution, they lost that market overnight (Qualey, 2017a). This attests to the fact that there was an ever-growing local market for translations of Mahfouz during this phase and beyond.
economic capital. Thus conceived, investing in Mahfouz’s fame through translating his works was arguably perceived by the AUC as a strategy for securing legitimacy and recognition in Egypt, as well as international visibility and economic capital. The above statements demonstrate that the AUCP’s interest behind translating Mahfouz, and modern Arabic works of fiction in general, was primarily driven by accruing symbolic capital that could later be transformed into economic capital.

In 1985, the AUCP signed an exclusive foreign rights agreement with Mahfouz, which allowed the press to license translations of all his works into any language in the world, ‘in exchange for nothing’ (Johnson-Davies, 2007; see also Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.40). The AUCP’s interest in Mahfouz continued, arguably due to the persistent rumours in the literary field that the Nobel Committee was contemplating the idea of awarding its literature prize to an Arab writer and Mahfouz’s name was cited as a nominee (see Salem, 2011, p.36, pp.38–40, see also Image 5). Rodenbeck (1988, p.43), for instance, alludes to ‘the fact that he [Mahfouz] had been a regular nominee’ for the Nobel Prize for several years. However these rumours became rife in 1984, just one year before the AUCP acquired the rights of all Mahfouz’s works in translation. Interviewed in the magazine Titel in 1984, Lars Gyllensten, a member of the Swedish Academy, reports that ‘attempts are made “to achieve a global distribution”’ to the Nobel Prize in Literature (Espmark, 1991, p.132). It became more likely that an Arab writer would win the Nobel Prize when in the same year, Artes, a magazine published by the Swedish Academy, devoted its first edition of the year to Arabic literature (Espmark, 1991, p.138), and Lund University and the Swedish Institute co-organised a conference on the same subject later that year (Jayyusi, 1993, p.17). Rumours became all the more definite when the Swedish Academy sought the opinions of experts in the field of modern Arabic literature and, purportedly, lists of specific Arab authors, on all of which Mahfouz’s name topped the list, were put forward by the Nobel Committee (on these points, see Johnson-Davies, 2006a, pp.40–41; Allen,5 2004, pp.5–6; Jayyusi, 1993, pp.17–19). Given the fact that none of the Nobel Committee knew Arabic and that Mahfouz was the most translated Arab writer in the languages accessible to the Swedish Academy, it became evident that he was the most plausible candidate for the Nobel Prize (on this point, 5 In an interview with Alkhawaja (2014, Vol. 2, p.84), Allen evinces to her that both he and Salma Khadra Jayyusi were asked by the Nobel Committee to write a report on the prospective winners from Arabic literature. He adds that ‘Salma wrote about Adunis, and I wrote about Mahfouz’ Alkhawaja (2014, Vol. 2, p.84).
When Mahfouz was awarded the Nobel Prize, ‘silence fell and many wondered’ who he was (Mahfouz, 1988). It is perhaps relevant to examine the factors that may have contributed to Mahfouz winning the Nobel Prize. When Mahfouz won there were strong views among Arab
intelligentsia⁶ about the controversial nature of the choice: that, among other arguments, Mahfouz had won the prize because of his support for the Camp David Accords and peace with Israel in general and that he was nominated by Israeli scholars (Munthe, 2002, p.26; Allen, 2004, pp.4–5). These views were consolidated by the Western media approach to the news who, as Mehrez (1994, p.86) states, ‘described Mahfouz as being a “supporter of President Anwar al-Sadat’s peace treaty with Israel”’ (on this point, see, for example, Howard, 1988, p.11; Honan, 1988, C32; Walker, 1988). Mehrez (1994, p.86) also recalls that one of the first people to be interviewed, immediately following the award, was the Israeli Press Officer at the United Nations and at the Israeli Consulate in New York, Barukh Binah, who ‘applauded’ the Academy’s decision and described Mahfouz as a ‘good neighbour of Israel’. (see also Rule, 1988, p.A1)

Members of the Nobel Committee, argues Pipes (1999), ‘have been known to respond to political pressures, and the absence of any Arabic writer among the ranks of the world’s most prestigious literary laureates weighed heavily on them’ (on this point, see also Nkrumah, 2009). Mahfouz’s selection, according to critics, was ‘a safe bet: a humanist who

⁶ Leading this group was Yusuf Idris, the prominent Egyptian writer who protested that the award should have been given to him instead of Mahfouz (Brunet, 1991, p.C4). Idris argues that ‘he was rejected by the Swedish Academy because of his strong anti-Israel views’ (Brunet, 1991, p.C4).
called for peace with Israel and would be palatable to the Western press’ (Kessler, 1990, p.60). He was also ‘the confirmed giant among Arab writers’ (Pipes, 1999), a Muslim who is married to a Christian and an Egyptian/Arab who had suffered with the Palestinians but was always for the peace process and the recognition of Israel. He defended a colleague who was expelled from the Writer’s Union for having visited Israel and had to endure criticism. (Kahle, 2006, my translation)

It is possible to locate the nomination letter of Mahfouz by an Israeli scholar and exchanges between him and Mahfouz where the former informs the latter that he had nominated him for the Nobel Prize, which confers a degree of legitimacy to the previous accounts (see Image 6—for exchanges between Avihai Shivtiel and Mahfouz, see El-Batrik, 1989, pp.76–81). This, however, is not to undermine Mahfouz’s literary talent; he was indeed the most significant literary figure in the Arab world and most important Arabic fiction writer of the twentieth century (Badawi, 1985, p167; El-Enany, 1993, i). Whether or not the above factors aided the Nobel Committee’s decision to award Mahfouz the Nobel Prize, it could be argued that the narratives surrounding his win and the approach of the Anglophone media, which portrayed him as someone who embraced Western values, rendered him more acceptable to Anglophone readers (Mehrez, 1994, p.86). As a result, Mahfouz’s works were disseminated more broadly, which increased the visibility of the AUC and its press as well as the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation overall.

5.2.2 The Nobel effect: The struggle over Mahfouz

Following the award of the Nobel Prize, the translations of Mahfouz’s literary works, which had lain for so long on the periphery of the field of world literature, leaped to the centre as they enjoyed sudden broad international appeal. The position of the field of translated modern Arabic fiction experienced a sudden upturn due to unprecedented public and institutional demand. Mahfouz turned ‘overnight into a major literary commodity’ (Pilkington, 1992, p.J6), and his books were sold out in the majority of bookshops worldwide, which left the AUCP ‘enjoying a windfall’ (The Globe and Mail, 1988). The expected financial gains seem to have led mainstream publishers to invest time and effort to buy a share of Mahfouz’s translation rights from the AUCP and publish the works of other modern Arabic fiction writers too. Arnold Tovell, Director of the AUCP at that time, was quoted stating, ‘I am besieged by inquiries from around the world about translating his works into foreign languages’ (The Globe and Mail, 1988). This alludes to the external factors that affected the
activity in field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and aided the transformation of the field during this phase. It also demonstrates the symbolic and economic capital that the AUC and its press accrued following Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize, as well as the rise of new positions in the field related to expected gains and catering to market demands.

Interest in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation was redefined following the award in 1988. The emergence of a new group of large-scale commercial publishers, becoming involved in the translation activities of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, particularly in relation to Mahfouz, resulted in expanding the field’s boundaries and the emergence of new positions within it. The Nobel Prize consecrated and canonised Mahfouz in the West and created an ‘unprecedented demand’ for his books among the public (Luxner, 1989, p.16). This led to changes in the conditions of membership to the field and led to tensions between the established and newcomer agents.

In August 1988, just weeks before Mahfouz was awarded the Nobel Prize, Heinemann’s new management decided to discontinue its Arab Authors Series (AAS) and sell the rights of its titles, including those by Mahfouz, to the AUCP as the new management believed these translations were ‘unmarketable’ (Allen, 1988, p.202; Currey, 2008, p.181; Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.48). Following the award, in the United Kingdom, Heinemann ‘begged to be allowed to reprint’ Mahfouz’s works but that was refused (Stewart, 2001, no pagination). The only other publishing agent, apart from the AUCP, that had rights to publish Mahfouz in English translation at the time of the award was 3CP, which owned the American rights to a few of his titles (Herdeck, 1998, p.95). Herdeck (1998, p.96) reports how 3CP sold what it ‘usually expected to sell in a year’ in ‘a day and a half’ following the announcement of the Nobel Prize. However, the struggle between the AUCP and 3CP, and the competition over translation rights and who represents Mahfouz in English translation ensued.

Subsequent to the award, American newspapers described the competition between American publishers to obtain rights to publish Mahfouz as the ‘World rights race’ (Weatherby, 1988, p.26). Herdeck (1998, pp.96–97) recounts how he received a call from Tovell ‘suggesting we mesh our reaction to the flood of inquiries for rights coming in from big commercial firms’. Tovell’s argument, argues Herdeck (1988, p.96) was ‘being that by packaging our four Mahfouz titles with AUC’s five or six we could get a better price, per volume, than if we worked separately’. The tension between the 3CP and the AUCP becomes
all the more visible in a letter sent from Herdeck to Vicky Unwin, Publishing Director at HEB (3CP, Box 13, 23 December 1988) advising her that regarding Tovell’s ‘verbal guarantee’ not to market any titles where Three Continents hold U.S. rights, we don’t have faith in his ‘verbal’ guarantees, but we shall see.

Without consulting with 3CP, the AUCP quickly forged a partnership with Doubleday, to whom the AUCP sold the English translation rights to thirteen of Mahfouz’s novels and a collection of short stories (McDowell, 1988, p.C22). It was the idea of Jacqueline Onassis,

7 All citations labelled 3CP are from the publisher’s archives in the Harry Ransom Centre, the University of Texas at Austin.
the wife of the former American President J. F. Kennedy and a Doubleday editor at that time, to join the race to acquire Mahfouz’s translation rights. Herdeck (1998, p.5) reports how she said ‘on learning Mahfouz had won the Nobel (…) that she wanted “a piece of him”’. Onassis’ efforts to acquire Mahfouz rights were aided by her symbolic and social capital, as could be deduced from Herdeck’s (1998, p.5) account, who recalls how she ‘phoned, at midnight, Cairo time, the U.S. Ambassador to Egypt requesting him to get into touch with Mahfouz’. When asked about Mahfouz, Doubleday President Alberto Vitale reportedly said that he ‘didn’t know of Mahfouz (...). But for him to have received the Nobel prize [sic] means his books are special, and it is an honour to be able to publish him’ (McDowell, 1988, p.C22). Kalfatovic (2013) speaks of how Mahfouz’s books ‘proved to be long-term moneymakers for Doubleday’. The above accounts highlight the tension in the field over the emergent forms of capital. They also demonstrate how the niche publishers who ventured early into the market in the United Kingdom and the United States, and who had struggled to keep a limited repertoire of translated works of fiction in print, were made to ‘battle against the giant, faceless controllers of corporate publishing, who “discovered” Mahfouz [in particular, and modern Arabic fiction in general] after the Nobel Prize and insisted upon their exclusive rights to his works’ (Burness, 1992, p.100). In other words, agents competing over the translation of Mahfouz’s works were, in Bourdieus’s terms, competing over the symbolic capital attached to his name as a Nobel Prize laureate. This, in turn, would have implications on the field in terms of the economic capital that could be realised.

The emergence of new forms of capital (i.e. symbolic capital, which could be exchanged into financial gains) propelled the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation into a new phase of struggle between those agents who were operating in it (i.e. the avant-gardes) and those who wanted to gain membership to the field (i.e. the newcomers). The struggle between 3CP on one side and the AUCP and Doubleday on another took another shape when the ‘early publicity for Three Continents diminished to zero’ (Herdeck, 1998, p.98). Media outlets were used as a channel to claim legitimacy, power and ‘appropriate the specific products at stake’ in the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.102) by the newcomer to the field, Doubleday. News reports on Mahfouz, for instance, ignored the role played by 3CP in the United States and HEB in the United Kingdom, and focused solely on the eager and energetic efforts of Doubleday to bring out for a hungry audience its Mahfouz titles—all discussed as if these were virgin and daring enterprises of the redoubtable Doubleday firm. (Herdeck, 1998, p.98)
This narrative seems to have extended to other Anglophone countries as well. In Canada, for example, *The Ottawa Citizen* reported how ‘Doubleday is reissuing translations of Mahfouz’s major novels, most of which were published earlier by the American University in Cairo Press’ (Manguel, 1990, p.17), overlooking the role of both 3CP and HEB in promoting his work prior to 1988.

This struggle marks the emergence of new positions in the field related to translatorial agents’ interest in commissioning and publishing particular translations due to their expected financial returns based on the symbolic or cultural capital of a literary work or author. For example, following Mahfouz’s winning of the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1988, all his publishers reprinted his translations and conspicuously flagged Mahfouz as the Nobel Prize laureate on all front covers as a strategy to maximise their profits. For instance, when asked by Alkhawaja (2014, Vol. 2, p.39) about whether or not the AUCP had changed its marketing strategy for Mahfouz’s works in the Anglophone world, Atef El-Hoteiby, the press’s Sales and Marketing Manager replies:

Atef: We certainly did change our marketing strategies. I recall very well, this was in 1989, (…) the Director [of the AUCP] came in and asked us to calm down, not to talk to anyone, to close the doors on ourselves and ponder what to do.

Linda: What did you do?

Atef: We agreed to release new editions of all available [translations] of Naguib Mahfouz’s oeuvre with new covers where we could flag that he is a Nobel Prize winner.

Linda: Was your strategy to do the marketing through the Nobel Prize?

Atef: Yes, to take advantage of the event and market Naguib Mahfouz’s works [through the Prize]. We reprinted his works quickly because the cultural, political and security environment in Egypt was stable at that time. We could very easily print 2,000 books and sell them immediately. (my translation)
5.2.3 The rise of new agents in the field

This post-Nobel phase constituted, as Allen (2003, p.3) puts it, ‘some kind of heyday’ in the publication of modern Arabic literature in general and Arabic fiction in particular. International anthologies and mainstream literary journals in the Anglophone world started publishing and reviewing English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction. In the United States, small publishers, such as Interlink (through its *Interlink World Fiction* and *Emerging Voices Series*), as well as several university presses and programmes, started to publish series dedicated to translations of modern Arabic fiction. The efforts of various university presses such as the University of Texas Press (through its *Modern Middle East Literatures in Translation Series*), University of Arkansas Press, Columbia University Press (through its partnership with PROTA—see section 4.4.7), Syracuse University Press (through its *Middle East Literature in Translation Series*), University of California Press (through its *Literature of the Middle East Series*) and University of Minnesota Press (through its *Emergent Literatures Series*) increased the circulation of modern Arabic fiction translations into English. These initiatives indeed played a pivotal role in disseminating modern Arabic fiction in the Anglophone world by bringing ‘Arab writers with a high reputation in their countries to international attention’ (Clark, 2000, p.12).

It is worth noting that some American universities established Arabic translation and Middle Eastern studies programmes and professorships because of socio-political events that fell outside the academic and literary fields. A pertinent example is the King Fahd Centre for Middle East and Islamic Studies at the University of Arkansas. In 1991, Bill Clinton, the Governor of Arkansas at the time, petitioned the Saudis through the Saudi ambassador to the United States at the time, Prince Bandar bin Sultan, to pay for a centre of Middle Eastern studies at the University of Arkansas (Walsh, 2003). Kaiser and Ottaway (2002) state that there was no response from the Saudis for nearly a year. However, in November 1992, in a congratulatory call from King Fahd to Clinton upon his election as president of the United States, the former advised the latter that ‘the Saudi government had decided to give $20 million to fund the Middle East studies programme’ (Kaiser and Ottaway, 2002). An initial $2 million was gifted in the same year by the Saudi government to the University of Arkansas to initiate an Arabic literary translation programme (Park, 2006; University of Arkansas, no date). The establishment of the King Fahd Centre for Middle East Studies followed in 1994,

---

8 Most of the translations published by Interlink were supported by the Project for the Translation of Arabic (PROTA) (see section 4.4.7).
when a larger endowment of $18 million was gifted from the Saudis, then the largest gift in the history of the University of Arkansas (Park, 2006; University of Arkansas, no date). Kaiser and Ottaway (2002) argue that the Saudis approved the funds as part of their strategy to use ‘their money to make new American friends or reward old ones’. That is, the Saudis’ political strategy was to maintain good relationship with the United States and initiate a rapport with its then-newly elected president, which had an impact on the volume of activity in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. This demonstrates the isomorphic relationship and structural homology between the field of politics and the field of fiction translation and how the latter is always affected by events in the former. From 1995 to 2005, for instance, the University of Arkansas Press published eleven translations of modern Arabic works of fiction into English (see Appendix A). The University of Arkansas also funded the publication of several other Arabic literary books in English translation through its Arabic Translation Award. It is noteworthy that the award is currently administered by Syracuse University Press, the University of Arkansas Press and the King Fahd Centre for Middle East Studies at the University of Arkansas (Tresilian, 2015). Since 2008, all winning translations of the Arabic Translation Award have been published by Syracuse University Press as part of its Middle Eastern Literature in Translation Series (see Appendix A).

In the United Kingdom, several niche independent publishers emerged and began working with the London-based Saqi and Quartet Books to produce a significant number of translations featuring modern Arabic fiction writers from most parts of the Arab world during this phase. Among those publishers were Garnet Publishing and its academic imprint Ithaca. These small publishers, all of which are ‘owned by people from the Arab world’ (Clark, 2000, p.12), have allowed the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation to maintain some degree of autonomy and, consequently, to attain its present degree of recognition in the Anglophone world. They have also played an invaluable role in keeping the repertoire of translated modern Arabic fiction alive by making it accessible to Anglophone audiences.

In the Arab world, the General Egyptian Book Organisation (GEBO), which initiated its Contemporary Arabic Literature Series in the previous phase (see section 4.4.6.1), expanded its English translation production as well. Other Arab countries started either producing or subsidising the translation of modern Arabic fictional works into English. For instance, the Jordanian Dar Al-Hilal for Translation and Publishing published a few translations which
were mainly subsidised by the Jordanian Ministry of Culture (see Appendix A for the details thereof). Moreover, Arab diaspora intellectuals in the Anglophone world started expanding the boundaries of the field. For example, in Canada, York Press, which was founded in 1974 by the late Saad Elkhadem (Dahab, 2010, p.18), who was an Egyptian-Canadian professor at the University of Calgary and had published a few translation of modern Arabic fiction prior to 1988, implemented a more systematic and consistent approach to publishing English translations of, and critical studies on, modern Arabic works of fiction through the press’s *Arabic Literature and Scholarship Series*. All of these translation activities contributed to legitimising the field and expanding its boundaries.

### 5.2.4 Projects and initiatives

In 1998, a landmark initiative was introduced, its mission being to serve as a ‘vehicle for intercultural dialogue and exchange’ between the Arab and Anglophone worlds and to give Arabic literature ‘its rightful place in the canon of world literature’ (Peterson, 2013). The initiative was in the form of a magazine titled *Banipal: Magazine for Modern Arabic Literature*. *Banipal* comprises translations of short stories, excerpts from novels and poems, as well as other Arabic literature-related material and news. It now publishes three issues a year, each of them focusing on a particular country or theme. *Banipal* currently occupies a central position in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, ‘being the only magazine which has systematically kept a finger on the pulse of the literary life of an entire region for over a decade’ (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.22). It is noteworthy that *Banipal* expanded its volume of activity in the field during the next phase. For instance, in 2004, it established Banipal Books, an imprint that aims to publish ‘in book form works by contemporary Arab authors’ (*Banipal*, no datea). Banipal Books published its first publications in 2005. These were *Sardines and Oranges*, a collection of short stories from across the Arab world, and *An Iraqi in Paris*, an autobiographical novel by Samuel Shimon, one of the founders of *Banipal*. Since then, Banipal Books has published another two books featuring translations of modern Arabic fiction into English (see Appendix A for the details thereof). Although criticism has been levelled against the uneven quality of their translations (see Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.23) since their inception, both *Banipal* and Banipal Books have played an important role in expanding the audience for various genres within the modern Arabic literary tradition in general and modern Arabic fiction in particular.
The 1990s also witnessed the foundation of another important initiative, the *Mémoires de la Méditerranée* project, a European project which expanded the field’s volume of activities and its participating agents (for full details on the project and its contribution to the field, see Beugen and Parilla, 2000, passim; Rooke, 2004, pp.40–50). The project, which aimed to ‘multiply the volume of translation from Arabic into European languages’ (Faiq, 2004, vii), was set up in 1994 by two leading translators from Arabic, Yves-Gonzalez Quijano, who translates into French, and Hartmut Fähndrich, who translates into German (Rooke, 2004, p.47). Both Quijano and Fähndrich initiated a network of translators, each representing a different European language (Rooke, 2004, p.47). The task of this group was to engage in ‘building interest in contemporary Arabic literature in their different national literary communities’ through the translation of autobiographical novels and memoirs (Rooke, 2004, p.47; *Banipal*, no dateb; Allen, 2003, p.4). The group comprised nine translators, who were responsible for selecting texts for translation (Allen, 2003, p.4). The European Cultural Foundation in Amsterdam, which funded the project, incentivised publishers by providing financial support towards translation and production costs (Rooke, 2004, p.47; *Banipal*, no dateb). The project’s translation process was unique in that once a book had been identified, all translators would work simultaneously and closely with one another on translating it into their respective language, in cooperation with its author (Allen, 2003, p.4; *Banipal*, no dateb). All translations in different languages would then appear more or less concurrently in European literary markets (Rooke, 2004, p.48). Although the project was discontinued due to lack of funds (Ettobi, 2008, p.22; Allen, 2011, p.14), it helped to expand the repertoire of available translations of modern Arabic literature and fiction, and introduced new authors to European readers (for a list of translations produced under the auspices of the project, see Cañada and Comendador, 2000, pp.73–83).

5.2.5 The representation of Arab women writers

Moreover, there was increased interest in translating works by Arab women writers into English during this phase. Amireh (1996) argues that it was the positive reception of El-Saadawi’s works in the Anglophone world, and beyond, that spurred this interest. The anticipated success and potential financial gains of works representing the stereotypical oppression of Arab women appear to have motivated mainstream publishers to take part in publishing such works in English translations. Yassin-Kassab (2008) argues that Arab writers such as Radwa Ashour and Ghada Samman, ‘whose work did not fit easily into the oppressed oriental female stereotype’, were excluded from translation. This demonstrates the
emergence of positions in the field during this phase related to expected economic gains: large-scale publishers’ choice of which Arab women writers to translate appears to have been largely based on the expected economic yield of their translated works for the Anglophone readers. For instance, Doubleday took an active interest in translating the Lebanese writer Hanan Al-Shaykh’s *Misk al-Ghazāl*, a novel which depicts ‘the oppressed lives of four women in a Saudi-like desert country’ (Amireh, 1996). The novel, which appeared in 1992 in English translation as *The Land of Sand and Myrrh*, enjoyed instant commercial success in the Anglophone world (Amireh, 1996). It was hailed, as Amireh (1996) recounts, as ‘one of the year’s best books’ by *Publisher’s Weekly* and Doubleday even ‘prepared a guide to go with it and arranged for a 22-city American book tour’ for Al-Shaykh, a publicity campaign unprecedented for an Arab writer.

Enticed by the wide interest in the Anglophone market and the economic gains that could be realised, other agents, both within and outside the Anglophone world, published English translations of works by Arab women writers (see Appendix A for the details thereof). In 1994, for example, the Egyptian Ministry of Culture published a collection of short stories by Egyptian women writers as part of its *Prism Literary Series*. Several writers of these stories, argues the collection editor, Angele Samaan (1994, p.6), are ‘preoccupied with woman’s place in society, woman’s worries and the discrimination she has suffered from for so long’. In the United Kingdom, Quartet Books focused its attention solely on publishing works of fiction by Arab women through its *Arab Women Writers Series*. The series, which ran from 1994 to 1996,

> reflected on the concerns and issues permeating contemporary Arab women’s writing such as the experience of war, political conflict, the decision to be active or passive in struggles, views towards domesticity and marriage as well as the internalisation of conflict experienced within the family and the homeland. (Valassopoulos, 2007, p.5)

In an interview with the British Council (no datea), Dan Nunn, the former Editorial Manager of Garnet, states that ‘[c]ertainly the books from Garnet’s earlier Arab Women Writer’s series (...) did quite well!’. This attests to the economic capital gained by Quartet Books and the popularity of works of fiction by Arab women in English translation during this phase. During its short lifespan, the *Arab Women Writers Series* published English translations of five novels and a collection of autobiographical essays by women writers from different Arab
countries. This aided the expansion of the boundaries of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and the diversification of translations available within it as well.

**5.2.6 The drivers of interest in the field and its products**

However, interest in modern Arabic fiction in English translation, including the works of Mahfouz, began to fade soon after the Nobel Prize. Many publishers, especially corporate mainstream ones, started cutting back when they realised that the Anglophone reading public’s interest in modern Arabic fiction was a temporary phenomenon. This fact is supported by Edward Said’s (1990, p.278) ‘Embargoed Literature’, in which he emphasises that ‘Mahfouz has more or less dropped from discussion—without having provoked even the more venturesome literati into finding out which other writers in Arabic might be worth looking into’. This lack of interest continued until the beginning of the twenty-first century, although some socio-political events both in the Arab and the Anglophone worlds initiated sudden yet short-lived spikes of interest in the field, its agents and its products from Anglophone readers. Notable among these are the furore caused by Salman Rushdie’s *Satanic Verses* and how it was linked to one of the works by Mahfouz, ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā; and the Gulf War, which began in 1990 and ended in 1991. Other events include the rise of Al-Qaeda and their bombing of the World Trade Centre in New York in 1993, the assassination attempt against Mahfouz in 1994, the Oklahoma bombing in 1995 and the assassination attempt against Mubarak in Ethiopia in the same year, the heightened tensions in the Algerian Civil War from 1996 to 1997, the Lebanese Civil War and its aftermath, and the Second Palestinian Intifada of 2000 (for an in-depth discussion on the effect of the socio-political tensions in Lebanon and Palestine on the activity in the field of Arabic literature (and fiction) translation into English, see Salem, 2000–2001, passim). A number of these events and their impact on the field are discussed below.

Following the publication of Rushdie’s *Satanic Verses*, Khomeini, an Iranian religious leader, charged him with blasphemy and issued a *fatwa* (decree) on 14 February 1989 calling for his execution (Netton, 1996, p.20). Two months later, Omar Abdel-Rahman, also known as The Blind Sheikh, who is serving a life sentence in the United States for plotting the 1993 attack on the World Trade Centre, followed Khomeini’s lead and issued a similar *fatwa* against Mahfouz, arguing that if he had been punished for writing ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā, a scathing/controversial allegory of religion and politics that depicts God and Prophets (see Chapter 6), Rushdie would not have dared to write his blasphemies (Booth, 1990, pp.23–24;

There was a brief spurt of interest in the United States in Mr. Mahfouz’s books, after he won the Nobel Prize, and his defence of Mr. Rushdie has triggered new interest in the Egyptian author. Norman Ware, a vice president of Three Continents, said that the house went back yesterday for a new printing of ‘The Children of Gebelawi,’ and is getting lots of orders for each of the other Mahfouz titles.

Following Abdel-Rahman’s fatwa, a failed assassination attempt against Mahfouz’s took place in 1994, which nearly killed him (see Saad, 2015 for an in-depth account of the incident). This also seems to have led to a renewed interest in Mahfouz and his works, especially the translation of his ‘Awlād Hāratinā, i.e. Children of Gebelawi. For instance, in a letter from Stewart to Herdeck (3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, 21 October 1994) following the assassination attempt against Mahfouz’s, the former asks the latter: ‘Are you ready to meet a sudden demand?’ In his response, Herdeck informs Stewart that 3CP is ‘just about out-of-stock on Children of Gebelawi, and will reprint it in December’ (Herdeck to Stewart, 3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, 2 November 1994). This demonstrates how the field was affected by external socio-political events outside the realm of the literary social space.

It was in 1990 that Iraqi troops invaded Kuwait, leading to the Gulf War in 1991. The war witnessed the participation of Anglo-American troops. This appears to have created a growing interest in the Arab culture, which in turn generated more interest in modern Arabic fiction in translation, especially the works of Mahfouz, among the Anglophone public. For example, Fein (1992, p.D8) writes:

Doubleday, for one, benefited from the Gulf war. (...) The focus on the Middle East also brought attention to a Doubleday hardcover author, Naguib Mahfouz of Egypt, a Nobel laureate in literature who wrote ‘The Cairo Trilogy’. ‘We had the right books at the right time,’ said Stephen Rubin, Doubleday’s president and publisher. ‘Sometimes, it’s just dumb luck’.

The attention given to Mahfouz in translation subsequent to the Nobel Prize meant excluding other Arab writers from translation if they did not conform to his writing style (on this point, see for instance, Aboul-Ela, 2001, p.42). Following the Gulf War, there was growing interest in the Anglophone world and the West in the Arab World. A number of
translation projects sought to challenge this emerging canon and raise awareness that there is more in Arabic literature and fiction than Mahfouz. Notable among these was the Border Lines Project\(^9\) founded by Professor Lawrence Venuti of Temple University in the United States. The project solicited the translation of two novellas by an experimental and ‘unfamiliar’ (Mehrez, 1995, viii) fiction writer, Abdel-Hakim Qasem. These novellas were published in 1995 because Venuti felt the need to show the Anglophone and Western worlds ‘that there was a diversity of voices in the Arab world’ and that there was more than Mahfouz in modern Arabic fiction (Venuti, pers. comm., 2014).\(^10\) Such initiatives challenged the prevailing doxa in the field and helped to diversify its activity and products. They have also given rise to new positions in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation related to translating non-canonised fiction writers in order to challenge the primacy of Mahfouz in translation trend (see section 5.3.4).

With the rise of such initiatives, the field witnessed a change in its modes of production, which were largely driven by the emergence of new autonomous and semi-autonomous positions. The appearance of Arab authors other than Mahfouz and their positive reception in translation dictated the restructuring and expansion of the field’s boundaries and pressured Mahfouz’s publishers to change their practices and position-takings, i.e. their selection and publication strategies. In 1996, for instance, in response to the rise of the semi-autonomous positions in the field, the AUCP ‘made a conscious decision to expand the programme of Arabic literature in translation beyond Naguib Mahfouz’ by establishing its Naguib Mahfouz Medal for Literature (NMML) (Linz, 2011, my emphasis). It was Johnson-Davies who suggested the idea to Mark Linz, Director of the AUCP at the time, and convinced him that the AUCP’s publications ‘would gain prestige and a boost in sales if they instituted a literary prize bearing Naguib Mahfouz’s name’ (Johnson-Davies, 2011, p.7). In the inaugural speech of the award, Linz outlined its twofold objectives:

> ‘recognise an outstanding contribution to Arabic writing’ and to confirm ‘the AUC Press continuing and expanding commitment to bring the best Arabic literature to the attention of the widest possible English language audience throughout the Middle East, Europe and North America’. (Mehrez, 2002; Mehrez, 2008, p.43; my italics)

\(^9\) The project was stalled in mid-1990s due to lack of funds, among other reasons.
\(^10\) Personal communication with Professor Venuti on 5 June 2014 as part of the 2014 Nida School of Translation Studies.
The use of Mahfouz’s name legitimised the award and endowed symbolic honorarium on both its recipients and the AUCP. Described by Neil Hewison, the AUCP’s Associate Director, as ‘the spearhead of our translation programme’ (Yassin-Kassab, 2008), the award further allowed the AUCP to dominate the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. The AUCP became the field’s main gatekeeper and secured financial gains as a result. It could be said that by establishing the award, the AUCP engaged in an act of symbolic violence, in the Bourdieusian sense, in which it leveraged the capital invested in Mahfouz’s name to expand its sales and undermine other agents in the field. It is noteworthy that there has been heated debates surrounding the award since its establishment. Moreover, its launch ‘dovetailed with anti-American sentiments [in the Arab World] that were accentuated by the American-led war against Iraq and the US’s unwavering support for Israel’ (Mehrez, 2008, p.46). This had an impact on the award’s reception and the AUC (and its press), which was, and still is, perceived by some as an American institution with a political and intelligence agenda to serve the American regime and its interests (Al-Bahrawi, 2005, pp.268–278; for a full account of the award’s history and the debates therein, see Mehrez, 2008, pp.43–57).

Among the other socio-political factors that impacted the volume of activity in the field is the World Trade Centre bombing of 1993 and the Oklahoma bombing of 1995 in the United States. Although the latter was not done by Arabs, it seems to have elicited an interest in modern Arabic literature and fiction in translation, ‘especially in the early days when most everyone believed it was the “Arabs” who had done the evil deed’ (Herdeck to Stewart, 3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, 31 May 1995). The bombing of the World Trade Centre appears to have renewed the American reading public’s interest in Arab culture (on this point, see the 1993 exchanges between Stewart and Herdeck, 3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart). Reading Arabic literature in English translation seemed an appropriate way to learn about the Arab world, which in turn dictated the availability of modern Arabic works of fiction translated into English. Although these were external factors related to political events in the United States, they were directly associated with the Arab culture, which increased the demand for translated Arabic literature and fiction and hence affected the volume of activity in the field and expanded its boundaries.

5.2.7 The characteristics of the field: The post-Nobel phase (1988–2001)

The field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation enjoyed increased international visibility following the award of the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1988 to Naguib Mahfouz (see
This event marked a notable shift from earlier phases in terms of the numbers of reprints and translations published, reviews written and literary events organised on translated modern Arabic fiction.

1- The proclivity to invoke the legacy of *Arabian Nights* extended into this phase, despite Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize in 1988. Allen (2000, p.97) argues that this tendency was given additional impetus by the unfortunate translation of the second volume [of Mahfouz’s trilogy] as Palace of Desire [sic] (a dutifully accurate translation of the Cairo street name, Qasr al-Shawq).

Allen reveals how his university colleagues always started reading Mahfouz’s trilogy with the second part and not the first. He states that his colleagues’ uniform response has always been: because its title, *Palace of Desire*, ‘is the most attractive’. Allen explains that this perhaps means that this exotic/carnal title ‘best matched their pre-conceptions’ about the Arab world and culture (Allen, 2000, p.97). Another example of the evocation of *Arabian Nights* is the title of other translations, such as the 1989 *The Modern Arabic Short Story: Shahrazad*—a title fraught with Oriental associations.

2- As a result of Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize in 1988, mainstream publishers such as Doubleday started taking interest in publishing modern Arabic fiction in English translation, primarily for the financial gains that could be realised. As a result, mainstream newspapers and literary periodicals began to review modern Arabic works of fiction and write about Arab writers more frequently (Altoma, 2005, p.18). This had a considerable positive impact on the volume of activity in the field and saw its products reaching a broader base of readers in the Anglophone world. Moreover, specialised independent publishers and university presses started to expand their activity of publishing English translations of modern Arabic fiction beyond the needs of academic courses to cater to the increasing public demand at the time.

3- Although the AUCP started taking part in the field during the previous phase, it emerged as the leading agent of modern Arabic literature and fiction in English translation during this phase. The AUCP’s role was consolidated following Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize in 1988, as they were at the time, and still are, the worldwide agent for all of his translation rights. Another factor that helped the AUCP to strengthen its

---

11 Shahrazad, also spelled Shahrizad, is the storyteller in the *Arabian Nights*. 
position in the field is that it bought the titles that were still in print in HEB’s defunct AAS in 1988 as well. In response to the emergence of a number of other publishers who sought to challenge the primacy of Mahfouz’s fiction in translation by publishing English translations of works by other Arab writers, the AUCP expanded its Mahfouz Project, turning it into one that translates modern Arabic literature more generally. It also established one of the very early Arabic fiction translation prizes, arguably to ensure its dominance and legitimacy in the field.

Graph 10

4- With the increase in the number of publishing agents in the field and the AUCP’s expanded focus beyond Mahfouz, the range of geographical representation of translated Arab authors increased as well. This diversification enabled the appearance of works of fiction writers from Arab countries such as Yemen, Algeria, Emirates and Jordan in English translation.

5- Although there was a diversification in terms of geographical representations, there was an uneven representation in terms of number of translations for each country
(on this point, see Transeuropéennes and Anna Lindh Foundation, 2012, p.13; Altoma, 2005, p.58). Various geo-political and socio-cultural events that took place in the Arab and Anglophone worlds during this phase impacted the translation output in the field. Whereas Egyptian predominance continued, the socio-political unrest in countries such as Palestine and Lebanon ensured that works of fiction from these countries would be featured more in English translations than those from other Arab countries (see Graph 11). The number of English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction from Palestine grew from 11 in the previous phase to 22 in this one. Similarly, English translations of Lebanese works of fiction grew from seven to 19.

Graph 11

6- Significantly, there was a rise in the number of English translations of autobiographical and documentary novels by writers from Arab countries with conflict/war, such as Palestine, Lebanon and Iraq, during this phase (see Appendix A). Most of these memoirs and autobiographies were translated and read more as exposés than as literary works. Commenting on the translations of the autobiographical works of Al-Hakim and Hussein, Tresilian (2015) states that they
‘were often read as sociological reports on life in Egypt or as works providing ethnographic details of picturesque manners and customs’.

7- There was a gradual and considerable increase in the number of English translations of works by Arabic women writers (see Graph 12). There were also a number of literary series dedicated to publishing translated works written only by women, such as the Arab Women Writers Series published by Garnet. However, Amireh (1996) argues that works of fiction by Arab women writers published in English translation during this phase were primarily read in the Anglophone world ‘as sociological and anthropological texts that “reflect” the reality of Islam and the Arab world and “lift the veil” from what one reviewer called the “unimaginable world of Arab women”’.

To illustrate, Fadia Faqir, editor of the now defunct Arab Women Writers Series, ends all introductions to translations of novels in the series by promising the Anglophone readers that by reading these novels ‘you will see the variant, colourful and resilient writings of Arab women, the fresh inner garden. You can hear the clear voices of Arab women singing their survival’ (see, for instance, Faqir, 1995, x; 1996, ix). On the back covers of Hanan Al-Shaykh’s The Story of Zahra, we read that the novel ‘has lifted the corner of a dark curtain’ for Anglophone readers. Similarly, on the back cover of her Women of Sand and Myrrh, we read that ‘little is known of what life is like for contemporary Arab women living in the Middle East’ and are promised a glimpse onto this ‘still-closed society’. A last example can be drawn from Peter Clark’s (1998, p.3) introduction to Ulfat Idilbi’s Grandfather’s Tales, in which he states that the novel ‘introduces Western readers to new angles and perspectives on the history [of women] of regions [in the Arab world] that are often overlooked’.

8- Translator’s work became more recognised, and their task of finding publisher less arduous during this phase. For example, in an interview with Alkhawaja (2014, Vol. 2, p.113), El-Enany reveals how following the Nobel Prize in 1988, his royalties for the translation of Mahfouz’s Respected Sir ‘increased sharply’, which attests to the increase in status for translators during this phase. There was also an increase in the number of women translators during this phase.
Altoma (1996, 2000, 2005) identifies three phases in the history of translating modern Arabic fiction into English. This study argues for a fourth phase referred to as the post-9/11 phase. Identifying this period as a new phase is justified by the fact that following the 9/11 events and their aftermath, there was a sharp and a relatively steady rise in the volume of activity in translating modern Arabic fiction on the part of the publishers and an increased interest in translated modern Arabic fiction on the part of readers. This is supported by the fact that in the years subsequent to the start of the so-called war on terror (WoT), the number of English translations of modern Arabic fiction reached some (and in some instances more than) 30 translations per year (see Graph 13). By way of illustration, there were 22 translations in 2005, 18 in 2006, 27 in 2007, 32 in 2008, 28 in 2009, 26 in 2010, 27 in 2011, 30 in 2012, 19 in 2013 and 36 in 2014 (see appended Appendix A for the details thereof).

While it is indubitable that 9/11 was a tragic event, the incident and its repercussions appear to have reignited interest in modern Arabic fiction translated into English, primarily by readers ‘seeking answers to burning questions about the Arab culture, rather than appreciating the novels as art for art’s sake’ (Shalal-Esa, 2002). Mark Linz, the AUCP Director at the time of the 9/11 attacks, concurs with this view and notes that while the enormous

5.3 The post-9/11 phase (2001–2014)
increase in interest was ‘for perhaps the wrong reasons’, it resulted in the press publishing, and selling, more titles (British Council, no dateb).

Graph 13

The events of 9/11 and its aftermath seem to have drawn a widespread attention from the Anglophone world to the Arab world and its literature not seen since Mahfouz’s 1998 Nobel Prize. This period is described by Humphrey Davies, one of the leading translators in the field, in an interview with Qualey (2009) as a ‘kind of a fecund period in Arabic literature’. In a similar vein, Ismail (2015, p.916) states that ‘there has been greater interest’ after 9/11 in English translations of modern Arabic literature, which readers believed would help them to better understand ‘the Arab–Muslim world’. This phase was characterised by a significant shift in the field ‘reflected in everything from Arabic provision and uptake at universities to a growing interest in and consumption of Arabic cultural product’ (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.18). Sharing this view is the AUCP’s Hewison, who states to Yassin-Kassab (2008) that

people are looking to read more from the Arab world since 9/11 and the invasion of Iraq, for both the right and the wrong reasons. We don’t pander in any particular direction to that increased audience, we’re just glad that more people are picking up our books. (my italics)
These statements provide further justification for identifying this period as a new phase. The impact 9/11 had on the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation is also echoed in Davies’s response to Qualey’s (2009) question about whether the renewed interest in the field began in 2001. He states:

That probably is the biggest thing. It has had an effect. The Middle East is always in our screens, if not in our faces. People do want to understand more, how does that part of the world tick? One would like, as any intelligent person, to know what people are thinking. When you learn it through literature, you sometimes get a much more intimate, a way more real sense of what the person’s world is like. (Qualey, 2009, my italics)

5.3.1 The AUCP’s exploitation of Mahfouz’s name

Significantly, in December 2001, just a few months after 9/11, the AUCP launched its Naguib Mahfouz Fund for Translation to encourage and support ‘the Press’s growing program of translations and worldwide distribution of the best of modern Arabic fiction’ (AUCP, 2014b, my italics). It is noteworthy that the fund was set up in the early 1990s (Agamieh, 1991, p.368; Association of American University Presses, 1994, p.27) but was not officially launched ‘due to lack of funds’ (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.52). Hewison reveals to Büchler and Guthrie (2011a, p.52) that ‘some of the start-up money came from Mahfouz himself (either from his Nobel prize [sic] winnings or his book sales income) and an appeal for more funds went out’. The reasons behind the AUCP’s Naguib Mahfouz Fund can be understood from three perspectives. The first is Love’s (1989, p.21) arguments in his Mahfouz Project proposal that Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize ‘would surely help university fund raising’. The second is El-Hoteiby statements to Alkhawaja (2014, Vol. 2, p.39) in reference to the AUCP’s marketing strategies following the Nobel Prize in 1988, which concentrate on ‘tak[ing] advantage of the event’ to market their translations. The third is Johnson-Davies’s (2011, p.7) suggestion to Linz in 1995 that establishing a prize in Mahfouz’s name ‘would gain [the AUCP] prestige and a boost in sales’.

Based on these statements, it could be argued that the AUCP once again made use of Mahfouz’s name to legitimise itself, its funding plan and to entice sponsors to take part in financially backing its publishing programme. The timing of initiating the fund is also telling because Arabs and their governments, who wanted to counter the negative images portrayed in the West, were arguably very likely to contribute to the fund, especially because it bore Mahfouz’s name, a Muslim/Arab Nobel Prize winner who had suffered a similar attack on his life plotted by religious fanatics. Put differently, one could infer from
the above that the AUCP ‘exploited’ Mahfouz’s name and the events of 9/11 for its benefit; by establishing the fund, the AUCP consolidated its position and continued to dominate the market in the field. Moreover, by projecting the idea that the press only publishes the best modern Arabic fiction in translation, it could be argued that the AUCP engaged in an act of symbolic violence, discrediting modern Arabic fiction translations published by other agents in the field. Bourdieu (1998a, p.21) avers that to classify is to ordinate and to render the classifier ‘legitimately licensed to dominate’ their field of cultural production. The AUCP’s position-taking could be said to be a strategy to dominate the field and to maximise its symbolic and economic capital.

Utilising the capital endowed in Mahfouz’s name as a marketing strategy was continued by the AUCP beyond the fund. In 2001, for instance, the press published *The Complete Mahfouz Library*, a boxed collection to celebrate Mahfouz’s 90th birthday. The collection comprised 20 volumes, including 19 novels and a collection of short stories. In 2006, the year when Mahfouz died, the AUCP expanded the collection to 25, branding it ‘The ultimate collection of Nobel laureate Naguib Mahfouz’s works in English’ (AUCP, 2007–2008). The collection included 22 novels and three short story collections. Describing it as ‘a very special publishing event’, the AUCP also published in 2011 *The Naguib Mahfouz Centennial Library* to commemorate Mahfouz’s birth centenary (AUCP, 2014c). This collection was labelled ‘The definitive collection of the translated works of Egypt’s greatest writer’ and contained 20 volumes comprising all Mahfouz’s novels, in addition to his autobiographical writings and three collections of short stories. The AUCP marketing strategies varied from organising exhibitions, in which translations of Mahfouz’s works into English and other languages were showcased, to holding book reading and signing events to boost sales (Linz, 2011; Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 2, p.43). This ensured the press’s continued dominance over the field through its being continually socially present, which demonstrates once again how the AUCP’s Mahfouz Project was a ‘largely commercial enterprise’ (Said, 2000, p.46), primarily focusing on increasing the press’s economic capital by making use of the symbolic capital attributed to the Arab Nobel Prize laureate’s name.

---

12 In his interview with Alkhawaja (2014, Vol. 2, p.40), El-Hoteiby states that the AUCP ‘took advantage of’ or ‘exploited’ Mahfouz’s ‘name’. In El-Hoteiby’s words, ‘استغلالنا اسمه [sic]’.
5.3.2 The rising interest in (modern) Arabic (fiction in English translation)

5.3.2.1 Stamps of approval: Literary and translation prizes

Beside the AUCP’s NMML (see section 5.2.6), which was established during the post-Nobel phase of the field, other prizes proliferated as well. These literary prizes have become an important deciding factor behind publishers’ decisions on what to translate/publish from modern Arabic fiction into English, and hence a tool to (de)legitimise authors and texts and a license to dominate the field. Notable among these are The International Prize for Arabic Fiction (IPAF), commonly referred to as the Arabic Booker prize; The Saif Ghobash–Banipal Prize for Arabic Literary Translation, administered by the British Society of Authors and the literary magazine Banipal; and the University of Arkansas Arabic Translation Award (for an account on prizes available in the field, see Tresilian, 2015). It is noteworthy that all of these awards guarantee translations for winners as well as some shortlisted works. Hanna (2006, p.50) avers that literary/translation prizes generally help to promote the position of the cultural tradition of writers who win these awards and render texts belonging to that tradition more likely to be selected for translation than texts from other traditions.

It is worth noting that there have been heated debates among prominent figures in the field regarding these prizes, who, as Mehrez (2008, p.12) reports, perceive them as ‘threats’ and tools for domination. Whether these literary prizes impose on the internal logic of the field or are actual expressions of works of literary value is not the concern of this study, however important. They have, nevertheless, become formal acts of accreditation that are capable of endowing symbolic value on winning works and increasing their sales, and are hence an ‘informant’ that literary publishers currently rely on. English’s (2005, p.164) words are pertinent here:

it is the capacity of prizes to effect rapid conversions of cultural scandal and embarrassment (what we might think of as a form of journalistic capital) not only into financial windfall (economic capital) but into cultural prestige (literary capital).

5.3.2.2 Projects and initiatives

This phase witnessed an increase in the number of universities in both the United Kingdom and the United States offering courses under the general umbrella of “Arabic literature in translation”. For instance, Rasheed El-Enany, Emeritus Professor of modern Arabic literature at the University of Exeter, avers in an interview with Alkhawaja (2014, Vol. 2, p.113) that the increased interest in Arab/Muslim culture following 9/11 is reflected in a desire to read
more Arabic literature in translation. He states that the number of ‘degree students in university departments that teach the subject [in the UK] has (...) more than doubled in the following years’, primarily as a result of the British government’s increased funds to encourage ‘the production of more Arabists’ (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 2, p.113). He further elaborates on how a provision was made by the British government
to encourage the study of the (Arabic) language by academics who worked in disciplines related to the Middle East such as the political and social sciences and who had hitherto not felt that knowledge of the language was necessary for their particular pursuits. (Alkhawaja, 2014, Vol. 2, p.113)

Moreover, organisations such as English PEN, the British Council, the British Centre of Literary Translation, and Arts Council England strove to bring Arabic literature/fiction closer to the British reading public through translation. In late 2008, English PEN launched its project The English Pen Online World Atlas with a focus on writings from the Arab world (PEN Atlas, 2008). It aimed to acquaint the Western public with the region's literature (Flood, 2009). It is noteworthy that these organisations also placed particular focus on training and developing competent Arabic–English literary translators through workshops and summer schools (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.18). Moreover, some Arab organisations started investing more in sponsoring research on Islam and Arabic in the United Kingdom, the United States and the Arab world. A pertinent example are The Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Centres.

Similarly, in the United States, Arabic has ‘become the number-one desideratum of the American government and its various agencies’ following 9/11 (Allen, 2007b, p.258). The Patriot Act of 2001, the full title of which was the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001 stressed in Section 205 the importance of having competent translators in ‘certain languages’ to meet the ‘needs of the FBI for specific translation services’ (United States Congress, 2001, p.23). Arabic became ‘a major government priority, and so there [was] a pressure to produce students to work in the government’ (Halim, 2006). The post-9/11 GI Bill, an education benefit programme, allowed United States army personnel to pursue degrees by funding their studies and providing support for language study both at American institutions and abroad. Likewise, the National Security and Education Programme (NSEP) initiated programmes for the study of Arabic and the Department of Defence became ‘yet more assertive in expressing its need for Arabic-competent citizens’ (Allen, 2007b, p.260).
Other state-funded initiatives with the aim of ‘bridging the gap’ between the Arab world and America started to emerge as well. Significant among these initiatives were the Teachers of Critical Languages Programme (TCLP) and the Youth Exchange and Study Programme (YES), both funded by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) of the American Department of State. Moreover, in 2006, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence established the STARTALK Programme to entice ‘learning, speaking, and teaching critical need foreign languages’ in the United States (STARTALK, no date). Arabic was one of the languages included in the programme. Correspondingly, some American non-governmental organisations started to initiate similar initiatives, such as the Fulbright Commission’s Foreign Languages Teaching Assistants programme (FLTA).

One could make conjectures about the relationship between the above initiatives and the NDEA of 1958 in the United States and Hayter Report of 1961 in the United Kingdom, i.e. that all of their missions were to produce ‘specific defence oriented personnel’ (Rhoton, 2010, p.291). However, contextually, this ‘growing interest has naturally necessitated the availability of Arabic literary works in English’ (Aldebyan, 2008, p.86). Reading Arabic literary texts, one would assume in English translation, was perceived as ‘a readily available means of educating an American public to interpret messages’ due to ‘their deliberate complexities’ (Allen, 2007b, p.260). This subsequently resulted in evolving and consolidating the boundaries of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. That is, despite the fact that this interest was described by Sinan Antoon as being a ‘forensic interest. For the most part it’s bad, because it’s assumed that novels and poems are going to explain September 11 to you’ (Lake, 2010). These government initiatives illustrate the influence of the field of politics on the field of translation in general and on the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation in particular. This is a manifestation of how external factors influenced and informed the dynamics of the field, its activities and products.

5.3.2.3 (Inter)national book fairs

There was also increased focus on the Arab world and its literature at international book fairs during this phase. This helped to increase the visibility and aided the promotion of the agents and products of the field of modern Arabic fiction in translation in the Western world (Linz, 2011). In 2004, for example, the Arab world was the guest of honour at the Frankfurt Book Fair (FBF) in Germany. Sessions run by The Translators Centre at the FBF in 2004 and 2005 discussed supporting the translation of modern Arabic literature and ‘highlighted the
need for funding for translations from Arabic’ (VdÜ, 2005). Similarly, in 2008, the Arab world was the market focus at the London Book Fair (LBF). Both young and established Arab literary luminaries engaged with the Anglophone public through various activities and sessions (Ba-Isa, 2008). Moreover, in 2009, Egypt was the guest of honour at the Turin Book Fair (TBF). Egyptian, as well as other Arab, writers were featured in the TBF and events were dedicated to reading the works of Mahfouz as well (Cultura Italia, 2009; RAYA, 2009). Additionally, in 2016, the Arab World was the guest of honour at the TBF, where Arabic literature was the event’s main focus (ANSA, 2015; Qualey, 2015). In the United States, the 2009 Book Expo America’s (BEA) Global Market Forum concentrated on the Arab world (Nawotka, 2009). Although the BEA focused primarily on book publishing in the Arab world, translated works by Arab authors were being marketed/sold and side events included seminars and cultural programmes about Arabic literature in translation (ECSSR, 2009; Wischenbart, 2009). For instance, as part of the BEA, the New York Public Library (NYPL) hosted an event titled New Arab Eyes on the World: Breaking Down Barriers of Fear and Prejudice, which focused on modern Arabic fiction in English translation and brought together such Arab fiction writers as Raja Alem and Muhammed Al Mur, the American translator of modern Arabic fiction Peter Theroux, and two American novelists who write about the Arab world and the Middle East (NYPL, 2009; Wolff, 2009). All the above events and literary festivals heightened the awareness of Anglophone readers of Arab culture and literature. They also aided the dissemination and expansion of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

5.3.2.4 Arabic literary festivals and translation promotion
This phase witnessed an increase in literary festivals and events in the United Kingdom, the United States and beyond which aimed to facilitate a better understanding of the Arab world and to promote Arab culture and literature. Public and private grants and subsidies played a pivotal role in this respect. An example of such as event was The Liverpool Arab Arts Festival, which included a literature component (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.41). Although the festival was set up in 1998, it first took place in 2002 and has been running annually ever since. It aims at ‘raising awareness and promoting an understanding and appreciation of Arabic culture for both Arab and non-Arab audiences in Liverpool and beyond’ (Nunes, 2012). In 2004, another event was held in the United Kingdom to promote Arabic literature in English translation to British readers through a plethora of literary activities ranging from performance readings and live discussions, Banipal Live, ‘the first-
ever tour of Arab authors in the UK’ organised by the literary magazine Banipal (Goring, 2004). Following the first tour, which took place from 29 October to 13 November 2004 and included four authors from Iraq, Lebanon and Palestine, Banipal organised its second tour in 2006 to introduce young writers from Egypt, Palestine, Lebanon and Syria to British readers through works in English translation. Similarly, Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) hosted the United Kingdom’s first festival of Palestinian literature, the Palestinian Literature Festival, in 2006 as part of the university’s larger Manchester Literature Festival (MMU, 2006). The event introduced British readers to ‘some of the finest writers in the Arabic’ speaking world (MMU, 2006; Sissay, 2006). Furthermore, in 2010, Visiting Arts Organisation and West Dean College in Sussex invited two Emirati writers to take part in its Literature LAB project, a one-week residential writers exchange which aims to ‘provide the opportunity for creative writers to work together and build relationships, taking language, heritage and practice as themes for exploration’ (Arts Council Wales, no date). As part of their visit, the Emirati writers also took part in a mini-tour organised by Banipal in cooperation with the Emirates Foundation, during which they visited the London Literature Festival, among other places (Visiting Arts, 2010). The majority of the above events were funded by the British Council and/or Arts Council England, and as Büchler and Guthrie (2011b, p.6) argue, ‘have increased the visibility of Arabic culture and literature’.

The British Council and Arts Council England collaborated on organising other events which also contributed to the expansion of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. In 2009, for instance, both organisations jointly convened a ‘landmark Arabic-English literary translation workshop in Cairo’ and backed the Beirut 39 Project (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.18). Beirut 39 was a collaborative project of the Hay Festival and Beirut World Book Capital 2009 which resulted in the publication of an anthology of modern Arabic fiction translated into English in 2010 carrying the same name (Hay Festival, 2010; Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.18). Subtitled New Writing from the Arab World, Beirut 39 was published by Bloomsbury and brought together selected works of fiction by 39 Arab authors under the age of 39 ‘from around the Arab world and the Arab Diaspora’ in English translation (Burdock, 2010; Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.18; for a complete timeline of the project, see Hay Festival, 2009).

5.3.2.5 Publishing trends and the rise of new agents in the field
The increased interest in modern Arabic fiction in translation during this phase encouraged the establishment of new publishing ventures (Tarbush, 2012). Examples of these include
Arabia Books in the United Kingdom, Bloomsbury Qatar Foundation Publishing in Qatar, Swallow Editions in the United Kingdom and Hoopoe Fiction in Egypt. Arabia Books was founded in 2008 as a joint initiative by two publishers already operating in the field, Arcadia Books and Haus Publishing, to expand their list of published titles of modern Arabic fiction (Tivnan, 2008). It could be argued that this cooperation between the two players in the field was to consolidate their positions within it, which would ensure them both more symbolic and economic capital. Barbara Schwepcke, founder of Arabia Books, was quoted by Snaije (2013) stating that the whole idea behind establishing the press ‘was to bring Arabic literature to as wide an audience as possible in the wake of 9/11 and events that divide us, in order to build bridges between cultures’. Between 2008 and 2011, the newly founded press was the distributor of, and in some instances a co-publisher with, the AUCP titles in the United Kingdom and commonwealth (Arabia Books, 2008; Snaije, 2013), which legitimised and strengthened its membership in the field. Bloomsbury Qatar Foundation Publishing (BQFP) was jointly set up in 2008 by Bloomsbury Publishing and Qatar Foundation (Eyre, 2015) and launched its publishing programme in 2010 (HBKU Press, no date). Headquartered in Doha, one of the aims BQFP was to make available ‘more Arabic literature available in translation’ (Lindsay, 2014). The press concentrated mainly on publishing translated modern Arabic fiction into English and expanded its list of publications by acquiring the titles that had been published by Aflame Books, a United Kingdom-based publisher which specialised in publishing fiction in translation but which ceased trade in 2011 (Orthofer, 2011). It is noteworthy that in 2015 the Qatar Foundation ended its partnership with Bloomsbury Publishing, changing the name of the press to Hamad bin Khalifa University Press (Eyre, 2015).

Swallow Editions was another new player that recently joined the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. Founded in the United Kingdom in 2011 by Rafik Schami, a Syrian-German writer, and run by Arabia Books and Haus Publishing (Snaije, 2011), the press claims to offer readers of modern Arabic literature worldwide a selection of works that are ‘free from tedium, oil and dictatorship’ (Schami, 2011/2016). The aim of Swallow Editions is to find emerging Arab writers and help them to get published in English translation (Snaije, 2011). Attempting to secure a distinct and recognisable position in the field, Schami (2011/2016) describes fiction translations published/commissioned by his press as unique in relation to other works existing in the field. He states that the press
will not select works of fiction for publication, whose authors aim to copy the
greats of world literature, as these imitators will always remain small and languish
in the shadow of the great works’ original creators. What the series editor is
looking for are writers who possess courageous and vivid imagination and a
fascinating voice. (Schami, 2011/2016)

Another publisher who ventured into the field during this phase was Hoopoe Fiction, an
imprint of the AUCP. Based in Cairo and founded in 2016, Hoopoe publishes works of fiction
by Arab writers whether they live at home or abroad, and whether they write in Arabic or
in other languages, as long as the events are set in or talk about the Middle East (Ermelino,
2016). Hoopoe’s books are distributed in North American through Oxford University Press,
which did not have much interest in the field at its early stages (see section 4.3.2), in Egypt
by the AUCP’s distribution network, and elsewhere through I.B. Tauris (Ermelino, 2016).

One may wonder why the AUCP, described as the leading publisher of Arabic literature,
would create an imprint. Examples of similar cases where other mainstream publishers
developed imprints could provide the answer. Bailey (2008, p.167) argues that when African
literature, which was the speciality of niche publishers in the United States, started having
a wide sales base among African-American communities in 1995, mainstream publishers
started to compete over a share and ‘created imprints to serve this expanding market’. In a
similar vein, Sullivan (2016) avers that while large-scale publishers in Australia ‘still
concentrate on sure-fire hits, they are mimicking the small publishers by creating imprints
to bring out less commercial titles’ to ensure their survival and domination in the field. The
AUCP stated in its news release of Hoopoe that the new imprint is its ‘response to the surge
in interest in new fiction writing from the Middle East’ which would allow the press ‘better
access [to] that large new market of general readers’ (Abrams, 2016; my italics). The new
imprint was also described as an attempt to divorce ‘from the heavy scholarly books that
can be found over at AUCP’ (Qualey, 2016) and to make books published by Hoopoe feel
more accessible to readers outside of academia. It could therefore be argued that given the
rise of a fiction readership with new taste in this field, primarily due to the emergence of
specialised niche publishers which challenged its prevailing doxa, the AUCP was pressured
to create Hoopoe to increase its sales base and to ensure its dominance over the market of
Arabic fiction in translation.

Establishing the new imprint could also be perceived as the AUCP’s strategy to distance itself
from academic publishing, thus ensuring the accumulation of economic capital by catering
to the large emerging market of non-academic readers. Nigel Fletcher-Jones, Director of the AUCP, was quoted by (Onwuemezi, 2016) saying that Hoopoe would ‘showcase groundbreaking literature from celebrated Arabic writers’, which would allow it and the AUCP, to ‘closely fit with contemporary reader’s [sic] desire to access a more complex mixture of novels which includes titles of wider public appeal’. To secure a distinctive and legitimate position for the new imprint, Fletcher-Jones leveraged the symbolic capital attached to the AUCP’s name, given its ‘long and extensive experience in developing the best in Arabic fiction for the global market’ (Onwuemezi, 2016), to that of Hoopoe. Similarly, punning on the name of the imprint, i.e. Hoopoe, Trevor Naylor, the current AUCP’s Sales and Marketing Director, describes it as ‘the penguin of the Middle East’ (Qualey, 2017a)—which could be understood as an attempt to draw an analogy between Hoopoe and the fiction publishing giant, Penguin Books, to leverage some of the symbolic capital attached to its name worldwide. The symbolic capital leveraged by proxy to Hoopoe could later be transformed to economic capital for both the AUCP and its imprint.

Several other publishers started taking part in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. Examples include the New York-based New Directions (2010) and the Manchester-based Comma Press (2008). This phase also witnessed the rerelease of discontinued series and the creation of new series, which demonstrate a rise of interest in the field and its stakes. For example, GEBO’s Contemporary Arabic Literature Series, which was called off in 2002 (see section 4.4.6.1), was revived through the publication of The Fulfilled Promise, a translation of Taha Hussein’s [al-Wa’d Al-Ḥaqq] by Mohammed Enani, in 2016 (Farid, 2016; Enani, 2016). Moreover, in 2017, Haus Publishing, which ventured in the field in the post-Nobel phase, established its Modern Arabic Classics Series (Qualey, 2017b). Finnegan’s List, a project run by the European Society of Authors (ESA), also started including modern Arabic works of fiction in 2012. Finnegan’s List annually invites ‘prominent writers from around the world’ to recommend three literary works each that have been overlooked in translation and encourages publishers to translate/publish them (ESA, no date). For instance, Haus Publishing started its Modern Arabic Classics Series by

---

13 A colourful bird with a history in the Islamic and ancient Egyptian traditions: ‘In the Qur’an the hoopoe is depicted as a trusted messenger, carrying messages between Solomon and the Queen of Sheba; while in ancient Egypt the hoopoe was sacred and was a symbol of the heir apparent to the throne’ (Hoopoe Fiction, no date).
publishing one of the translations included on Finnegan’s List 2012, Ascension to Death by the Syrian writer Mamdouh Azzam (Qualey, 2017b).

The increased interest in reading works of modern Arabic fiction in English translation following both 9/11 and the Arab Spring (see section 5.3.2.6) and their aftermath rejuvenated publishers’ interest in taking part in the field and its activities. The rise of niche publishers, which challenged existing translation norms, also led to the emergence of new tastes and resulted in tensions between agents occupying the autonomous and heteronomous positions in the field. This diversification helped to strengthen and transform the field’s boundaries, changed its internal logic of practice and structure, and affected the hierarchy of positions within it.

It is noteworthy that a number of publishers of English translations of modern Arabic fiction largely prioritised commercial content over literary value during this phase. That is, focus was placed on publishing translated modern Arabic works of fiction that were commercially viable in the Anglophone world. For instance, Booth (2010, p.155) recalls how following the WoT, a number of publishers asked her: ‘Haven’t you got any novels from Iraq we can publish?’ (for a similar account see Lake, 2010). Booth (2010, p.155) also remarks that when she interviewed Abdallah Hassan of the American University in Cairo Press, he revealed that fiction from ‘Iraq and Saudi Arabia are at the top of publishers’ desiderata lists’. This attests to how external socio-political factors can affect the volume of activity in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

5.3.2.6 The ‘Arab Spring’ and its aftermath

Other geo-political and socio-cultural events in the Arab world, such as what is commonly referred to as the ‘Arab Spring’ (2010), seem to have recently sparked a new surge of interest in the region and its literature and fiction. Tarbush (2012) states that political events such as 9/11 and the Arab Spring heightened the interest in modern Arabic fiction translation into English. To understand the motives behind the Arab Spring, the Anglophone reading public turned to translated Arabic literature in search of information. The uprisings in the Arab world and their aftermath have made the region the object of continual attention in the media, resulting in a ‘more specifically news-oriented’ interest in translated modern Arabic literature (Lindsey, 2013). For instance, the ongoing events in Syria led to a number of Syrian works of fiction being translated into English and made them the focus of attention (Lindsey, 2013). Examples of these works include Khaled Khalifa’s In Praise of
Hatred (2012), Samar Yazbek’s A Woman in the Crossfire: Diaries of the Syrian Revolution (2012) and Nihad Sirees’s The Silence and the Roar (2013). Despite the fact that this interest was primarily triggered by political events and the news cycle, it has a number of merits, including the ‘professionalisation of more translators, more publishers who are getting Arabic readers on board, and a general tuning-in to the fact that Arabs write books’ (Lindsey, 2013). Moreover, these mainly politically-driven mini-spikes appear to have increased the amount of translated modern Arabic fiction and continue to have an effect on the field, both internally and externally. It is perhaps quite early to assess whether these activities are ushering in a new phase in the field or not. However, because the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation has been influenced by these forces, and because they are ongoing, it is likely that the field will continue to evolve in response to such forces.

5.3.3 The characteristics of the field: The post-9/11 phase (2001–2014)

As was the case in the post-Nobel phase, the number of new translations of modern Arabic fiction into English, and especially reprints of existing works, rose rapidly and consistently during this phase in response to increasing market demand. Anglophone readers turned to literary works for answers for their questions about the Arab world and the Middle East in general. Below are the active properties that could be observed in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation during the post-9/11 phase.

1- There was a rise in what Gaber Asfour (2010, p.32) calls the ‘neo-orientalist tendency’, a new ideology that espouses a set of literary and artistic works from the Third World in general, and the Middle East in particular, abounding with denunciations and exposés of a ubiquitous vile backwardness and rampant corruption at every level, with the aim of marketing these works after translating, distributing and promoting them in the media to an unprecedented degree. (translation by Robin Moger)  

Although this study does not investigate English translations of modern Arabic fiction through the lens of a postcolonial paradigm, especially as reflected in Edward Said’s Orientalism, Asfour’s reservations cannot be discarded as irrelevant to the field’s socio-cultural characteristics during this phase. That is because there has been a certain degree of proclivity to feed the entrenched stereotypes about Arabs in the West through translations, which is reflected in which works are selected for

14 https://qisasukhra.wordpress.com/2012/09/14/is-it-really-necessary-to-translate-arabic-literature/.
translation as well as their titles, covers and introductions. A pertinent example is how Bensalem Himmich’s historical novel [٢٠١١] ‘This Andalusian’, was published in English translation in 2011 as *A Muslim Suicide*, a title fraught with stereotypical—and ideological—references.

2- Mainstream publishers continued publishing translated modern Arabic works of fiction as sociological or anthropological treatises rather than literary ones. A pertinent example is Alaa Al-Aswany’s novel [٢٠٠٤] *The Yacoubian Building* (for similar examples, see Allen, 2009, passim; Rooke, 2011, passim). The novel was hailed as a work that provided a key to understanding Arab-Islamic society and that *gave an answer to the question of what it was that made a terrorist* (Grees, 2008, my italics). Significantly, given the ethnographic topics it tackles and its having been perceived as an exposé work (Allen, 2009, p.12), the translation was published in 2004 by the AUCP, only two years after the novel’s first publication in Arabic. Following its phenomenal sales in translation, Harper Perennial, a large-scale commercial American publisher, bought the American rights to the English translation in 2006, primarily because of its guaranteed ‘widespread success’ (Boutrig, 2012, p.64), i.e. financial gains (for more discussion on the topic, see Boutrig, 2012, passim; Ismail, 2015, passim). Another example can be drawn from how medium- and large-scale publishers reprinted or published certain English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction and gave them commercially viable titles to make them appeal to a wider reader base. For instance, Elham Mansour’s novel [٢٠٠٨] *I Am You: A Novel of Lesbian Desire in the Middle East*.  

3- A corollary to the above, and because publishers prioritised commercial gains, one cannot help but notice the way the influence of geo-political and socio-cultural events on the publication of several fiction translations from Arabic carries certain ideological components. Following the 2003 invasion on Iraq, as part of the WoT, a considerable number of English translations and publications of modern Arabic works of fiction by Iraqi writers started to emerge. Publishers’ commercial interest and their prioritising of financial gains is evident not only in the number of translations published of works from Iraq (46 translations compared to only five in the previous phase) but also in the titles selected to market these translations. For
example, Mahmoud Saeed’s novel [أنا الذي رأى] (‘I am the One Who Saw’) was published in English translation in 2004 as *Saddam City*. Similarly, Alia Mamdouh’s novel [حبات النفتالين] (‘Naphthalene Balls’), which was published in English translation as *Mothballs* in 1996, was reprinted following the WoT under a different title: *Naphthalene: A Novel of Baghdad*. To demonstrate that the title was changed to include reference to Baghdad as a marketing strategy to maximise gains, on the top part of the back cover of the translation we read in uppercase letters and bold typeface: ‘A NOVEL OF BAGHDAD ... “COULDN'T BE MORE TIMELY”’ (ellipsis in original). This calls attention to how paratexts can affect a translation’s reception and how they can be used to serve an ideological purpose. Points 1–3 above bring to mind the reservations of some scholars in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, such as Tresilian (2015), who states that:

> Literary works that deal explicitly with issues of interest to western [sic] readers, among them themes emphasised in the international media such as Political Islam and the status of women in the Arab world, are often more likely to interest western [sic] publishers than those that do not.

4- The number of English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction by women writers increased considerably from previous phases (see *Graph 14*). Tresilian (2015) calls the ‘increasing recognition of work by [Arab] women authors’ in translation in recent years the ‘feminisation’ of modern Arabic literature. Among the top nine positions of the most translated authors in the history of the field, three are (co)occupied by women writers: Nawal El-Saadawi (17 translations), Hanan Al-Shaykh (eight translations) and Amina Al-Sadr (six translations) (see *Graph 15*).

5- The prevalence of the commercial model among large-scale publishers gave rise to new niche publishers, who challenged the predominant modes of selection, production and consumption. This subjected the field to new struggles between the newcomers and established agents. The rise of semi-autonomous positions in the field, represented by the newcomer niche publishers to it, led established mainstream publishing agents to change their selection, publishing and marketing strategies. This manifested in the form of setting up new imprints through which to publish less commercially viable modern Arabic works of fiction in English translation to ensure their dominance in the field.
A noticeable change in publishing trends during this phase was the increase in self-publishing; that is, authors or translators who self-published English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction. Examples of these include translations published by Xlibris Publishing, Antibookclub and Peter Lang (see Appendix A). These demonstrate the rise of new positions in the field related to the consecration of non-(or not fully) consecrated authors or translators through translation. Another change in the publishing trends of Arabic fiction translations into English was the rise of the print-on-demand model. This mode of production was introduced by some publishers, such as the University of Texas Press, arguably to reduce mass publishing risks and related financial losses.
7- The number of young translators of modern Arabic fiction into English increased during this phase, representing, as (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.77) put it, ‘a more diverse demographic in terms of race and gender’, and, one would add, age. This helped to diversify the type of modern Arabic works of fiction that are being translated into English (see also Freccero, 2013, p.246). This phase also witnessed an increase in the number of translations by women translators and the emergence of many new women translators. It is noteworthy that four women translators currently (co)occupy the top eight positions of translators with the highest number of translations published in book format\textsuperscript{15} (see Graph 16): Marilyn Booth (15 translations), Nancy Roberts (14 translations), Catherine Cobham (10 translations) and Paula Haydar (nine translations).
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8- The translations of autobiographical novels and memoirs increased during this phase (see Appendix A). These modern Arabic works of fiction were primarily read

\textsuperscript{15} These women translators produced translations of several short stories that were published in anthologies/literary magazines etc. but are not included in these statistics.
in the Anglophone world as exposé works responsible for the ‘urgent task of showing the world what is happening’ in such conflicted Arab countries as Syria and Iraq, as Beckett (2012) describes Samar Yazbek’s *A Woman in the Crossfire: Diaries of the Syrian Revolution*. He adds that thanks to Yazbek, the West ‘can read about the appalling things that go on in secret, underground places’ (Beckett, 2012).

9- There was a noticeable surge in the number of literary festivals and events in the Anglophone world related to Arab culture and literature during this phase. These events helped to promote modern Arabic fiction writers and expand the translation activity in the field. By way of illustration, the Lebanese writer Hanan Al-Shaykh reveals to Büchler and Guthrie (2011a, p.43) how her participation in a prestigious literary festival led to the manuscript of her novel *Beirut Blues* ‘getting fought over by four mainstream publishers, just because of that public appearance’. Al-Shaykh concludes that literary festivals are important, especially for not very well known or emerging Arab writers (Büchler and Guthrie, 2011a, p.43).

10- There was a similar rise in the number of literary and translation prizes in the field. Although several Arab writers perceive these prizes as ‘threats’ (Mehrez, 2008, p.12) and tools of domination insofar as they control what works of modern Arabic fiction are recognised by being translated (see Farghali, 2012), they nevertheless helped to increase the annual number of modern Arabic works of fiction translated into English. It can, however, be argued that because most of these prizes limit the definition of ‘fiction’ to novels, there was a noticeable increase in English translations of modern Arabic novels during this phase compared to other genres of fiction. That is, in contrast to the early phases of the field where translations of Arabic short stories prevailed, this phase saw translations of the modern Arabic novel leading the field (see *Graph 17*).

11- In terms of the geographical representation of published translations of modern Arabic fiction into English during this phase, writers from Egypt continued to take the lead, with 118 English translations from 2001 to 2014. It was followed by Iraq (46 translations), Lebanon (38 translations), Palestine (32 translations), and Syria, Morocco and Saudi Arabia (15 translations each). One cannot help but notice how the number of translations for certain countries increased from the previous phase. English translations of Arabic fiction writing from Iraq, for instance, went from five to 46; arguably because of the WoT and its aftermath. Similarly, English translations
of Arabic works of fiction from Morocco more than doubled from six to 15. Moreover, geographical diversification continued to expand during this phase. The field became more inclusive than ever with the appearance of translated works by authors from such Arab countries as Oman, Qatar and Eritrea (see Graph 18).

Bourdieu avers that one’s only chance to deconstruct and reconstruct a field is through having ‘a realistic knowledge of what it is’, i.e. the field’s social history and ‘what they [i.e. agents] can do to it by virtue of the position[s] they occupy in it’ (Bourdieu, 1991b, p.242). That said, the section below critically explores the positions available in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation from its genesis to the present.

Graph 16
5.3.4 The dynamics of the field (1908–2014): Positions and position-takings

Within the framework of Bourdieu’s sociology, the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation could be conceived as currently comprising a multitude of positions largely occupied by institutions, as opposed to being largely dominated by individual agents as it was when it emerged. Institutions in this context are large and small-scale publishers, governmental and ministerial bodies, as well as university presses. Accordingly, a variety of positions\(^{16}\) can be identified within this field.

1. **Positions related to different mediums and consumer markets of translation.** As for the mediums of translation, these include positions related to the different mediums of publishing translations (e.g. publishing in book format, literary magazines or online, etc.), and positions related to the communicative medium of literary and intellectual expression (e.g. using elegant or inelegant form of language, or literary or unliterary style in translation). As for positions related to consumer markets of translation, these include, for instance, translations for niche markets, translations for the masses and translations for

---

\(^{16}\) The names of some of the identified positions draw, though not exclusively, on Hanna (2006, pp.49–55). I attempt to build on the positions he identifies in the field of drama translation and adapt them for the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.
students etc. An example on the latter, for instance, include translations published in bilingual editions (see Appendix A).

2. **Positions related to the genre of the source text.** These positions include the range of fiction produced in the field and available for translation, such as the various genres (tragic, dramatic, political, historical and social, etc.) of novels, novellas and short stories. By way of illustration, although the modern Arabic fiction tradition started with the emergence of the novel in the late nineteenth century, it was the Arabic short story that first blossomed into a developed mature genre (see for instance, Jayyusi, 2008, pp.11–14). Short stories dominated the literary scene because pioneers of modern Arabic fiction were mainly a small group of avant-garde writers who were eager to explore the new Western literary genres, bridge the gap between the classical and the modern, and raise the standard of literary tastes in the Arab world (Gibb, 1962, pp.246–247). This led the early translators of modern Arabic fiction, such as Denys Johnson-Davies, to pay more attention to translating short stories than novels. Although the reasons for this could be attributed to the dominant position enjoyed by the short story in the field of modern Arabic fiction at that time, one could also argue that these reasons relate primarily to the fact that it was easier to fit translated short stories into periodicals and intellectual journals as previously explained (see section 4.3).

![Geographical Representation of Modern Arabic Fiction Translations into English](image)

3. **Positions related to the status of the source text.** These include positions related to modern Arabic works of fiction that gained great popularity in their source culture due to

---
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their controversial nature, and the like. An example of this is Naguib Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā. When the novel was first published in serial form, between 21 September and 25 of December 1959, in Al-Ahram newspaper, it caused a storm of religious commotion among many Islamic scholars, because they identified its characters with God and His Prophets, although Mahfouz did not mention them by name. Considered blasphemous, the novel was not allowed publication in a book form in Egypt, although there was no official decree banning its publication. The controversy surrounding the novel gained it a widespread popularity, not only across the Arab world but also in the literary circles worldwide, to such an extent that when the Lebanese publisher Dar Al-Adab tried to buy the rights to publish the novel in book form, they had to pay Mahfouz the highest price ever paid for a novel. This is evident in the quote below where Suhayl Idris, one of the founders of Dar Al-Adab, recollects how the novel was first published in book format in 1966:

I remember when I visited Taha Hussein in Cairo on 8/3/1967, I told him that I had just come from a visit to Naguib Mahfouz and that I had convinced him to publish his novel ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā in our [publishing] house, which he had published in a serial form in Al-Ahram and which arrayed Al-Azhar against him. For years, he has been refusing to publish it and I have been encouraging him to review his decision [but he has always declined]. Until I came to him that day, so determined to publish the novel, as long as I had the text that was published in Al-Ahram. With me was my co-brother Mr Fathi Nofal, the representative of the [publishing] house in Cairo, who rushed to lay an envelope with five thousand [Egyptian] pounds in front of Mr Mahfouz, as his author rights for the first edition of the novel. Dr Taha Hussein questioned: ‘Five thousand [Egyptian] pounds in one lump sum?’ When I confirmed this to him he said: ‘Lucky him!’ (Dar al-Adab, 2013, my translation)

17 Al-Ahram is a daily Egyptian semi-governmental newspaper.
18 Taha Hussein (b.1889–d.1973) was a distinguished writer and intellectual in twentieth century Egypt. He is celebrated as the doyen of Arabic literature (Jacquemond, 2008, p.120; see section 4.3.1).
19 Al-Azhar is an Islamic Egyptian university, long regarded as Egypt’s, and one of the Islamic world’s, top religious authorities.
On the recommendation of Denys Johnson-Davies, Philip Stewart translated Mahfouz’s novel, as part of his master’s study at Oxford in 1962,20 as Children of Gebelawi (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.42). Although Stewart’s translation was not published in book format until 1981, the example still stands as a valid illustration of how the status of a literary source text can lead to the emergence of positions in the translation field.

4. Positions related to the status of the source author. These positions are related to translating canonised and non-canonised modern Arabic fiction authors. Translation plays a central role in canon formation. The anticipated success of a canonised fiction writer’s work leads to struggle among fiction translators, because canonisation guarantees a degree of consecration and legitimacy for translatorial agents and institutions. Conscious of this fact, fiction translators and publishers, for instance, spare no capital in their endeavours to win the rights to translate a canonised fiction writer. By way of illustration, following Mahfouz’s award of the Nobel Prize in literature in 1988, there was fierce competition between mainstream publishers over securing the rights to his translations (Weatherby, 1988, p.26), primarily due to the expected symbolic and economic gains (see section 5.2.2). It could therefore be argued that Mahfouz’s position as a canonised fiction writer led to the emergence of new positions in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

Translatorial agents and institutions may, however, seek to translate non-canonised fiction writers for a number of reasons:

a. At the genesis of this field, when both consumers and translatorial agents and institutions were not fully aware of who is and who is not canonised, the selection of what to translate was largely driven by the translators themselves and had little to do with the works’ literary merit. That is, the selection was based on either the translators’ personal preferences, their awareness of a particular author’s prominence or their having a personal relationship with the author. This process resulted in a ‘sporadic and haphazard’ translation flow of modern Arabic fiction into English (Le Gassick, 1992, p.48).

b. When a particular work by a non-canonised fiction writer is seen as relevant to the needs of a large section of the target culture’s market, it lures translatorial agents

20 أولاَد حارتناً [‘Awlād Hāratinā] is, therefore, the first novel among Mahfouz’s oeuvre to have been translated into English. The first published translation, however, is of زقاق المنزَ [Zuqāq al-Midaq], translated by Trevor Le Gassick and published in 1966 as Midaq Alley.
and institutions to translate/publish it due to its anticipated success and hence economic yield. بنات الرياض [Banāt al-Riyāḍ], the first novel to be published by Rajaa Alsanea (a non-canonised figure in the Arabic literary field at the time the novel was published), is an example of this. When the novel was first published in Lebanon in 2005 by Dar Alsaqi, it caused a lot of controversy and was banned in conservative Saudi Arabia because it speaks of the love affairs of and private challenges of adult life for four upper-class Saudi women and the division between the dominant Sunni faction and the minority Shia in the country. Given the nature of novel, the cloistered lives of Saudi Arabian women and the yearning interest of Western readers to discover the intricacies of the Muslim world’s most impenetrable society, translatorial agents and institutions were fast to translate the novel, despite the source author not having been consecrated/canonised, to meet readers’ needs and for the anticipated economic gains. The novel has since enjoyed a ‘phenomenal success’ (Johnson, 2008) in translation, selling some three million copies and being translated into some 40 languages (Wagner, 2013).

c. When a new translatorial agent or institution ventures into an established field, they tend to be experimental and risk-takers; that is, they seek to translate non-canonised fiction writers to try to secure themselves a distinct and recognisable position in the field.

d. A translatorial agent or institution can also choose to translate non-canonised fiction writers to challenge an emerging translation trend, primacy of specific authors or literary canon in the target culture and the stereotypes they may present of foreign cultures. A relevant example is Venuti’s Border Lines project, which commissioned the translation of works by Abdel-Hakim Qasem, a non-canonised writer in the Anglophone world at the time, following the Gulf War to highlight other Arabic fiction writers worthy of translation beside Mahfouz (see section 5.2.6).

Moreover, a non-consecrated author may decide to either commission a translator, who is usually partially, or not fully, consecrated, or to self-translate their works of fiction to confer on themselves some degree of legitimacy in the field of fiction translation. Examples include Mohamed Saïd Raïhani’s Waiting for the Morning, which was self-published in a self-

---

21 The novel was translated into English by Marilyn Booth in 2007 as Girls of Riyadh. For an overview of the issues surrounding the translation process, see Booth (2007, 2008, passim, 2010, passim).
translation in 2013, and Adel Bishtawi’s *Times of Death and Roses* and *Traces of a Tattoo*, both of which were translated by Mohamed Khaled Bishtawi, a non-consecrated translator in the field, in 2011 and published through the self-publishing company AuthorHouse (see Appendix A).

5. **Positions related to expected gains.** The two major positions related to expected gains are translations aimed at gaining symbolic or economic capital, usually undertaken by established or large-scale publishers, and translations aimed at gaining cultural or social capital, usually undertaken by newcomer or small-scale publishers.

6. **Positions related to target market demands.** Positions along this axis can arise in response to *socio-political factors in a source text’s culture* which increase the target culture’s interest in its translation (for example, the Gulf War and the 25 of January revolution in Egypt both led to mini-booms of modern Arabic fiction translation into English). Positions can also arise in response to *socio-political events in a target culture*, which directly link to a source culture, increasing the demand for its translated literature/fiction. For instance, given the umbilical relationships among Islam, Arabic and, indeed, the Arab world, after the attacks of 9/11 the Anglophone world showed significant interest in the Arab world, its literature and its culture (see section 5.3).

7. **Positions related to the consecration of a translator.** These positions can include both consecrated and non-consecrated fiction translators. Translating the works of a non-consecrated Arabic fiction writer by a consecrated translator in the field is likely to grant that writer a degree of symbolic capital and prestige, helping them to become consecrated. A pertinent example is Marilyn Booth’s *Stories by Egyptian Women*, which is a collection of 19 short stories by eight Egyptian women writers. In an interview with Irving (2013), Booth reveals that one of the reasons for her wanting to translate these stories, which were written by women writers non-consecrated in the Anglophone world at the time, was her belief that Nawal El-Saadawi should not ‘be the only voice out there’. It could be said that Booth, a consecrated translator at the time, decided to translate the works of non-consecrated writers in the English-speaking world, both to challenge the existing canon and also to consecrate these writers in English translation.

Translations by *non-canonised* fiction translators in the field may emerge for a number of reasons:
a. A publisher may choose to opt for a not fully consecrated translator if a consecrated translator refuses to undertake the translation. A case in point is the retranslation of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā into English. Because Philip Stewart, the first translator of the novel, refused to sell his translation rights to the AUCP and Doubleday, the two publishers offered Johnson-Davies the job, but he refused as well (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.43). The translation was then offered to Peter Theroux, who was not a fully consecrated translator at that time. Consequently, he translated the novel, which was published in 1996 (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.43).

b. A medium- or large-scale publisher may choose to work with a non-consecrated translator if they wish to reduce production costs. This is possible if the publisher is aware that the non-consecrated translator has secured funding for the translation production and/or has produced a translation of a timely work that could earn them economic capital. A case in point is the translation of Tawfiq Yusuf Awwad’s novel, طواحن بيروت [Tawāḥīn Bayrūt], which was rendered into English as Death in Beirut by Leslie McLaughlin, a non-consecrated translator at the time. The book was published by HEB in its AAS in 1976, four years after its publication in Arabic. A letter from McLaughlin to Sambrook of HEB (HEB 24/7, 07 October 1974) reveals that the translator offered his translation to the publisher. It appears from the communications between McLaughlin and HEB that two reasons tempted the publisher to publish this translation by a non-consecrated translator. First, the translation was accepted by the UNESCO Collection of Representative Works Programme (McLaughlin to Sambrook, HEB 24/7, 07 October 1974, p.2), so it had existing funding. The second reason was opportune timing: the translation was produced ‘against a background noise of Israeli attacks on Lebanon’ (McLaughlin to Sambrook, HEB 24/7, 07 October 1974, p.4) and the eruption of the Lebanese civil war (McLaughlin to Currey, HEB 24/7, 09 April 1975, p.2).

c. A non-consecrated translator may have their fiction translations published with a reputable publisher because of their social capital. By way of illustration, in a letter from Johnson-Davies to Sambrook (HEB 23/8, 14 November 1977), the former vouches for Catherine Cobham, a not fully consecrated translator in the field at the time, ‘Catherine Cobham has suggested doing a volume of 3 of Yusuf Idris’s novellas. I would like to ask her to go ahead as she is a good translator’. HEB published this book in 1984 as Rings of Burnished Brass.
A newcomer publisher to the field of fiction translation is likely to commission non-consecrated translators to work for them. That is because it is more plausible for consecrated fiction translators to work with publishers with sufficient symbolic and economic capital, which ensure more legitimacy and financial gains.

A non-consecrated translator may decide to take part in the field to acquire a needed form of capital. Translations undertaken by these translators are usually self-published or published by obscure small publishers. By way of illustration, non-consecrated Arab academics and non-consecrated fiction translators themselves may undertake English translations of works of fiction by local non-consecrated writers to achieve cultural and symbolic capital in the academic field. Such translations could also lead to professional advancements for the non-consecrated translators, leading to economic capital gains as well. Translation in this context is used as a tool for accumulating capital (see Casanova, 2010, passim). It is noteworthy that these translations primarily target students and other academics in the Arab world (see Appendix A for translations published by Peter Lang or Dar Al-Hilal, for example).

A non-consecrated translator may choose to retranslate a work that had previously been translated by a consecrated translator, rendering it obsolete or inadequate to consecrate and attain distinction for themselves. An example could be drawn from the retranslation of Sonallah Ibrahim’s 

Tilka al-Rā’iḥa

Although the novella was translated in 1971 by Denys Johnson-Davies as The Smell of It, it appeared in a retranslation by Robyn Creswell, a not fully consecrated translator, in 2013 as That Smell. Creswell (2013, p.7) states that he found Johnson-Davies’s original translation too elegant and that it did not capture the purposefully ‘inelegant’ and ‘aggressively unliterary’ style of the Arabic text. Creswell (2013, p.8) adds that in Johnson-Davies’s translation,

Ibrahim’s lower-middle-class characters speak a plummy version of English and the unbroken block of the original Arabic text—a layout that fits the stream-of-consciousness narrative—is transformed into tidy paragraphs and indented dialogue.

By distinguishing his retranslation and discrediting Johnson-Davies’s, Creswell could be said to have engaged in an act of symbolic violence to not only legitimise his retranslation but to consecrate himself in the field as well.
Changes in positions and position-takings in a field are the result of the struggle among its social agents over various types of capital, which is the generative principle that conditions a field’s existence (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.232). Therefore, it is vital to note that positions in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation are in a continuous state of flux, which results in a continual rearrangement of the field’s internal structure and hierarchy. This is because these positions respond to internal and external factors, which affect both the field of fiction translation and its other interrelated fields.

5.4 Concluding remarks: Thinking things together

The aim of chapters four and five was to investigate the genesis and socio-historical trajectory of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. They also aimed to identify and evaluate the positions available within the field, the agents occupying them and their practices, as well as the socio-cultural determinants of the translation activity taking place within the field. Pierre Bourdieu’s sociological concepts, primarily field, capital, positions and position-takings, allowed us to investigate translation activities within the field as a social practice. That is, they offered us the opportunity to perceive this cultural product as a historically constituted, socially situated activity. They also enabled us to understand the internal and external determinants that informed and conditioned the formation of this intellectual field during its various phases.

By drawing on Bourdieu’s concept of field, we could situate the English translations of modern Arabic fiction within their historico-political and socio-cultural contexts. Correspondingly, by drawing on his concepts of capital, position and position-takings, we could understand agents’ practices and the dynamics of the field, which are the outcomes of the struggle between the various agents over positions and capital. Using Bourdieu’s sociological concepts enabled us to unveil the geo-political forces influencing the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation during its four different, though overlapping, phases. Although Graph 19 below shows that there is a noticeable increase in the number of English translations from modern Arabic fiction since its genesis to 2014, it also illuminates that works of fiction from certain Arab countries experienced mini-spikes in the number of translations due to geo-political reasons. The list of the most translated modern Arab fiction authors also corroborates this view (see Graph 15).
As a result of the findings of chapters four and five, English translations of modern Arabic fiction should not be perceived merely as translations but also be interpreted against the backdrop of the socio-cultural and historico-political conditions under which they were/are selected, produced and read. Although the translations of modern Arabic fiction may be thought of as literary works, it has been shown that the field of translation itself and the actual process of translating are informed and conditioned by factors that fall outside the literary field. Because the field of fiction translation is influenced by numerous such forces, and because these forces are ongoing, the field and its activities are likely to continue to evolve in response to them.

Moreover, the chapters and the bibliography presented in Appendix A, which attempted to be as exhaustive as possible in terms of covering all English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction from the field’s genesis to 2014, made it possible to accurately trace the
first translation of a modern Arabic work of fiction translated into English back to 1908. Although Altoma (2005) mentions that prior to 1947 there were very few translations of Arabic fiction, he does not provide a specific date. This means that we can now set the initial phase as being between 1908 and 1967, contrary to the earlier implied date of 1947–1967. In addition to the three phases identified by Altoma, these chapters also identified a fourth phase, the post-9/11 phase, and provided a rationale for perceiving it as such. They also highlighted the active characteristics of each phase and explained their dynamics and structure from a sociological viewpoint. The chapters also identified and critically examined all available positions in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and provide examples for each. Based on Bourdieu’s definition of a field and its indicators and characteristics (see section 3.3), it is now possible to perceive the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a field in its own right. Contrary to Bourdieu’s conception of a field as a national social space, these chapters demonstrate that the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation is a supranational field that has homologous relations with other fields that may or may not fall outside the literary field, with agents who are located in and operating from different social spaces and geographic areas.

Because these chapters investigated the socio-cultural and historico-political determinants of the larger field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, the one that follows concentrates on a case study for how these determinants manifest themselves. Because modern Arabic fiction a complex genre and the Arab world a large entity, the next chapter focuses on the retranslations of Naguib Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā. Conducting a sociological analysis of how and why Mahfouz’s works, mainly ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā, were (re)translated into English both before and after the Nobel Prize in 1988 is intended to help elucidate some of the socio-cultural and political determinants of the field of modern Arabic fiction into translated into English. Chapter six also aims to examine the interactions between and the logic underlying the practices of agents operating in the field through the case study.
CHAPTER SIX: SHOWCASING THE DETERMINANTS: 
THE (RE)TRANSLATIONS OF NAGUIB MAHFOUZ’S ‘AWLĀD ḤĀRATINĀ

6.1 Initial remarks

Chapters four and five investigated the socio-historical trajectory of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, and examined the various determinants conditioning and/or circumscribing it, its structure, its agents and the positions they occupy, as well as its products. This chapter narrows the focus of analysis to the study of the (re)translations of Naguib Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā. Drawing on Bourdieu’s concepts of field and homology, it investigates the relationship between the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation and the broader field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. It also discusses the factors that promoted the commissioning and publication of a new translation of Mahfouz’s most controversial novel, and identifies whether they correspond to contingencies in the broader field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

Through a thorough paratextual analysis, this chapter also aims to identify the types of capital that motivate agents’ practices, and to closely investigate the dynamics of interaction between them. It evaluates the struggle and/or cooperation between agents over capital, how they pursue collecting it and the way by which they attempt to consecrate themselves in the field or deconsecrate other agents, their translations and the edition of the source text they relied on in their translations. This chapter will also challenge and critique the commonly perceived idea that ‘text ageing’ is what warrants or motivates the production of retranslations, and will propose an alternative interpretation of the retranslation phenomenon, primarily by drawing on Bourdieu’s concepts of social ageing, distinction and capital.

In line with the above, the sections that follow present Naguib Mahfouz’s biography, attempt to reconstruct the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, in relation to the larger field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, and outline the content and history of the publication of his novel ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā and its English retranslations that are available, as well as their various editions.

6.2 Source text author: Naguib Mahfouz and his world

The acclaimed Egyptian writer Sonallah Ibrahim was once quoted by Kessler (1990, p.60) as saying, ‘You cannot picture Egypt without the Pyramids and neither can you conceive of Arabic literature without Naguib Mahfouz’. Perceived by some as the father of the modern
Arabic novel and the ‘grand man of Arabic letters’, Naguib Mahfouz (1911–2006) is recognised as the ‘Arab world’s leading writer of fiction’ (Allen, 1988, p.203). He was born in the Gamaliya district in the historic heart of the old Fatimid city of Cairo to a lower middle class Muslim family (Le Gassick, 1995, p.43). In 1924, he moved with his family to the new Cairo suburb of Abbasiya (Le Gassick, 1995, p.43). Mahfouz was greatly influenced by his time in Gamaliya and Abbasiya, as evidenced by his use of both locations in most of his writings.

After obtaining a BA in Philosophy from King Fuad I University (now Cairo University) in 1934 (Luebering, 2010, p.308; Le Gassick, 1995, p.44), Mahfouz was employed in an administrative position within the same university. Mahfouz’s appointment was based on a recommendation from his professor, Sheikh Mustafa Abdul-Raziq, who noticed Mahfouz’s remarkable intelligence and fondness for writing and philosophy. In 1938, Sheikh Abdul-Raziq was appointed Minister of Religious Endowments, and he chose Mahfouz to be his parliamentary secretary. In 1950, upon Mahfouz’s request, he moved to Al-Ghuri Library, near his birthplace of Gamaliya, where he served as the manager of the Ministry of Religious Endowments’ Goodwill Loan Project. Mahfouz then held several rather influential cultural positions, including Secretary to the Minister of National Guidance, Fathi Radwan; Director of Censorship in the Bureau of Art; Director of the Cinema Support Foundation; and, finally, adviser to the Minister of Culture, Tharwat Okasha (El-Noshokaty et al., 2007, p.2; Peled, 1983, p.2). In late 1971, at the age of 60, Mahfouz retired after nearly 34 years of working in government bureaucracy (Peled, 1983, p.2).

Mahfouz could not devote himself entirely to writing mainly because, as Allen (1982, p.25) explained, it is not ‘a profession by which one would earn a living in the Arab world’ (see also Peled, 1983, p.2). Nevertheless, it should be noted that Mahfouz’s fiction owes much to his career as a civil servant, as this career formed the backdrop for many of his writings (Altoma, 1990, p.131). During his career in civil service, Mahfouz wrote detective short stories and articles on philosophy and the history of ideas, among other topics, for a number of newspapers (Badawi, 1981, p.1104; Le Gassick, 1995, p.45). Notable among these was the Al-Ahram newspaper, where most of his fiction was first published in serial form and which he joined as a contributing editor after retiring from government work. It is worth noting that, by making ‘the works available to a wider public through serialisation’, the
Arabic press has played an important role in the development of modern Arabic fiction (Allen, 1982, p.25).

Mahfouz’s experience of witnessing the 1919 revolution impacted him greatly (Le Gassick, 1995, pp.43–44). He once proclaimed that ‘the one thing which most shook the security of my childhood was the 1919 revolution’ (El-Enany, 1993, p.4). It could be argued that the revolution informed part of Mahfouz’s (literary) habitus, since it features prominently in a number of his novels, including, particularly, his magnum opus: the Cairo Trilogy (Haydar and Beard, 1993, p.6; Altoma, 1993, p.161).

Mahfouz began writing fiction at the age of 17. Critics divide his literary creation into four stages with overlapping features: historical romances, realistic novels, allegorical or psychological narratives and experimental fictions (Hassan, 1990, p.357). Mahfouz’s first published work was a 1932 Arabic translation of James Baikie’s Peeps at Many Lands: Ancient Egypt (Le Gassick, 1995, p.45; Moosa, 1997, p.347). Subsequently, he published a myriad of novels, plays and collections of short stories (Luebering, 2009, p.309). In 1938, with the help of Salama Mousa, an Egyptian sociologist and a pioneer in Arab socialism who had a great influence on him, Mahfouz published his first collection of short stories, همس الجنون [Hams al-Junūn] (‘Whispers of Madness’) (Moosa, 1997, p.347). Most of Mahfouz’s early writings were historical (Badawi, 1981, p.1104), written as part of a larger unfulfilled literary project in which he sought to narrate the history of Egypt (Allen, 1982, p.56). In the early 1940s, Mahfouz turned his interest to the present and began to write about the effects of Egypt’s socio-cultural and political changes on people (Allen, 1982, p.56; Peled, 1983, p.4; Le Gassick, 1995, pp.45–46). Mahfouz engaged heavily with politics in his writings. He was once quoted as saying that politics, faith and sex ‘are the three poles around which my works revolve, and of the three, politics is by all odds the most essential’ (Hassan, 1990, p.357). He similarly noted that politics manifests in some form in all of his literary works:

In all my writing, you will find politics. You may find a story which ignores love, or any other subject, but not politics; it is the very axis of our thinking. (El-Enany, 1993, p.23)

Mahfouz reportedly stopped writing twice in his life. The first time was after the 1952 revolution, when he encountered a lack of inspiration and desire (El-Ghitani, 2006, p.136), and ceased to write for approximately five years. Although Mahfouz attributed this period to him having nothing new to present, Badawi (1981, p.1104) suggested that ‘he must have...
experienced a spiritual crisis’ responsible for him writing ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā’ (‘Children of Our Alley’). The second time Mahfouz stopped writing was in 1994, after a religious fanatic stabbed him in the neck outside his home because of his controversial novel ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā, which was regarded by fanatics to be ‘blasphemous’.

Mahfouz played an important role in the development of the modern Arabic fiction tradition, especially the novel genre. He is credited with revolutionising the Arabic fiction genre by enriching it with new trends and techniques (Al-Sherbini, 2006). As a result, Mahfouz occupies a unique and enduring place in the history of modern Arabic fiction and is considered to have transformed the course and standards of the field (Allen, 1993, pp.35–36). Allen’s views echo those of El-Enany (1993, i), who declared Mahfouz to be the Arab world’s foremost and most important Arabic fiction writer.

In 1988, Mahfouz was the first—and, thus far, the only—Arab writer to be awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature, an accomplishment that solidified his central position in the Arabic literary tradition in general and in modern Arabic fiction in particular. The Prize ‘recognised his single-minded dedication to the fostering and expansion of a tradition of modern fiction in Arabic’ (Allen, 2007a, p.111). In its citation for the Prize, the Swedish Academy of Letters stated that Mahfouz, ‘through works rich in nuance—now clear-sightedly realistic, now evocatively ambiguous—has formed an Arabian narrative art that applies to all mankind’ (Nobel Prize, 1988a). However, Mahfouz’s fame was unmatched in the Arab world even before he won the Nobel Prize. Recognised as ‘a master of fiction “by any standard”’ (Sarhan, 2002, p.3), Mahfouz was and still remains a household name, not only because of his prolific literary output and unique style, but also because many of his works were adapted into popular films as well as television and radio serials (Agamieh, 1991, p.369). Mahfouz’s literary output exceeded 45 fiction works and several other drama works (Luebering, 2010, pp.309–310; for discussions on Mahfouz’s works, see for example Allen 2007a, passim; Al-Mallah, 2009, passim). Collectively, Mahfouz’s professional history and the impact of his work add to the justification provided in section 1.4 regarding the selection of Mahfouz and his works in English (re)translation as a case study.

6.3 Naguib Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation

In their discussions about the reception of Naguib Mahfouz’s works in English translations, Agamieh (1991, passim), Altoma (1993, passim, 2005, pp.21–53) and Allen (2002, passim) divide his works into two periods: ‘before’ and ‘after’ the Nobel Prize (or 1988). Building on
these studies, this thesis conceptualises the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation as comprising two distinct phases: the pre-Nobel phase (1960–1987), the start date of which marks the publication of Mahfouz’s first English translation, and the post-Nobel phase (1988–2014), the final year of which marks the termination of the analysis in this thesis. In the following sub-sections, I attempt to sketch the important characteristics of each of these phases, especially in relation to the broader field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and its various phases (see chapters four and five). This is done in terms of the socio-political factors affecting the translation activity, agents’ practices and the overall dynamics and homology between the two fields.

6.3.1 The pre-Nobel phase (1960–1987)

The section below reconstructs the pre-Nobel phase in relation to the two sub-phases identified in the larger field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation: the initial phase (see section 4.3) and the expansion phase (see section 4.4).

6.3.1.1 The representation of Mahfouz in English translations: The initial phase

Although Mahfouz’s fiction writings were first published in Arabic as early as 1938 (see section 6.2), the bibliography compiled for this study, which is presented in Appendix B, indicates that English translations of his works began to appear only in 1960 1 (at which point Mahfouz had published 12 novels and a collection of short stories in Arabic). Mahfouz’s fiction works were marked by only a marginal presence in English translation during the initial phase of the history of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation (see section 4.3). Specifically, nine of Mahfouz’s short stories and novel/novella excerpts were published in various literary periodicals and an anthology, and a novel, *Midaq Alley*, was published in book form (see Appendix B). It could be said that the factors identified in section 4.3 concerning the lack of interest in modern Arabic fiction in the Anglophone world during this phase affected the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, which was, at that point, still being created. Given the difficulty of finding a publisher, the efforts of exponent translators in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation who aimed to reverse the dominant publishing trends at the time found expression in Mahfouz’s case. These

---

1 It is noteworthy that Johnson-Davies mentioned to Hussein (1997) that he had translated (but perhaps never published) Mahfouz’s short story “Whisper of Madness” in the 1940s. Every effort made to locate this translation has been unsuccessful. Moreover, no earlier bibliographies of Mahfouz’s works in English translation make any reference of this work, which suggests that it may never have found its way to publication. This history speaks of the haphazard state of the field when it first emerged and the difficulty of finding a publisher.
translators focused primarily on translating and publishing his short stories, despite the fact that by 1967, the end boundary of the initial phase, Mahfouz had published 18 novels/novellas and only three short story collections. This supports the argument proposed in chapter four that it was easier to publish translated short stories because they could be squeezed into literary periodicals and anthologies, etc. (see section 4.3). As was the case with the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, this resulted in the emergence of positions in the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation related to the medium and the genre of translation, which further attests to the isomorphic relationship between these two fields of cultural production.

Of the nine short stories and novel/novella excerpts by Mahfouz that were published in English translation during the initial phase, five were translated by Arabs, three were translated by anonymous translators and one was translated by Denys Johnson-Davies. The year 1966 witnessed the publication of Mahfouz’s زقاق المدق in English translation as Midaq Alley by Trevor Le Gassick. It was reported by Mahfouz, however, that neither he nor the translator gained any financial benefit from this publication because the publisher ‘cheated’ them (El-Shabrawy, 1992, p.54). As explained in section 4.3.2, other socio-political factors outside the literary field (e.g. the aftermath of the 1967 War) partially affected the activity in the field, leading the translation’s Lebanese publisher Khayats to declare bankruptcy. The novel was later republished in 1975 under the joint imprint of the American University in Cairo Press (AUCP) in Egypt, Heinemann Educational Books (HEB) in the UK and Three Continents Press (3CP) in the US.

It appears that the novel was initially translated to cater to the demands of the newly established academic courses on modern Arabic literature and area studies that emerged in the United States, following the National Defence and Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, and in the United Kingdom, following the Hayter Report of 1961 (see section 4.3.2). This conclusion is supported by Le Gassick’s answers to HEB’s Publicity Questionnaire. Specifically, in response to the question of whether or not the book was intended for the student market, Le Gassick stated:

Yes. Midaq Alley was widely used in its prior edition and a good market for it exists today and for the foreseeable future. It is useful in several areas: 1) In introductory university courses dealing with the anthropology and sociology of the modern Near East and North Africa. 2) It will be much used in the Unites States in courses, mainly undergrad, introducing a) specifically the literature of the Near East in translation.
and b) courses in Comparative Literature. 3) It will be used in Arabic language and
literature courses at all levels. (Publicity Questionnaire, HEB 17/7, no date, p.5)

Point one in the above quote upholds chapter four’s findings that modern Arabic works of
fiction were translated into English as exposé literature. That is, they were translated more
because of their sociological and anthropological significance than their literary merit. This
is further supported by Le Gassick’s response to another question in the Publicity
Questionnaire, in which he stated that *Midaq Alley* ‘offers the reader insights of remarkable
intimacy into many areas of Arab and African life today’ (Publicity Questionnaire, HEB 17/7,
no date, p.3). This indicates that there existed a homologous relationship between the field
of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and that of Mahfouz’s fiction in English
translation since the early years of its formation. What happened in the larger field of
modern Arabic fiction in English translation and its intersecting fields seemed to reciprocally
affect the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, and vice versa.

The first English retranslation of Mahfouz’s works of fiction appeared during this phase. In
1966, the same year in which Le Gassick’s version was published by Khayats, an excerpt of
the novel translated by Nissim Rejwan was published in the Tel Aviv-based magazine *New
Outlook* under the title ‘The Maim Maker’. In 1967, two retranslations of Mahfouz’s short
story ‘Zabalawi’, which was initially published in a translation by Safeya Rabie in the
Egyptian-based *Arab Review* magazine, were published. One translation was done by
Johnson-Davies, and the other by Nissim Rejwan. These retranslations attest to the
popularity of Mahfouz and his works, at least within academic circles and among specialists,
even in the early phases of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation.

6.3.1.2 The representation of Mahfouz in English translations: The expansion phase
As the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation entered its expansion phase, so
did the field of Mahfouz’s works. The number of English translations of Mahfouz’s works of
fiction into English more than doubled during this phase in comparison with the first phase,
resulting in translations of 29 short stories and novel/novella excerpts during this phase
(compared to nine during the previous one), 14 novel/novellas published in book form
(compared to one) and two collections of short stories (compared to none). Mahfouz’s
increased popularity in the Anglophone world (especially among scholarly audiences) during
this phase was also evident in the number of articles on Mahfouz and reviews of his fiction
work in English translation, which began to feature prominently in journals and magazines
(Allen, 1982, p.55; Agamieh, 1991, p.367). Likewise, Mahfouz and his works in translation became the focus of a number of theses and dissertations (Allen, 1982, p.55; Agamieh, 1991, pp.367–368). Agamieh (1991, p.367) noted that 10 articles were written on Mahfouz and/or his work in English translation in 1977 alone. The bibliography compiled for this study, though it does not include reviews or critical works on the laureate or his oeuvre, signals a similar relative leap in the number of Mahfouz translations: one novel, and five short stories and novel/novella excerpts in 1977 (see Appendix B). This unprecedented number of English translations of Mahfouz’s fiction works, though, could be said to be a coincidence, could perhaps also be attributed to Mahfouz’s ‘staunch support for Sadat’s “peace initiative” [with Israel] in 1977’ (El-Enany, 1993, p.236). This, in turn, demonstrates how socio-cultural and geo-political factors have affected not only the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, but also the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation and its expansion and development. The only other year in which the number of English translations of Mahfouz’s fiction surged was 1985, just one year following the spread of rumours that an Arab (and potentially Mahfouz in particular) would win the Nobel Prize in Literature (see section 5.2.1). 1985 was also the year in which the AUCP signed an exclusive agreement for all of Mahfouz’s works in translation, primarily as a direct result of the circulating rumours. This further attests to how external socio-cultural factors affected the volume of translation activity in the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, as it did in the case of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. This also demonstrates the extensive homology between not only these two fields, but also the field of discourse and the field of power (both political and economic).

In addition to the short stories and novel/novella excerpts published in literary periodicals and anthologies, translations of which were undertaken by Arabs and foreigners alike (see Appendix B), two short story collections appeared in English translation from 1968 to 1987. The first was a selection of Mahfouz’s short stories published in 1972 by the Egyptian Ministry of Culture and Information, the first collection of his short fiction works to have been published in English translation. This publication also marked the first participation of a governmental press in the field of Mahfouz. The press’s illusio or interest in taking part in translating and publishing Mahfouz’s work in English translation can be attributed to the large symbolic capital attached to his name. Mahfouz had won the Arabic Language Academy’s Award in 1946, the State Prizes in both 1957 and 1970 and the Collar of the Republic, Egypt’s highest accolade, in 1972 (see Altoma, 1990, p.129 and Image 7). In the
first few lines of the introductory chapter to the collection, the translator or editor, whose name(s) is anonymous, clearly mentions Mahfouz’s capital:

Not only has the name Naguib Mahfuz [sic] for long been synonymous with contemporary Arabic literature in the Arab States, but it has become a name honoured far outside them. Arab States have bestowed honorary degrees, but so also have Soviet Russia, France and Denmark. In 1970 his own country bestowed upon him its National Prize for Letters, and in March this year the State decorated him with the Collar of the Republic, the highest of its national honours. (Egyptian Ministry of Culture and Information, 1972, p.5)

The second collection of Mahfouz’s short fiction in English translation was published in 1973 and included short stories culled from a number of story collections dating all the way up to 1970 (Allen, 2004, p.4). This collection was translated by Akef Abadir and Roger Allen and published by the American-based, independent, quasi-academic publisher Bibliotheca Islamica (see section 4.4.4.1). Allen (2002, p.18) states that the short story collection included in the volume was selected for translation to showcase to Anglophone readers the latest themes on which Mahfouz had written. These included: ‘the alienation of modern man, the search for solitude, the role of religion in society, and the nature of just rule and tyranny’ (Allen, 2002, p.18), within—as it is perhaps safe to assume—the Egyptian/Arab context. Since Bibliotheca Islamica had a number of scholarly book series related to the Middle East (see section 4.4.4.1), one can infer that these stories were perhaps translated not only for the reasons stated by Allen, but also to cater to the demand for Arabic-related materials in North American universities as a result of the NDEA. Thus, this publication further demonstrates of how the field of power impacted translation activity in the field of Mahfouz. Moreover, as explained in section 4.4.4.1, Allen was a recently appointed academic at the University of Pennsylvania, and Abadir was writing his doctorate on Mahfouz (Allen, 2002, p.18). One could also interpret their undertaking the translation as a means to accumulate certain forms of capital, which they could perhaps later transform into economic capital. Nevertheless, the collection was cited and praised in the Nobel Academy’s Press Award:

Mahfouz is also an excellent short story writer. In the volume of selected stories God’s World [sic] (1973) we get a very good view of what he has achieved in this field. The artistic treatment of the existential questions is forceful and the formal solutions often striking. (Nobel Prize, 1988b)
In terms of Mahfouz’s novels/novellas published in English translation from 1968 to 1987, one was produced in 1971, one in 1977, one in 1978, one in 1979, one in 1981, one in 1984, two in 1985, two in 1986 and three in 1987. The 1971 translation was of Mahfouz’s thetright [al-Ṭariq], translated into English by Rima Najjar as The Way. The translation was undertaken as part of Najjar’s MA degree at the American University in Beirut. It is, therefore, safe to assume that the translation was done to accrue some sort of cultural capital and that it was perhaps symbolic/prestigious for the translator to position her name next to that of the Arab world’s leading fiction writer. It was not until 1977 that another translation was published. This translation, done by Roger Allen, was of Mahfouz’s المراءة [al-Marāyā], which was published as Mirrors by Bibliotheca Islamica. Perhaps this translation was done to once again supply materials deemed necessary for the Arabic courses, as with God’s World, and to further consecrate Allen’s name in the Arabic literary (translation) field.

Although the AUCP launched the Mahfouz Project in 1972 (see section 5.2.1) expressly to publish Mahfouz’s works in English translations, the press did not possess sufficiently high quality printing equipment to produce the translations itself (on the point of a lack of printing means, see Murphy, 1987, p.262). Thus, the AUCP had to cooperate with other publishers to produce joint imprints. In the case of Mahfouz, the most prominent of the AUCP’s cooperative efforts was with HEB in the UK and 3CP in the US. One of the early

**Image 7:** Title page of Naguib Mahfouz: A Selection of Short Stories.
fruitions of such cooperation was the novel *Mirāmār*, which was translated into English by Fatma Moussa-Mahmoud and revised by Maged El-Kommous and John Rodenbeck as *Miramar*. The acclaimed British novelist John Fowles bestowed symbolic capital on the translation, at least in the British market, by writing its introduction, thus earning the London-based publisher HEB certain financial gains. For instance, in an unsigned note in HEB’s archives at the University of Reading, we can read:

> John Fowles’ introduction is going to be a big selling point in the UK market at least. Suggest to put him in caps on the title page – his to put last under 3 translators/editors/revisers. Also his name should appear on the front of the cover. (HEB 14/6, 23 January 1978, emphasis in original)

The introduction was meant, to use Fowles’ own words, ‘to drum up interest’ in *Miramar* (Fowles to Currey and Sambrook, HEB 16/4, 5 February 1976; see Image 8). In the same correspondence, Fowles revealed why he believed the novel should be published in English translation:

> Despite the many adverse things I’ve now heard about Mahfouz—for sheer cattiness Cairo evidently has London beaten by several very sharp claws—it does seem to me a revealing novel in terms of what has been happening to Egypt since the war ... and therefore in that way valuable for the non-Arabist reader. (Fowles to Currey and Sambrook, HEB 16/4, 5 February 1976, ellipsis in original, my italics)

One can deduce from the above that the revelatory nature of Mahfouz’s *Miramar* concerning the conditions of contemporary Egypt at the time was one of the driving forces behind its publication in English translation. It could, therefore, be argued that, like other works of modern Arabic fiction that were published in English translation at the time, *Miramar* was published more because of its significance as a social document than its literary merit as a fiction work. This further reveals other aspects of the homology among the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, the broader field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and the field of power. It is noteworthy that although the translation does not declare at any point that Fowles helped with the editing process, several exchanges in HEB’s archives (see HEB 16/4) reveal that he was substantially involved in editing it. Allen (2002, p.19) spoke of the care given to the production of this novel (i.e.

---

2 Judging by the handwriting and the consultation of other exchanges, the writer of the note was Tony Beal, ‘the managing director’ of Heinemann (Currey, 2008, p.157).
translation, revision and editing) and stated that the rest of Mahfouz’s subsequent translations did not receive as much editorial attention as *Miramar*.

The next of Mahfouz’s novels/novellas to be published in English translation was *اﻟﻛرﻧاك* (al-Karnak), which was published in a collection translated by Saad El-Gabalawy entitled *Three Contemporary Egyptian Novels*. The volume was published by York Press in Canada (see section 5.2.3). York Press was ‘devoted to the promotion of scholarly publication’ (*The International Fiction Review*, 1979, p.107), and El-Gebalawy, who immigrated to Canada in 1968, had recently been appointed as an assistant professor in the English Department at the University of Calgary (*Passages*, 2002). It is worth noting that courses on Arabic and Middle Eastern subjects proliferated in Canada beginning in the late 1950s (on this point, see Hayter et al., 1961, p.124). The idea, as one can deduce from the example of McGill University (mentioned by Hayter et al., 1961, p.124), was to allow ‘Muslim’ staff members and students from these regions, which were fraught with numerous troubles, ‘to study their own problems with a certain detachment’. The establishment of these courses could perhaps be attributed to either the increasing flow of Arab and Middle Eastern immigrants to Canada at the time or a direct result of the NDEA in Canada’s close neighbour: the United States. Regardless of motive, the implementation of such courses impacted both the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and, as illustrated by the translation of *Al-Karnak*, the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation. It could therefore be argued that this translation was also published to cater to the demands of the newly introduced courses at Canadian universities and that El-Gabalawy undertook this translation (and many others) to earn sufficient cultural and symbolic capital to consecrate himself in his academic position. In El-Gabalawy’s obituary, we read, for example, that:

> Possibly his greatest scholarly achievement was to bring a body of Arabic literature to the English speaking world by translating classic Egyptian novels and short stories by literary giants such as the Nobel prize [sic] winning author Naguib Mahfouz. (*Passages*, 2002)

In 1981, the translation of Mahfouz’s most controversial novel, ‘*Awlād Ḥāratinā*, appeared in English translation. This translation was first rendered by Philip Stewart as part of his MA degree at Oxford in 1962, making it the first novel/novella of Mahfouz’s oeuvre to have been translated. The translation gave Mahfouz a degree of visibility among public readers. In fact, Allen (2000, p.891) argued that it ‘aroused the most interest among Western readers curious about a new and unknown writer’. In 1984, another of Mahfouz’s works, *النص والكلاب*...
[al-Liṣṣ wa-al-Kilāb], appeared in an English translation by Trevor Le Gassick and M. M. Badawi that was revised by John Rodenbeck under the title The Thief and the Dogs. It is worth noting that Adel Ata Elyas produced another translation of this novella in 1979 as part of his PhD studies at Oklahoma State University. Elyas’s version was later published in 1987, also as The Thief and the Dogs, by the Jeddah-based Dar Al-Shorouq. It is uncertain whether either of the retranslators (i.e. Le Gassick or Badawi) were aware of the initial translation when they produced theirs. While this is an interesting topic to investigate, it is not the concern of this study, which confines itself to examining the retranslations of Mahfouz’s ʿAwlād Ḥāratinā into English (rationale provided in section 1.4).

Image 8: Front cover of Mahfouz’s Miramar featuring Fowles’ name as a means to increase sales.

Two of Mahfouz’s other fiction works found their way to publication in English translation in 1985. These were [al-Sammān wa-al-Kharīf] and [Bidāyah wa-Nihāyah]. The former was published by the AUCP in a translation done by Roger Allen and revised by John Rodenbeck as Autumn Quail. The latter appeared in a translation done by Ramses Awad and edited by Mason Rossiter Smith, also in a publication by the AUCP.
Similarly, two additional works appeared in English translations in 1986. The first of these was حضرة المحترم [Haḍrat al-Muḥtaram], which was translated by Rasheed El-Enany and published by the London-based Quarter Books as Respected Sir. The translation was initially produced by El-Enany as part of his PhD studies at the University of Exeter in 1984. The second was الشحاد [al-Shahādh], which was rendered into English as The Beggar by Kristin Henry and Nariman Warraki. In 1987, another PhD thesis on Mahfouz was presented to the University of Exeter. This thesis included a translation of the first part of his Cairo Trilogy، بين القصرين [Bayna al-Qaṣrayn], by Souad Fateem. During this same year, the AUCP published another translation: a retranslation of Mahfouz’s الطريق [al-Ṭariq] into English done by Mohamed Islam and edited by Magdi Wahba. In this case, too, it is unknown whether the retranslators knew of the existence of a previous translation. Such cases speak to the haphazard state of the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation before his winning of the Nobel Prize in 1988.

It is noteworthy that some have raised concerns over the quality of the English translations of Mahfouz’s works of fiction. For example, Edward Said (1989, xi) stated that a number of Mahfouz’s ‘novels in barely serviceable translations are available in English, none of them in currency or a part of normal literacy’. It was, nevertheless, these translations and those available in other languages that supported the Swedish Academy in deciding to award Mahfouz the Nobel Prize in 1988 (see section 5.2). Following this achievement, Mahfouz, who was previously known primarily to academic specialists in Arabic-related area studies, was suddenly the focus of intense international attention. This affected not only the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, but also the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, further demonstrating their homologous relationship. Perhaps for the first time, as a direct result of Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize in 1988, mainstream publishers started to take part in the field, publishing English translations of not only Mahfouz’s works of fiction, but also those of other Arab writers.

6.3.2 The post-Nobel phase (1988–2014)

6.3.2.1 The representation of Mahfouz in English translations: The post-Nobel phase
When the Nobel Committee announced Mahfouz as the winner of the Nobel Prize in Literature 1988, the decision was greeted by many with either silence or the question, ‘Mahfouz who?’ (Hassan, 1990, p.357). However, the Prize ‘worked its dubious magic’ and thrust Mahfouz’s fame into the ‘global glare’ (Hassan, 1990, p.357), bringing his translated
work unprecedented international appeal. The symbolic capital attached to Mahfouz’s name as a Nobel laureate and the financial gains that could be realised from publishing his works in translation subjected the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation—and, indeed, the wider field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation—to intense struggles to secure the rights to relevant works. Arnold Tovell of the AUCP, to whom Mahfouz had sold all his translation rights in 1985 (see section 5.2.1), was quoted as stating, ‘I am besieged by inquiries from around the world about translating his works into foreign languages’ (The Globe and Mail, 1988). The ‘race’ to secure Mahfouz’s translation rights, as Weatherby (1988, p.26) described it, saw those publishers who had published Mahfouz in English translation and endured prior to the award being thrown outside of the ‘game’. In addition to the examples provided in section 5.2.2 of the struggles to which the Prize had exposed the field, one can also cite how the AUCP took the General Egyptian Book Organisation (GEBO), the Egyptian national publishing house, to court when they published Mahfouz’s *The Day the Leader was Killed* in English translation in 1989 ‘without buying rights’ (Agamieh, 1991, p.368). The number of translation reprints of Mahfouz boomed immediately following the award, with many publishers changing covers only to flag him as a Nobel laureate as a marketing strategy and to maximise their financial gains. Garfield (1989, p.279) stated that Mahfouz’s publishers in English translation ‘had their inventories drastically depleted by the sudden demand for his writings’ within one day of the Prize announcement. Similarly, Herdeck (1998, pp.95–96) recounted how 3CP sold what it ‘usually expected to sell in a year’ in a day and a half immediately after the Nobel. Moreover, in the years immediately following the award, Mahfouz’s works started to appear in English translations on a more or less annual basis. The symbolic act of recognition of the Nobel Prize consecrated Mahfouz’s name on a global scale, prompting larger circulation and wider reception of his works in the Anglophone world and expanding his field of cultural production. Furthermore, in addition to reaffirming his position as one of the main gatekeepers of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, the Prize also positioned Mahfouz as an informer of its structure and propeller of its dynamics. Thus, it could be argued that the Nobel strengthened the homology between these two fields of cultural production.

The American-based Doubleday was the publishing firm that managed to secure the English translation rights to many of Mahfouz’s works from the AUCP. This resulted in three main players in the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation: the AUCP, his global publisher;
Doubleday in the United States; and 3CP in the United States, which had partial or full US rights to four of Mahfouz’s works (Herdeck, 1998, p.95). In 1988, 3CP published a translation of Mahfouz’s [Ḩikāyāt Ḥāratinā] by Soad Sobhi, Essam Fattouh and James Kenneson as *Fountain and Tomb*. It is noteworthy that 3CP had signed an agreement with Mahfouz to publish this book in English translation before the award (Herdeck, 1998, p.95). Following the award, 3CP was ‘shoved aside’ from the Mahfouz-in-translation publishing scene, and its translation licenses were never renewed (Herdeck, 1988, p.95). The struggle over the stakes in the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation speak to how translation can be used as tool to either gain and/or maintain status, recognition and legitimacy and/or to obscure, exclude and delegitimise in the field of cultural production.

The modes of selection, production and circulation of the English translations of Mahfouz’s works of fiction changed drastically following the Nobel Prize. Allen (2000, p.891) stated that ‘every aspect of the process, from selection of the works for translation to the marketing of the translated texts was placed on a more organised and indeed better compensated footing’ (see also Allen, 2002, p.20). In 1989, the first part of Mahfouz’s *Cairo Trilogy* was published in English translation by William Hutchins and Olive Kenny as *Palace Walk*. This was effectively a retranslation of the 1987 publication, and there is no evidence concerning whether or not the retranslators knew of the first translation. The *Cairo Trilogy* had featured prominently in the Nobel Press Release; hence, there was an immense demand for its publication. This fame could be said to have motivated Mahfouz’s publishers to publish this particular work soon after the award to maximize potential financial gains. The Nobel Release stated that:

Mahfouz really made his name with the big Trilogy [sic] (1956–57). In the centre is a family and its vicissitudes from the end of the 1910s to the middle of the 1940s. The series of novels has autobiographical elements. The depiction of the individuals relates very clearly to intellectual, social and political conditions. (Nobel Prize, 1988b)

The other two parts of the *Trilogy* were published in English translation in 1991 and 1992, respectively. The second part of the *Trilogy* was published in a translation by William Hutchins, Lorne Kenny and Olive Kenny as *Palace of Desire*. The third volume was rendered into English by William Hutchins and Angele Samaan as *Sugar Street*. The three volumes were published under the joint imprint of the AUCP and Doubleday. Allen (2002, p.20) criticised the presentation of these translations, from the choice of titles and cover art
designs to other stylistic choices, arguing that they reinforced certain narratives about Arabs in the West. He further argued that the French translation of the trilogy was better than the English one (Allen, 2002, p.20; see also El-Enany, 1992, passim).

With respect to the question of quality, Said (1990, p.278) also raised a number of concerns, alluding to publishers’ lack of concern for quality and their desire to earn maximum economic capital at the expense of everything else:

Doubleday acquired the rights to much of his work and a few months ago began to introduce a handful of his stories and novels, including the first volume of his major work, the *Cairo Trilogy*, in what appeared to be new editions. In fact, with one exception, the translations were exactly the ones that had been available all along in England, *some quite good but most either indifferent or poor*. Clearly the idea was to capitalise on and market his new fame, but not at the cost of a retranslation. (my italics)

It is worth noting, however, that Doubleday and the AUCP did commission the retranslation of one of Mahfouz’s works due to socio-political factors during this phase. This work was ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā, published in an English retranslation in 1996 by Peter Theroux as *Children of the Alley*. This case demonstrates the homology between the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation and the field of power.

Said further expanded on his above comments in 2000, stating that:

To Arab readers Mahfouz does in fact have a distinctive voice, which displays a remarkable mastery of language yet does not call attention to itself. But in English he sounds like each of his translators, most of whom (with one or two exceptions) are not stylists and, I am sorry to say, appear not to have completely understood what he is really about. (Said, 2000, p.46)

The timing of Said’s last comment (i.e. 2000) is revealing. It insinuates that the problem of ‘mediocre’ quality started at the beginning of the Mahfouz Project (see section 5.2.1) and lasted until the end of the post-Nobel phase, during which most of Mahfouz’s fiction works were published in English translation either in book form and/or in literary periodicals, magazines and anthologies. These included the short story collection *The Time and the Place* (1991), *The Journey of Ibn Fattouma* (1992), *A Drift on the Nile* (1993), *The Harafish* (1994), *Arabian Nights and Days* (1995), *Echoes of an Autobiography* (1996) and *Akhenaton, Dweller in Truth* (1998). To maximise their profits and financial gains, Mahfouz’s publishers began publishing combined editions of his works as a remarketing strategy. These publications presented multiple novels and/or novellas as single volumes (for examples of these, see
As the bibliography presented in Appendix B indicates, from 1988 to 2000, the field of Mahfouz saw a noticeable increase in the number of foreign translators at the expense of Arab translators.

An important aspect to highlight is the rise of Mahfouz as a phenomenon not only in the Arab world, but also in other countries from which writers had not been awarded the Nobel Prize. The Mahfouz phenomenon can be summarised as follows. (1) To be successful, an Arab writer—a not fully consecrated writer in the Anglophone world—needed to be successful in relation to Mahfouz, to be compared to him in order to gain consecration and legitimacy in the field of world literature of which Mahfouz had become a member. (2) For an opinion, political view or discourse concerning the Arab and/or Islamic world to be perceived as legitimate, it needed to be attributed or linked to Mahfouz.

Below are a few examples that illustrate the Mahfouz phenomenon. Seeking to perhaps consecrate Elias Khoury and his work in the Anglophone world, Said (1989, passim) set out to associate him with Mahfouz. Similarly, to confer some degree of legitimacy to other modern Arabic fiction writers, the AUCP leveraged Mahfouz’s symbolic capital to launch its Naguib Mahfouz Medal for Literature in 1996. The Medal, as explained in section 5.2.6, guaranteed the translation of any awarded work (Mehrez, 2002), hence consecrating the work and its author and ensuring financial gains for the AUCP (since all awarded works were flagged on the cover with Mahfouz’s name). Similarly, in an attempt to consecrate the Japanese writer Haruki Murakami and his works in English translation, Hower (1998, p.261) sought to liken him to Mahfouz, among other writers:

At times his ingenious plotting and sheer originality allow him to approach the ranks of such international writers as Salman Rushdie, Gabriel Garc’a [sic] Márquez, Patrick Chamoiseau, and Naguib Mahfouz.

Furthermore, in an interview with The World and I (1991, p.64), following the invasion of Kuwait and the Gulf War, Ibrahim Oweiss, then a professor of economics at Georgetown University, attempted to legitimise his political views by relating them to Mahfouz:

There is some popular support of Saddam Hussein, but there was a complete condemnation in countries such as Egypt. Egypt has 55 million people, and all the coverage in the newspapers in particular, the opinions of Naguib Mahfouz, who is a Nobel Prize winner -- [sic] very much stood against the invasion by Iraq. Mahfouz still condemns Iraq. You don’t say that he is not a person who can actually feel the aspirations of the majority of the Arab people. (my italics)
In addition to demonstrating the Mahfouz phenomenon, the examples above also highlight the existence of a reciprocal relationship between the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation and other fields, such as the fields of politics and discourse. This homologous relationship demonstrates the global nature of his field of cultural production. Other socio-cultural and historico-political events that occurred from 1988 to 2000 in both the source (Arab) and the target (Anglophone) cultural milieus, which affected the production, dissemination and reception of the English translations of Mahfouz’s works and modern Arabic fiction in general, were discussed in section 5.2.6.

6.3.2.2 The representation of Mahfouz in English translations: The post-9/11 phase

The tragic events of 9/11 and its aftermath ushered the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation into a new phase of development. As explained in section 5.3, these events increased the visibility of English translations of modern Arabic fiction, as illustrated by the wide demand for such works in the Anglophone world. Given the homology between the field of politics and the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, and the isomorphic relation between these and Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, the events of 9/11 and its aftermath inevitably impacted the translation activity of Mahfouz’s works. During the year of the attacks, Mahfouz’s publishers issued three combined editions of his fiction works in English translation (see Appendix B). In the years that followed, six other combined works were published, arguably to maximise the publishers’ financial gains. It is argued that this publishing trend will continue and that more of Mahfouz’s works of fiction will appear in combined editions in the years to come.

Fewer English translations of Mahfouz’s short stories were published in literary periodicals and anthologies during this phase than during previous ones. The majority of works published during this phase were novels/novellas, though a couple of short story collections were also released. All but two of the translators of Mahfouz’s fiction during this phase were foreigners. The two exceptions were Aida Bamia, a Palestinian-American who translated قلب الليل [Qalb al-Layl] in 2011 as Heart of the Night, and Nora Talal Maddah, a Saudi student who partially retranslated حكايات حارتينا [Hikāyāt Ḥāratinā] in 2012 as Stories from Our Neighbourhood as part of her BA studies at Effat University, Jeddah.

The Mahfouz phenomenon and the use of Mahfouz’s name to consecrate other modern Arabic fiction writers in the Anglophone world continued during the post-9/11 phase. To add symbolic value to their cultural products (i.e. translations), several translation
(co)producers (e.g. publishers, translators, reviewers, etc.) endeavoured to draw analogies between Mahfouz and other writers they wished to consecrate. For example, in the opening line of his review of Alaa Al-Aswany’s *The Automobile Club of Egypt*, Tonkin (2016) wrote:

> In 2002, Alaa al-Aswany published *The Yacoubian Building*. Its border-crossing appeal propelled the Cairo dentist-turned-novelist into a worldwide renown unmatched by any Egyptian writer since the Nobel Prize-winning Naguib Mahfouz.

(my italics)

In 2010, the AUCP announced in a press release that it would publish the last five Mahfouz novels in English translations by 2011, which marked the centenary of Mahfouz’s birth (Qualey, 2010). The release also stated that:

> With these publications, the AUC Press will have completed the English translation of all 35 of the Nobel laureate’s novels, in addition to 7 other volumes of short stories and autobiographical and other works, in time for the centenary of his birth in December 2011. (Qualey, 2010)

By 2011, all of Mahfouz’s fiction works had appeared in English translation. The last five novels to be published were: *In the Time of Love* (2010), translated by Kay Heikkinen; *The Coffeehouse* (2010), translated by Raymond Stock; *The Final Hour* (2010), translated by Roger Allen; *Love in the Rain* (2011), translated by Nancy Roberts; and Bamia’s translation mentioned above. In discussing Mahfouz’s centenary, Mark Linz, the former Director of the AUCP was quoted by Qualey (2010) as stating that ‘Many celebrations have already...started around the country, and hopefully around the world soon’ (ellipsis in original). It could be argued that the AUCP utilised Mahfouz’s name as a marketing strategy to maximise its potential financial profits and expand its social capital by ensuring that Mahfouz—and hence the AUCP—remained visible on the (inter)national literary scene.

As part of the centenary celebrations, the AUCP also published a retranslation of Mahfouz’s [Zuqāq al-Midaqq] originally published in English translation in 1966 as *Midaq Alley*. The retranslation was also titled *Midaq Alley* and was done by Humphrey Davies. It appears that once all of Mahfouz’s fiction writings were available in English translation, the AUCP began to resort to retranslating Mahfouz’s works. Given the institutional habitus of the AUCP, which prioritises commercial gain, it is argued that the trend of retranslating Mahfouz’s works will continue in the years to come.

A number of critics have voiced concerns regarding to the quality of Mahfouz’s fiction works selected for translation and the quality of their English translations between 2000 and 2014.
These critiques echo Edward Said’s concerns regarding the quality of translations in the previous phase. For example, El-Enany, according to Tarbush (2010), stated that:

I don’t think that the entire oeuvre of Naguib Mahfouz deserves to be translated. His 35 novels are of varying quality and artistic achievement. Some of them are hardly read in Arabic now and he was the first to admit, with his usual modesty, that he had written some very negligible fiction in order to deal with an issue of the day that he felt he needed to make a statement on.

Nevertheless, El-Enany argued that, while not necessarily of great literary merit, Mahfouz’s less significant works have sparked interest and been translated due to their socio-political value (Tarbush, 2010). In the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, as in the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, it is primarily external socio-cultural and geopolitical forces that determine what gets translated (and what does not) and when. The homology between the two fields is also evident in that the criteria for selection for translation is based more on the sociological or anthropological significance of the fiction works than on their literary value.

Having sketched the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, the study will now narrow its focus to examining the retranslations of his modern controversial novel ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā. This discussion will be preceded by a brief history of the novel’s publication in Arabic.

6.4 ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā in Arabic: A historical account

‘Awlād Ḥāratinā marked a shift in Mahfouz’s focus from realism towards a combination of realism, allegory and symbolism, and it is the most controversial novel in the body of his literature (Le Gassick, 1995, p.47). When the novel was first published in serial form in Al-Ahram newspaper between 21 September and 25 December 1959, it caused a storm of religious commotion among Islamic scholars, who identified its characters with God and His Prophets, even though Mahfouz did not mention Them by name. Considered blasphemous, the novel was banned from publication in book form in Egypt, and it was not until 2006 that it was published there by the Cairene publisher Dar El Shorouk. However, following Mahfouz’s winning of the Nobel Prize in 1988 and the ensuing praise the novel received, the Egyptian national newspaper Al-Messa decided to republish the novel, again in serial form. However, Al-Messa ceased publication after the first instalment upon the request of Mahfouz, who was worried about the reactions of religious fanatics and the safety of him and his family (Ewais, 2006). Likewise, when, in 2005, the Egyptian publishing house Dar Al-
Hilal announced that it would publish the novel as part of its روايات الهلال [Riwa'yat al-Hilāl] (‘Al-Hilal Novels Series’) and advertised its proposed front cover in various newspapers (Ewais, 2006; see also Image 9), Mahfouz refused the publication, ‘indicat[ing] that for the sake of peace he would not support publication’ (Gabriel, 2001). When Mahfouz was stabbed in 1994 by religious extremists who accused him of apostasy, the independent Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahaly published the entire novel in a special edition released on 30 October 1994. All copies of the edition ‘sold out within a few hours of its hitting the street’ (Theroux, 1996, p.355). It is noteworthy that the novel was first published in Arabic in book form in 1967, by Beirut-based publisher Dar Al-Adab. Immediately following the book’s publication, Dar Al-Adab launched a publicising campaign to promote it and, arguably, to increase its financial gains (for a full history of the novel’s publication in Arabic, see Shoair, 2016).

On the surface, ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā is the chronicle over several generations of a Cairene alley and its denizens as they relate to Gebelaawi (the alley’s founder) and other heroic figures (his offspring) who emerge over the course of the alley’s history. The storyline depicts the alley residents’ lengthy battle to overcome the tyranny, injustice and corruption of the ruthless gangsters and embezzlers who run the alley’s affairs.

Substantively, however, the novel is a speculative treatise on the history of humanity from Genesis to modern times. It depicts God (Gebelawi), Iblis (Idris), science (‘Arafa) and most of the monotheistic religious figures of human history, including Adam (Adham), Moses (Gebel), Jesus (Rifaa) and Muhammad (Qasim), ‘but without the halo of religious myth: the novel is an attempt at demythologising humanity’s religious quest’ (El-Enany, 1993, p.142). Ultimately, the novel argues that, while the symbol of humanity’s hope and survival was once faith and religion, it is now science. In furtherance of this allegory, the novel is divided into five parts, alluding to the Five Books of Moses, and comprises 114 chapters (excluding the prologue), referring to the 114 Surahs (Chapters) of the Qur’an.

6.5 ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā in English: (Re)translations and editions

There are two English translations of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā. The first translation of the contentious novel, based on the serialised version published in Al-Ahram and rendered as Children of Gebelawi, was done in 1962 by Philip Stewart as part of his MA study at Oxford (Stewart, 2001, no pagination). However, Stewart’s translation, which had been undertaken on the recommendation of Denys Johnson-Davies (2006a, p.42), was not published until
1981, when it was released under the joint imprint of HEB in the United Kingdom and 3CP in the United States. After Mahfouz was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1988, his publishing agent, the AUCP, to which Mahfouz sold all his global translation rights in December 1985 (see section 5.2.1), celebrated the achievement by producing a uniform and more accessible edition of most of Mahfouz’s works (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.43). However, to prevent attempts on his life by religious fanatics, Stewart refused to sell his translation copyrights to the AUCP; thus, the AUCP decided to commission a new translation of the novel (see Stewart, 2001, passim; Aboul-Ela, 2004, pp.354–355). Johnson-Davies (2006a, p.43) was approached first, but refused. Other translators, according to Stewart (2001, no pagination), were subsequently approached but also refused to retranslate the novel. Next, the AUCP approached Peter Theroux, an American writer and translator, who accepted. In his translation, rendered as *Children of the Alley* and released in 1996, Theroux appears to have depended solely on the book version of the novel published by Dar Al-Adab (see Theroux, 2011, p.400). It is noteworthy that Theroux’s translation was meant to be published in 1993/1994, but that the publication was postponed for socio-political reasons (namely the attack on the World Trade Centre in New York City). This is evident in a letter from Stewart to Herdeck (3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, 20 May 1995), in which the former confides to the latter that Raymond Stock, Mahfouz’s biographer, told him that:

Doubleday had a big meeting to discuss the book and decided to keep it on ice. They should be worried—they must all have heard the bang from the World Trade Centre.

This excerpt speaks to how socio-cultural factors affected the production and dissemination of translations in the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation.

Between Mahfouz’s winning of the Nobel Prize in 1988 and the publication of Theroux’s retranslation in 1996, two further editions of Stewart’s translation were published: a revised edition in 1990 and a revised augmented edition in 1995. Following the publication of Theroux’s translation, and upon discovering some disparities between *Al-Ahram*’s serialised version and Dar Al-Adab’s published version of the novel, Stewart began on a new and revised edition of his first translation, focusing primarily on making it superordinate to Theroux’s (Stewart, 2001, no pagination). The updated and augmented version was published in 1997 as *Children of Gebelaawi* by the original American publishing house 3CP, which had been renamed Passeggiata Press.
Stewart’s motivation for undertaking these revisions can be discerned from two exchanges in the 3CP archives at the Harry Ransom Centre, Texas. In an undated letter from Stewart to Herdeck (3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, no date), he states:

Have you any idea what is happening in Doubleday? Tovell said he would commission someone else to do a new translation for them. I wouldn’t like theirs to come out and face no competition from mine. (my italics)

In another letter, also to Herdeck (3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, 3 June 1996), Stewart states that:

My main aim in 1981 was to make my work good enough for publication. My aim in 1991 was to make it good enough for a Nobel Prize winner. My aim this time is to make it better than any other translation and an indispensable aid to all future students of Mahfouz. (my italics)

From the first excerpt, one can see that Stewart was primarily motivated by the desire to maintain his legitimacy and distinction as the translator of the most controversial work in the field. The italicised line in the second quote reaffirms this view, but adds a possible
further motivation for the updated translation: to delegitimise the position of any other English translation, including, specifically, Theroux’s version.

The paratextual elements and textual analysis suggest that the two translators interpreted ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā differently. Whereas Stewart’s translation rendered the novel as a religious allegory—the story of the immensely long-lived patriarch Gebelaawi and his offspring, average Egyptians living the lives of Adam, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed in an imaginary Cairo alley—Theroux’s translation depicted it as a realistic representation of ordinary Egyptian people’s lives in a Cairene alley.

On the back cover of the 1981/1988 edition of Stewart’s translation, for instance, we read:

Veiled as the history of Cairo alley, this novel retells the lives of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abdel, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed and deals boldly with the modern ‘death of God’.

The above description clearly demonstrates that the translation was rendered as an allegory with religious symbolism.

By contrast, on the copyright page of both the hardbound and paperback editions of Theroux’s 1996 translation, we read:

All of the characters in this book are fictitious, and any resemblance to actual persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental. (italics in original)

One might wonder whether the translator was involved in writing this line on the copyright page. Likewise, one wonders whether his interpretation of the novel as a realistic representation of a Cairene alley was motivated by the furore surrounding ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā in the Arab world and amongst Muslims in the Anglophone world, especially after an analogy was drawn between it and Rushdie’s Satanic Verses and the assassination attempt on Mahfouz’s life in 1994.

Although the socio-cultural and historico-political contexts conditioning the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English are prioritised throughout this thesis over comparative textual/linguistic analysis (see section 1.4), the textual examples presented below attempt to highlight the contrast of lexical choice and style between the two translations of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā. These examples are intended to illustrate the potential differences in interpretation of the novel by the two translators.
Example 1

Source: منوهاً بثورته على أبيه، جبار هذه الأحياء جمیعاً (Mahfouz, 1986, p.25)

Stewart: winding up to his rebellion against his father, the greatest tyrant in all these parts. (Stewart, 1995, p.15, 1997, p.18)

Theroux: He particularly emphasised his rebellion against his father, the biggest bastard in the whole city. (Theroux, 1996, p.21)

This example demonstrates the distinctive differences in lexical choice and style between the two translations. The adjective جبار in Arabic is one of the 99 beautiful attributes of God in Islam. The word is mentioned only once in the Quran (Chapter 59, Verse, 23):

۲۳۹ | P a g e

This verse is translated by Abdul Haleem (2008, p.367) as follows:

He is God: there is no god other than Him, the Controller, the Holy One, Source of Peace, Granter of Security, Guardian over all, the Almighty, the Compeller, the Truly Great; God is far above anything they consider to be His partner.

Sarwar^3 translates it as:

He is the only Lord, the King, the Holy, the Peace, the Forgiver, the Watchful Guardian, the Majestic, the Dominant, and the Exalted. God is too exalted to have any partner.

In light of this background, one possible explanation for Stewart’s and Theroux’s distinct translation approaches could be that Stewart’s opted for a higher and less vulgar register because of this allegorical interpretation of Mahfouz’s novel. By contrast, Theroux used a lower, more colloquial register, which was more in line with his potential understanding and interpretation of the novel as a realistic representation of commonplace Egyptians. He may have also employed the informal register in his translation to perhaps maintain the orality of fictive dialogue and/or narration.

It is noteworthy that Theroux once mentioned asking Mahfouz about his interpretation of the novel as a religious allegory. He stated:

Mahfouz had little patience for his Islamist critics. He made two points: First, the book was a novel, a work of fiction, story—it ought to be enjoyed as such, and readers were free to think of it as they chose. Second, his fanatical detractors had

spun out of their own interpretations of the book as a retelling of divine scripture, and then knocked down these straw men. 'They spread those thoughts—I don’t! They are condemning their own interpretations, their own ideas! They say these things—I don’t!’ he exclaimed to me. (Theroux, 2011, p.400)

The above quote signals that Theroux may have been involved in writing the note on the copyrights page mentioned above and further substantiates my argument regarding his rendering of the novel as a realistic representation of an Egyptian alley. However, there is evidence to suggest that even Theroux, perhaps in hindsight, believed that the story was an allegory. Writing in 2001/2002, some five years after the publication of his translation, Theroux (2001/2002, p.671) stated:

Mahfouz’s deeply spiritual and questioning novel appears to me to be a work which first and foremost mirrors the stories of the Torah, Gospels, and Koran and retells them in modern literary form. In the course of doing this it humanises them by cutting them down to size and ennobling them—substituting human motives for superstition. Mahfouz might himself step away from this, or misremember his intentions—or maybe the evil Kishk⁴ and I are wrong— but I think the point is well past arguing.

Theroux’s mixed interpretation is also evident in another example from the translation:

Example 2

Source: اﻟﺣﺎرة ﻓﻲ ﺑﺎﻟﺳﻼﻣﺔ ﻣظﻔر ﻣـ– اﻟطﯾﺑﯾن ﻧﻔﺳﮫ رﻓﺎﻋﮫ إن (Mahfouz, 1986, p.457)

Stewart (1): Rifaa himself, the finest of men, had not been safe here [in the alley]. (Stewart, 1995, p.304).

Stewart (2): Rifaa himself, the best of men, had not been safe here [in the alley]. (Stewart, 1997, p.410).

Theroux: Rifaa himself – the best man that ever was – had never found safety in this alley. (Theroux, 1996, p.371).

Both Stewart’s translations cited above are in consonance with his interpretation of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā as a religious allegory. Likewise, Theroux’s translation proposes an allegorical interpretation of ‘Rifaa’, who symbolise Jesus in the allegorical interpretation of the novel. This example demonstrates and emphasises Venuti’s (1995, p.154) view, in which he follows the Italian translator Iginio Ugo Tarchetti (1839–1869) in arguing that

⁴ A blind Egyptian preacher who wrote a book attacking Mahfouz and his novel because of their depiction of God and Prophets (Malti-Douglas, 2001, p.6)
‘fictional discourse can never be free of social determinations’. The social determinant in this case could be the Christian view of Jesus, symbolised in the novel by Rifaa, as ‘the best man that ever lived’. It could also be that the uproar surrounding the novel at the time and the attempted assassination of Mahfouz compelled and/or informed Theroux to steer his translation as far as possible from being interpreted as an allegory and to avoid any clashes with the field of power, i.e. politics.

Perhaps the factor that reveals agents’ interpretation the most is paratextual elements. They are publishers’ selling point, their opportunity to convey a message to readers in some form. For instance, the different editions of Stewart’s translation from 1988 onwards primarily use one shape, but the colour changes with each edition. When asked by MacPhee (2015, p.52) whether he was responsible for changing and choosing the colours of Mahfouz’s translation covers, Max Karl Winkler, the cover designer of Stewart’s translation, published by 3CP, responded that

> It seems to me that I often chose the colours, and Dr. Herdeck approved them. Occasionally we would fan through a Pantone book together. After the first printing, however, I never participated in colour selection, nor in the decisions to change the colours.

This constant rebranding, evident in the regular change of the translation’s colour, was perhaps a remarking strategy to signal a new improved/expanded edition of the translation and hence help boost sales. As Image 10 below indicates, the covers of Stewart’s translation show an immensely long-lived patriarch up in the sky, looking down on some sort of a built-up area or a manmade concrete jungle. He looks like an overseer in what could be interpreted as God looking down on earth. This interpretation reconciles with Stewart’s allegorical interpretation of the novel.

Many of the covers designed by Winkler included hand-lettering (MacPhee, 2015, p.52). The font used on the cover of Stewart’s translation is not an exception. It is a free-style one, which appears to be a modified version of the Samarkan font, a Latin font that resembles Hindi. Apparently, the font did not have any significance for Winkler. This could be deduced from his interview with MacPhee (2015, p.53), in which he states the following:

> I had lapses of my own. On one occasion, when I was buying popcorn at a movie theatre, I saw the concessionnaire writing a letter, and I was enchanted by the

---

5 I am very grateful to my fellow PhD colleague, friend and calligrapher Abdullah Mashaan Al-Anezi for helping me identify the font names presented in this chapter.
writing: a line, with letters hanging from it as if from a clothesline. I incorporated that concept into my next 3CP cover, only to learn later that I was incorporating Urdu [sic, = Hindi] into an Arabic subject. I don’t believe I made many mistakes of that sort.

Judging by the covers that Winkler designed for 3CP (see MacPhee, 2015, passim), he was likely alluding to the covers of Mahfouz’s translations, which he designed as something of a series. Although the font may have not carried a significance for Winkler, one could argue that it was approved by 3CP because of its possible connection to Rushdie’s *Satanic Verses*, which could attract buyers’ attention and hence increase the publisher’s financial gains. The top part of the cover of Stewart’s translation flags Mahfouz as a Nobel Prize winner, which could be interpreted as an attempt on the publisher’s part to invest in the symbolic capital attached to Mahfouz’s name and thus earn economic capital. Right below it, we read the name of Naguib Mahfouz, and at the bottom part of the cover, the title of the translation is displayed in a substantially large font (see Image 10). This could be due to the popularity of the novel in the Anglophone world as a result of its controversial nature and its comparison with Rushdie’s *Satanic Verses*. The back cover of Stewart’s translation provides readers with a short biography of Mahfouz, followed by a history of the novel’s publication in Arabic and its story. A plug that contains other titles published by the publisher can also be found, and this could be interpreted as a marketing strategy to increase sales and maximise financial gains. Notably, following the uproar against Rushdie’s *Satanic Verses*, both the introduction and the synopsis of the novel were removed from the translation and back cover, respectively, upon Mahfouz’s request (see Image 10, 1990 edition). This attests to how socio-political external forces affect the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, as well as the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation.

Peter Theroux’s cover, on the other hand, displays in its middle part a man sitting in a garden playing his flute in tranquillity. The cover designer seemed to have drawn inspiration from the illustrations that accompanied ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā when it was in serial form in *Al-Ahram*. One of such illustrations shows a storyteller or a bard playing on a string instrument. On the cover of Theroux’s translation, the bard is portrayed as having dark black hair and a dark skin, and wearing the traditional dresses of middle-class men in Upper Egypt. This description could be said to reconcile with Theroux’s translation interpretation of the novel

---

6 Winkler’s description does not match with the Urdu alphabet and how it is written. It does, however, match with the Hindi alphabet and how it is written.
as a realistic representation of ordinary Egyptians, or him, and/or the co-producers of the translation, wanting it to look as such. On the top part of the (paperback) cover is a quote from the *Chicago Tribune*, which reads ‘Immensely entertaining and deeply serious’. This review could be said to be a mark of distinction to attract readers to buy the novel. Right below is the name of the translation (i.e. *Children of the Alley*), and between two diamond shapes below the name reads ‘a novel’. Having the descriptor ‘a novel’ underneath the title could be said to be a strategy to reassert the fictitious nature of the translated work. Both the title of the translation and the descriptor below it are written in a gold Gradl Highstep font. This font, according to Wallace (2008), is ‘based on caps designed by Max Joseph Gradl ca. 1900 for engraving on his art nouveau jewellery in Germany’, which ‘epitomises the visual language of elegance and sophistication’. Having the translation’s name written in such a font, in bold, gold colour and in the top position of the cover could be interpreted as a strategy to draw attention to the translation and make it stand out. The bottom part of the front cover displays the name of the author, Naguib Mahfouz, in gold colour and in a bolder and different font, i.e. *Aggie*, compared with the title of the translation. Below it, again in *Aggie* font, the cover flags Mahfouz as the ‘Winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature’ (see *Image 11*). The fact that the producers did not write the year of the award (1988) could be said to be a marketing strategy to make the novel more appealing to modern-day readers. Flagging Mahfouz’s name as a Nobel laureate could also be interpreted as a marketing strategy by the translation producers to gain both symbolic and economic capital.

The back cover of Theroux’s translation (hardcover) displays praise for Mahfouz, and the paperback displays praise for his novel. This strategy could be considered an attempt by the translation producers to convince people to buy the work, which could potentially increase the profit earned by the producers.

Nevertheless, a closer look on the front and back covers of Theroux’s translation (especially of the hardcover) reveals that they are fraught with allegorical references, which suggests another potential interpretation of the novel as an allegory. *Image 11* shows that the bard is surrounded by floral patterns and tiny spiders or fallen flowers, both depicted on a light-coloured background. This light background could be thought of as representing paradise or the Garden of Eden. The floral patterns are a mix of fritillaries, a Middle Eastern family of flowers that has biblical references and symbolises arrogance and crushed pride (Chandler, 1903, pp.45–46; Heilmeyer, 2001, p.40), and other flowers of the solanaceae family,
especially petunias which symbolise demonic powers or Satanism, as well as resentment and anger (Symbolism Wiki, no date). The fallen flowers or spiders, which resemble St Andrew’s Cross spiders species, bring a message that weaves spirituality, mortality and connection to the earth (Hakanson, ca. 2014). On the left corner of the cover and the spine are depictions of serpents on a dark background, which resembles a night sky full of stars. Serpents in Islam, as well as in other religions, symbolise punishment and hell, and the dark background potentially emphasises this symbolism. On the back cover of the translation, we see what appears to be a medieval Arab mise-en-scène that has five male characters, each assuming a different distinct position, and a woman. These could be said to be the five protagonists of Mahfouz’s novel. By way of illustration, the man standing on the top left hand corner is depicted as if he has descended from the stairs right beside him, and he is also shown looking to the sky in remorse, which could be a depiction of Adam. Below him, we see three men standing on a more or less the same level, and these could be interpreted as the leaders of the three Abrahamic religions. On the bottom left hand corner, we see a man standing as if leaning on a wall, and on this wall is the shape of a cross, which could be said to depict Jesus. Right beside him in the middle stands another man inside a mausoleum or a minaret whose top part takes the shape of a menorah, in a depiction of what seems to be Moses. Beside him on the right hand side, we could see a man standing in what appears to be a mihrab, clasping his hand in a Muslim praying position, which could be said to depict Mohammed. On the far right hand corner is a man standing on a fortress, overseeing the four other characters, which could be said to be the character Arafa in Mahfouz’s novel, which symbolises knowledge and science. Below him is a woman standing as if whispering something to someone, which could be said to depict a storyteller narrating the stories of all these characters. Notably, the four characters representing Adam, Jesus, Moses and Mohammed appear to be standing on more or less one building, as suggested by the colours and structure of this building. Arafa, however, is depicted as standing on another building. This juxtaposition could be interpreted to symbolise two worlds, the world of religion and that of science. The contradiction between the outwardly (i.e. realistic representation of a Cairene alley) and inwardly (i.e. allegorical) interpretation of the novel as represented on the front and back covers of the translation may have been prompted by the commotion surrounding ʿAwlād Ḥāratīnā in the Arab world and amongst Muslims in the Anglophone world, especially after an analogy was drawn between it and Rushdie’s Satanic Verses and
the assassination attempt on Mahfouz’s life in 1994, and the hesitation of the publisher/translator to face the consequences of promoting the novel as an allegorical one.
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*Image 10:* Front and back covers of Philip Stewart’s translation(s).

### 6.5.1 Profiling the translators

#### 6.5.1.1 Philip Stewart

Born in London in 1939, Philip Stewart is a writer, translator, poet and professor emeritus at the University of Oxford. Upon completing his BA degree in Arabic in 1961, Stewart decided to commence his PhD degree in modern Arabic literature. Deciding on his topic, he chose to translate one of Mahfouz’s then-recently published in serial instalment novels, namely ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā, only to be told that a work by a contemporary living writer could not be approved as a suitable subject for a PhD degree at Oxford (Stewart, 2001, no pagination). Thus, he decided to do an MA thesis and translated the novel (Stewart, 2001, no pagination). As no market for translated Arabic literature existed, Stewart lacked financial gains (Stewart, 2001, no pagination). Inspired by his childhood affinity for animals, insects and birds, Stewart decided to undertake a change of direction professionally: he embarked on obtaining a second BA degree in forestry, also at Oxford (Stewart, 2001, no
Stewart wrote a number of articles and book chapters both on Arabic literature and forestry. He also authored a book about Islam, *Unfolding Islam*, in which he explored the diverse history of the religion.

### 6.5.1.2 Peter Theroux

Born in Medford, Massachusetts in 1956 to a French–Canadian father and an Italian–American mother, Peter Theroux is an American translator, journalist and fiction writer. Acting on the recommendation of his elder brother Paul Theroux, a prominent fiction and travel writer, he used to visit the Egyptian capital Cairo, while doing his BA degree in English literature at Harvard (Johnson-Davies, 2006a, p.43). Hence, he developed an interest in the Arabic language and literature. Fascinated by the language, upon his graduation from Harvard in 1978, he moved to Egypt for one year to study the language at the American University in Cairo. However, it was when he worked in Saudi Arabia for five years as a journalist that he perfected his mastery of Arabic. In addition to this, he lived in and travelled to several other Arab countries, including Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Lebanon (Peterson, 2008). For Theroux, the Arabic language is like ‘quicksand’; it is ‘very deep and broad’ (Peterson, 2008). He started his career in translation while working in Saudi Arabia, where he translated Abdul Rahman Munif’s *Cities of Salt* ([Mudun al-Milḥ](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cities_of_Salt)), which he rendered into English as *Cities of Salt*.

Although he took part in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation before 1988, following the mini-boom that the field experienced after Mahfouz’s Nobel Prize, Theroux extended his career in translating modern Arabic fiction and is now one of the leading translators in the field. He has also authored some books, including *Strange Disappearance*
of Imam Moussa Sadr, Translating LA: A Tour of the Rainbow City and Sandstorms: Days and Nights in Arabia, which is a memoir of his journeys and experiences in the Arab world. He is also a contributor to different periodicals.

In addition to having been awarded an honorary doctorate from Mount St. Mary’s College, New York in recognition of his work, Theroux is also a winner of the Columbia University Translation Prize (ALTA, 2008, p.27).

6.6 The retranslation debate
In this study, the term ‘retranslation’ refers to a translation subsequent to an already existing one of a source text, produced by a different translator or translators into the same target language.
The driving forces behind the commissioning or production of retranslations—or the lack thereof—have been the concern of several studies and discussions in translation studies. Critical discussions regarding the retranslation hypothesis in the field of translation have traditionally focused on why a particular text gets retranslated when one or more translations of it already exist. The conventional view on retranslation, espoused by such scholars as Berman (1990) and Bensimon (1990), has argued for a teleological ‘history-as-progress’ model (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003, p.2) which assumes that translations ‘age’ chronologically and perceives retranslations as items that appear as time passes, succeeding the preceding translation(s) ‘in linear fashion’ (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003, p.2). According to this view, retranslation is thus professed as an act of producing a ‘better’ or ‘updated’ translation that is ‘more attentive to the letter of the source text, its linguistic and stylistic make-up, and its singularity’ than the ‘purblind and hesitant’ initial translation(s) (Berman, 1990, p.5), which lacked understanding either of the linguistic or stylistic dimensions of the source text or were oblivious to the target culture’s/readers’ expectations. Put differently, retranslations are seen as filling in a gap or overcoming the inadequacies/deficiencies of the ‘outdated’ earlier translations. It is thus generally presumed that a retranslation emerges when the already existing translations have become widely perceived as (linguistically) dated. This hermeneutic view is generally known as ‘text ageing’. The idea that source texts are ageless but translations are not appears to have been founded on the assumption that source texts possess what Levi Strauss refers to as an infinite ‘surplus of signifiers’ (Robinson, 2009, no pagination). That is, according to this view, source texts are expected to always suggest or indicate ‘more than is needed by any one interpreter or any one generation of interpreters’ (Robinson, 2009, no pagination). This suggests that for a translator to make the source text relevant for and to bring it closer to market readers in a particular epoch, they must reduce the text’s ‘significational surplus to only that narrow set that will ensure its uptake by its intended audience’ (Robinson, 2009, no pagination). This process of reduction makes the translation age far quicker than the source text (Robinson, 2009, no pagination).

Although retranslations may occur due to text or linguistic ageing, a source text might be retranslated for a whole host of other reasons, only a few of which are linguistic or time-passage related. (Co)producers of retranslations may feel at a certain time that an earlier translation imposes an excessively ‘narrow construction’ on the original and its status, ‘so that the retranslation comes to be conceived and/or presented rhetorically as quantitatively
rather than temporarily supplemental’, grasping more properties of the source text than the preceding translations (Robinson, 2009, no pagination). That is, the newly produced translation claims to better fulfil readers and critics’ expectations (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003, p.3). Moreover, in other cases, a first translation, recognised and established in the target culture, might be regarded as accurate but overscrupulous and insipid, lacking the stylistic eloquence and fervour of the source text (Robinson, 2009, no pagination). Retranslations in such a context are provided ‘as a qualitative supplement’, as colourful or vibrant and more alluring than their predecessors (Robinson, 2009, no pagination). Accordingly, retranslations might be conceptualised as a restorative operation, which attempts to get ‘closer to the source text’ (Chesterman, 2004, p.8) in order to rectify the (textual) deficiencies inherent in previous translations (Hanna, 2006, p.193). That is, a retranslation generally tries to restore something back to the original that has been lacking or lost in the previous translations (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003, p.3). In other words, retranslations are generally perceived as a correction of deficient initial translations. Commenting on this issue, Jianzhong (2003, p.194) contends that the ‘significance of retranslation lies in surpassing. If the retranslation is not better than the former one(s), the retranslation will not be worth a penny, and it will not be encouraged but criticised’ (my italics). The idea of improvement or betterment of earlier translations is shared by Venuti (2003, p.29), who contends that retranslations set out to ‘make an appreciable difference’ in relation to (co)producers of preceding translations. That is, retranslations endeavour to propagandise the notion that they are better than their predecessors (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003, p.3; Hanna, 2006, p.193).

Retranslation as a means of improvement or an act of betterment, understood as an outcome of ‘text ageing’ with the passage of time, is the traditional, generally assumed idea of retranslation. However, critical debates around this issue have produced an alternative understanding to this translational phenomenon. This contrasting view attributes the reasons for retranslation to translators and other translatorial agents involved in the process, as well as to the social sphere in which the retranslation is produced. According to Pym (1998, pp.82–83), interpreting the act of retranslation as the mere product of linguistic or textual changes in the target culture, or as a result of outmodedness, is to understand the process as ‘passive’. However, ‘text ageing’ or linguistic changes per se are not enough to explain why retranslations occur, and they are not sufficient/satisfactory in accounting for the phenomenon (Pym, 1998, pp.82–83). Pym (1998, p.83) therefore puts forward the idea of ‘active retranslation’, in which the trigger for undertaking a new translation tends to
be closely related to the translator and other translatorial agents, consequently causing active rivalry between the different versions published. However, Pym’s conceptualisation of ‘active retranslation’ appears to take little account of the devices and nature that inform this active retranslation, or how it relates to the translator. In Hanna’s words (2006, p.196), ‘Pym does not elaborate on the category of “active retranslation”’ and does not delineate the motivations for retranslation that are ‘closer to the translator’. Pym (1998, p.82) merely suggests that there is ‘active rivalry between different versions’. However, according to Hanna (2006, p.196),

there is no detailed discussion of the nature and mechanisms of this ‘rivalry’, the ways in which producers of the different versions are involved in this dynamic and the ways in which the different versions fare in the translation market and become canonised or marginalised. Even the examples provided are not particularly revealing of the nature of ‘active retranslation’.

Like Pym, Venuti (2003) emphasises the competitiveness between the various translations of the same original text. However, unlike Pym, he elaborates on the intricate nature of this active rivalry between (co)producers of retranslations. Venuti’s (2003, p.25) idea of active rivalry is informed by the supposition that retranslations establish or legitimise themselves by flagging their differences from previous translations. These differences, according to Venuti (2003, p.25), happen initially through the decision to commission and undertake a retranslation of a text that already has a previous translation. Venuti (2003, p.25), in turn, states that those differences ‘proliferate with the development of discursive strategies to retranslate it [where] both the choice and strategies are shaped by the retranslator’s appeal to the domestic constituencies who will put the retranslation to various uses’.

In other words, the choice of a text for retranslation is based on a perception that is different from that ‘inscribed’ in a previous translation, that inscribed perception being understood as ‘insufficient’ and conceivably ‘erroneous’ (Venuti, 2003, p.25). What Venuti appears to suggest is that retranslations are the outcome of a challenge to or disavowal of the readings on which preceding translations are premised (Venuti, 2003, p.26). This subsequently vindicates the view that the new reading put forward by the retranslation is connected to the social setting in which it operates (Hanna, 2006, p.197). Understanding retranslation as an act that is based on competition and flagging difference, which positions one or more translations in a contest with another, resonates with Bourdieus’s sociology. To examine a retranslation from a Bourdieusian viewpoint is to perceive it as a socially regulated and
regulating activity. That is, to attribute retranslations to a competition and struggle for stakes and social positions in which (co)producers of translations exhibit their agency by claiming legitimacy and distinction for themselves and their cultural products at the expense of preceding retranslations of the same source text. This, in turn, invites the investigation of retranslations not in isolation from the social agents that produce and promote them or from the social conditionings that govern their production and consumption. This also suggests perceiving (re)translations not as a mere linguistic act but as a site for struggle through which differences between translatorial agents are marked and established.

The idea that translations age and hence prompt the emergence of retranslations has recently been challenged in the field of translation studies. There have been attempts by a number of translation scholars, such as Susam-Sarajeva (2003), Hanna (2006) and Robinson (2009), to transcend the traditional, reductive view that time constitutes the generative trigger that explains the production of successive ‘ageing’ translations. Hanna (2006, p.198), for example, perceives time as a ‘site of struggle among producers of culture’. Retranslations, according to Hanna, could be explained in Bourdieu’s (1996a, p.157) terms as a site of a

...fight between those who have already left their mark and are trying to endure, and those who cannot make their own marks in their turn without consigning to the past those who have an interest in stopping time, in eternalising the present state; between the dominants whose strategy is tied to continuity, identity and reproduction, and the dominated, the new entrants, whose interest is in discontinuity, rupture, difference and revolution.

In the section that follows, I will attempt to provide an alternative understanding of the idea of translation or text ageing in terms of Bourdieu’s theory of social practice, while connecting this to the views on retranslation discussed above.

6.6.1 Reconceptualising retranslation: Rethinking text ageing

‘Social ageing’ is the concept Bourdieu uses to refer to the impact of time on the trajectory of an agent, an institution or a work of art within a field of cultural production. Bourdieu defines it as:

...nothing other than the slow renunciation or disinvestment (socially assisted and encouraged) which leads agents to adjust their aspirations to their objective chances, to espouse their condition, become what they are and make do with what they have, even if this entails deceiving themselves as to what they are and what they have, with collective complicity, and accepting bereavement of all the
‘lateral possibles’ they have abandoned along the way. (Bourdieu, 1984, pp.110–111, my italics)

As explained earlier (see chapter three), the existence of any work of art within the field of cultural production is conditioned by a continuous struggle between the dominant and dominated, consecrated and non-consecrated, elite and the masses, veterans and challengers. This struggle takes the form of a race or battle for recognition between ‘those who have made their names (...) and are struggling to stay in view and those who cannot make their own names without relegating to the past the established figures, whose interest lies in freezing the movement of time, fixing the present state of the field for ever’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.106).

Consecrated producers in any field of cultural production aspire to reproduce the established state of the field, preserving its dominant modes of production and maintaining its conventions of understanding and appreciating cultural products. A contrario, non-consecrated producers, who are the newcomers to the field, battle to gain legitimacy by flagging their differences and opposing the social order of the consecrated producers who are prevalent in the field. For them, as Bourdieu argues, ‘to be is to be different, to “make one’s name”, either personally or as a group’ (1980, p.289, italics in original). In their struggle for legitimacy and recognition, challengers or newcomers use the power of naming to make themselves distinctive, prove their existence in and establish the structure of the social world by being officially recognised as legitimate. All social agents, argues Bourdieu, ‘aspire, as far as [their] circumstances permit, to have the power to name and to create the world through naming’ (Bourdieu, 1991b, p.105).

As the newcomer producers proceed to legitimate differences, they inevitably push the consecrated producers into the past, labelling their products and the taste attached to them as dated or déclassé (Bourdieu, 1980, p.289; see also Bourdieu, 1996a, p.254). This suggests that the struggle in the field of cultural production revolves not only around symbolic capital (legitimacy, recognition) or economic capital (financial gains), but also around time. The winners of this struggle ‘are those who manage to get recognised as “ahead of [their] time” (avant-garde, innovative), whereas the losers are those who are driven by the winners to the realm of the past, where they are branded “conservative”, “traditional”, “obsolete”, etc.’ (Hanna, 2006, p.92). The ageing of a cultural product or any work of art is therefore governed, in essence, by the result of this battle against time.
It is worth mentioning that the ageing of cultural products also depends on the co-producers, or ‘artistic mediators’ (Johnson, 1993, p.11), who help the actual producers to win their battle against time. These co-producers include editors, critics, reviewers, academics, historians, book fairs, galleries, publishers and educational institutions. The discourse that co-producers produce about a work of art ‘is not a mere accompaniment’ to it but an important stage in the production of the work, its meaning and value (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.110). All artistic mediators find some ‘material or symbolic profit’ in reading, classifying, deciphering, commenting on, combating, knowing or possessing a work of art (Bourdieu, 1993a, p.111). It is essential for them to maintain, boost or challenge the categorisation of particular cultural products or works of art as innovative or ‘ahead-of-its-time’, or dated and ‘lagging behind time’ (Hanna, 2006, p.92). It is also to the benefit of artistic mediators to revive or lift certain ‘obsolete’ works of art and transform them into classic works or works ‘for all time’ (Hanna, 2006, p.92; see also Bourdieu, 1993a, p.111).

Against this theoretical backdrop, the idea of translation ageing ought to be interpreted in terms of ‘symbolic time’, which refers to a significance attached to cultural products (Hanna, 2006, p.198) that permits them to pass ‘into history’ in the sense of ‘the eternal present of consecrated culture’ (Bourdieu, 1996a, p.156). Retranslations contest with preceding translations over symbolic time. It is the result of this competition and struggle that defines the status and value of an existing translation as being either ‘in’ or ‘out’ of history (Hanna, 2006, 199). It is not only the translators that take part in this struggle and invest in a translation with symbolic time, but also other co-producers, as explained above.

In the field of translation, the struggle over symbolic time is denoted by the leveraging of symbolic capital by (co)producers of (re)translations in order to claim distinction for their works (Hanna, 2006, p.201). The main objective of claiming such a distinction is to challenge the legitimacy and dominant position of previous translations (Hanna, 2006, p.201). Symbolic capital could be leveraged through different rhetorical strategies employed in and communicated through various paratextual discourses. The objective of such rhetoric is to achieve different types of distinction in which the (co)producers of retranslations claim to have better access to the source text, source author, etc. (Hanna, 2006, p.208), thus delegitimising existing translations by flagging their deficiencies, or to assert that the new retranslation fulfils a need in the target culture that preceding translations did not consider or meet.
Against this background, (re)translatorial discourses can be perceived as an avenue of symbolic violence in which symbolic capital is generated, transferred and/or leveraged. This view echoes Bourdieu and Wacquant’s (1992, p.142, p.145, italics in original) argument that ‘linguistic relations are always relations of symbolic power’ and that every ‘linguistic exchange contains the potentiality of an act of power, and all the more so when it involves agents who occupy asymmetric positions in the distribution of the relevant capital’. That is, what gets (re)translated, or not, and why is always, at least partly, a matter of potentially exercising power, claiming legitimacy or reflecting authority. It could be said that Bourdieu’s sociology provides a new lens through which to interpret the retranslation phenomenon as the product of a struggle between social agents, individuals and institutions alike, over time, as well as over capital.

To sum up, Pym’s notion of ‘active retranslation’ posits that a retranslation’s objective could be one or more of the following: retranslating a different or a new version of a source text for a different or a new readership; retranslating to remedy textual inaccuracies in a preceding translation; retranslating to counterbalance restrictive access. St. André (2003, p.60) argues that the status of a retranslation as a challenger or competitor to a preceding translation is the outcome of a variety of interconnected factors. One of these factors may be to consecrate or institute oneself as an authority. This is attained by superseding previous translations, by altering the interpretation of the original text. It may also be the outcome of a potential division within the field, canon formation, changes in stereotypical views or other perceptions in the target culture, or perhaps rivalry between publishers, to cite but some other possible factors (St. André, 2004). Venuti’s work is constructed on the assumption that the ‘challenge’ is a trigger for retranslation, as explained above.

Bourdieu perceives such competition between cultural products as a struggle between social agents to maintain or attain legitimacy and distinction, and as a struggle over various forms of capital. The significance and worth of those cultural products are determined on the basis of their relationship to ‘other products within the same field of cultural products’ (Hanna, 2006, p.207). According to Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, p.100) ‘participants in a field (...) constantly work to differentiate themselves from their closest rivals in order to reduce competition and to establish a monopoly over a particular subsector of the field’. It could be posited that (co)producers of retranslations endeavour to establish themselves and their products by claiming distinction in relation to previously existing translations, which,
in turn, guarantees recognition for them and their products. This is achieved by flagging the flaws and limitations of the preceding translations. These trials to distinguish one’s work from others comprise a certain degree of departure from the generally accepted norms, at the time of production, within the particular field of production (Hanna, 2006, p.208). However, this divergence is conditioned by a minimum compliance with the conventions that make up the structure of the field (Hanna, 2006, p.208).

6.6.2 Packaging (re)translations: Paratextual elements

The symbolic struggle between agents and the competition between the different translations find expression primarily in the ‘paratextual’ zones, which accompany the text (Genette, 1997, p.1). Paratexts are those features in a published work that surround the text. According to Genette, these include such features as the blurb, preface, introduction, font style used, title and layout. Put differently, the paratext is peripheral to the printed text but in reality defines one’s understanding of the text (Lejeune, 1975, p.45). It is a zone between the off-text and text,

   a zone not only of transition but also of *transaction*: a privileged place of pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that (...) is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it. (Genette, 1997, p.2, italics in original)

From a translational viewpoint, Pellatt (2013, p.2) defines the paratext as ‘any material additional to, appended to or external to the core text which has functions of explaining, defining, instructing, or supporting, adding background information, or the relevant opinions and attitudes of scholars, translators and reviewers’. This means that paratexts are powerful tools at the publisher’s disposal because they can have some impact—or, on occasion, a great deal of impact—on target readers, critics and the like. It is primarily the paratextual elements that present and sell a text to target readers, and endeavours to attain a positive reception and consumption of the text in the target culture, ensuring its presence as much as possible.

Genette categorises paratexts into two key types: peritext and epitext (Genette, 1997, p.5). The former refers to all verbal and non-verbal paratextual elements that accompany the core text, such as the covers, title pages, prefaces, notes, introductions, etc. (Genette, 1997, pp.16–17). By contrast, the latter refers to all types of paratextual elements published external to the actual text—in this case the translated book—itself, such as commentaries,
reviews and interviews, etc. (Genette, 1997, p.10, p.38). Epitexts constitute avenues for (co)producers of cultural products in which they can ‘always more or less disclaim with denials of the type “That’s not exactly what I said” or “Those were off-the-cuff remarks” or “That wasn’t intended for publication” or indeed even with a “solemn declaration”’ (Genette, 1997, p.10).

The front cover is the key element that establishes a link between a text and the broader social world. A book sleeve primarily includes three parts: the front cover, back cover and spine. On the front cover are a few or all of the following elements: the title, subtitle, name(s) of the author(s) as well as that of the editor and/or the translator(s) and that of the publisher. However, the names of the editor and translator(s) may be positioned on the title page, which is the initial page following the front cover. It is noteworthy that some editors/translators may choose to withhold their names due to socio-cultural and geo-political forces. The front cover may also showcase visual illustrations, such as images or artwork. These are usually carefully selected or designed to attract the target readers or to communicate a particular narrative by highlighting the themes deemed most important in the book. The colour choice for covers could carry a significance or indicate what type of book it is (Genette, 1997, p.24). For instance, at the beginning of the twentieth century, yellow back covers were attributed to immoral French books (Genette, 1997, pp.24–25). The back cover usually includes the blurb and may at times display a picture, publishers’ colophons and other editorial information (Genette, 1997, pp.25–26). The spine often displays the title of the work, the author’s name, and the publisher’s colophon and name.

Pellatt (2013, p.2) contends that ‘games and deceptions’ may be involved in producing paratexts. One aspect to highlight in this regard is the relationship between the reader and translated text, and how interventions by publishers, editors, translators and other (co)producers of a translation mediate the readers’ perception of the translation. Such (co)producers of translations as translators, publishers, cover designers, blurb writers, etc. intervene and mediate at various points, and through a variety of means, to position themselves and their products in a dominant place within the field of activity. This is in order to accumulate certain forms of capital. It is this process of claiming distinction through positioning oneself and one’s cultural products within the field of activity that Bourdieu perceives as tension, struggle or challenge. The where, how and why of such
Interventions/mediations and struggles will be evaluated below through the example of the retranslations of *Awlād Ḥāratinā* into English.

In the case of the retranslations of Mahfouz’s *Awlād Ḥāratinā*, agents involved in each translation set out to claim distinction for their translations through various means. These agents, in the Bourdieusian sense, could be said to be playing a game to gain, maintain, regain or broaden the value and legitimacy attached to themselves and their cultural products. For instance, by claiming direct or better access to the source language, source text or author, or by claiming that earlier translations had misunderstood the message of the source text and its meaning. The section that follows examines the variety of strategies employed by retranslation (co)producers to distinguish their work through paratextual elements. That is, it examines the interactions and struggles of agents and the trajectories they follow in order to pursue and amass capital, how the socio-cultural and geo-political forces identified as operating in the field affect their practices and how these practices in turn affect the field’s structure. This is done through an analysis of how the agents claimed distinction through their use of the retranslations’ paratextual zones to exhibit their agency in order to attain legitimacy and dominance in the field.

6.7 Paratextual elements as means for claiming distinction: The (re)translations of *Awlād Ḥāratinā*

The value and worth of any new cultural product is not defined in a vacuum; instead, it is determined in connection with other products in its field. Conscious of this fact, new producers seek to attain distinction for their cultural products by addressing deficiencies in preceding products and adding these qualities to their own products. Perceived in this way, it could be said that ‘distinction’, by definition, involves differing to a certain extent from the familiar or accustomed within a field of cultural production. The process through which a literary product achieves distinction must similarly involve such differing, or what Bourdieu calls ‘deviation’:

> The work performed in the literary field produces the appearances [sic] of an original language by resorting to a set of derivations whose common principle is that of a deviation from the most frequent, i.e. ‘common’, ‘ordinary’, ‘vulgar’, usages. Value always arises from deviation, *deliberate or not*, with respect to the most widespread usage, ‘commonplaces’, ‘ordinary sentiment’, ‘trivial’ phrases, ‘vulgar’ expressions, ‘facile’ style. (Bourdieu, 1990a, p.60, italics in original)
According to Hanna (2006, p.208), it ‘is this process of deviation from what has become familiar or is beginning to “age” that brings about change’ in a field of culture production. It is noteworthy that this endeavour by (co)producers to distinct their products from existing ones and their producers must be balanced by a minimum compliance with the conventions that comprise structure of a field. In other words, this minimum compliance is the fee that new producers pay in order to gain and maintain membership in the field (Hanna, 2006, p.208).

The retranslations of Naguib Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Hāratinā and the ways in which cultural (co)producers attempted to distinguish themselves will be investigated through an analysis of the paratextual elements involved. This analysis is done by analysing three marks of distinction that could differentiate the various translations: how (co)producers of (re)translations claimed better access to and understanding the source culture and language; direct access to the source author, or having produced a better cultural product, i.e. translation.

6.7.1 Claiming better access to the source language and culture

For a (co)producer of a (re)translation to claim better or direct access to the source language and culture is, by default, an attempt to gain credit for themselves and their cultural products and perhaps indirectly discredit pre-existing (re)translations. In the title page of the 1981 edition of Stewarts’s translation, there was no indication of ‘Awlād Hāratinā’s name in an English phonetic transcription of the Arabic (although it must be said that the front cover depicted the title written in a relatively large and free-style font in Arabic letters). However, in all editions following the Nobel Prize, we read ‘Arabic Title Is Awwlad Haratina [sic]’. This could be interpreted as an attempt by the (co)producers of the translation to claim direct access to Arabic, the source language, and to have knowledge of it in order to amass cultural capital. It could also be interpreted as a marketing strategy, since the name of Mahfouz’s novel was well known, especially to academics and students of Arabic. Similarly, the introduction to the 1981 edition included a section titled ‘Notes on the translation’, in which Stewart sought to accumulate cultural capital for himself by detailing his knowledge of Arabic language (and culture), its variant dialects and the style and language of Mahfouz.

The language of daily life in Cairo is the dialect of Lower Egypt – a colourful variety of Arabic, which people take pleasure in using with wit and imagination. Mahfouz
writes in literary Arabic, a modern version of the classical language, which is altogether more deliberate, not to say solemn. In this novel, he comes nearer than ever before to combining the virtues of both. Much of the dialogue would need only changes of syntax to be turned into spoken Egyptian, and there are many songs, rhymes and proverbs that are given in straight colloquial Arabic. (Stewart, 1981, ix)

Moreover, in the HEB’s publicity material, Stewart is described as ‘an Arabist’ who ‘worked many years in North Africa’ (see Image 12). This description was perhaps meant to confer a degree of legitimacy on Stewart and his translation by flagging him as an expert in the matters of the North African Arab countries.

Although Theroux’s retranslation lacks an introduction in all of its editions, we read on the back flap of the hardcover edition that ‘He [Theroux] is the translator of several other Arab novels’. This could be interpreted as an attempt by Theroux, or the translation co-producers, to amass cultural capital by emphasising his knowledge of Arabic and symbolic capital by pointing to his translation of several other Arabic fiction works in order legitimise his retranslation in the literary field. It could also be perceived as an attempt to discredit Stewart, who translated only one novel in his career as a translator, thus delegitimising his translation in the field of literary translation. Theroux’s translations also claim better access to the source language and culture in the epitext: specifically, the two articles (2001/2002 and 2011) he wrote on his translation. He begins his 2001/2002 and 2011 papers by detailing the incidents and history of the novel’s publication in the Arab world, describing the problems it created and discussing how ‘this all-important novel made its way into English’ (Theroux, 2011, p.400, my italics). These sections were perhaps written to demonstrate Theroux’s superior knowledge (compared to Stewart) of Mahfouz’s work and the socio-cultural environment surrounding its publication, as well as to claim some of the symbolic capital attached to the ‘all-important novel’ and its author perhaps as a means to accumulate economic, or other forms of, capital. He continued by highlighting his constant contact with the Arab world, stating that:

I acquired a copy of Awlad Haratina [sic] while on a journalistic assignment in Cairo in 1990, navigating the community of Egyptian, Levantine, and Gulf refugees from a newly expansionist Iraq, and was quick to agree to translate it when the American University in Cairo Press offered the job. (Theroux, 2001/2002, p.668)
His claims of capital and distinction proceed in an even more revealing way, stating that ‘the translation took a year to do, a blissful year in the hands of a master’ (Theroux, 2001/2002, p.670, my italics). By describing Mahfouz as a ‘master’, Theroux appears to consecrate himself and enhance the authority of his translation, thus tacitly deconsecrating Stewart and his translation.

Image 12: Heinemann publicity material: Children of Gebelawi.

6.7.2 Claiming direct access to the source author

The expansion of an agent’s social capital, according to Bourdieu (1986, p.249), has the potential to reward the agent with ‘all the types of services accruing from useful relationships, and symbolic profits, such as those derived from association with a rare, prestigious group’. In the case of ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā, the (re)translators were likely to increase their social capital—and, potentially, other forms of capital, including economic capital—by translating the most controversial and all-important work of a Nobel laureate. For this reason, the (re)translators spared no effort emphasising their association with Mahfouz in both the peritexts and epitexts of their translations, seeking, perhaps, to use their connections with him to accrue other forms of profit.

With respect to the peritext, Stewart added an ‘Acknowledgments’ section in the introduction to his 1981 translation, the first sentence of which reads: ‘I owe special thanks
to Naguib Mahfouz for his friendship and encouragement’ (Stewart, 1981, ix). By professing that he was not only an associate of Mahfouz, but also a friend, Stewart perhaps sought to consecrate and legitimise himself and his translation, thus strengthening their positions in the literary field, particularly with respect to Mahfouz’s fiction. In the 1995 revised augmented edition, Stewart (1995, xii) ended his introduction with a similar line: ‘I am grateful to the author for his friendship and advice’. The word ‘advice’ is important here because it insinuates to the reader that the translation was done with Mahfouz’s help, hence conferring legitimacy and distinction on the translation. It also implies that Stewart’s interpretation of the novel, as presented in the translation, was approved by Mahfouz, making it legitimate. The 1997 corrected/revised augmented edition includes no explicit mention of Mahfouz’s friendship and advice; however, it does contain an implicit reference: ‘I have retained the continental punctuation of dialogue favoured by Mahfouz’ (Stewart, 1997, xxi). This comment is perhaps designed not only to claim distinction by flagging Stewart’s awareness of Mahfouz’s intentions, but also to discredit Theroux’s translation, which uses a different style of punctuation. Stewart also mentions Mahfouz at various points throughout the extended introduction to substantiate a point and/or strengthen an argument, especially concerning the interpretation of the source text (see Stewart, 1997, passim).

Although Theroux’s translation includes no introduction, it does include a ‘Translator’s Acknowledgements’ page, in which Theroux expresses his thanks to ‘Naguib Mahfouz and Sasson Somekh, whose generous guidance never failed’ (Theroux, 1996, no pagination). Theroux’s investment in the symbolic and cultural capital attached to Mahfouz’s name could be interpreted as an attempt to bestow a degree of authority and legitimacy on himself and his translation. His mention of Somekh, a Baghdad-born Israeli scholar and prominent translator of Arabic literature into Hebrew, could also be perceived as an attempt to claim having produced a better translation: one made with the help of a native Arabic speaker and specialist. This could, in turn, confer authenticity and legitimacy on his translation and its position in the field.

The two agents’ struggle to claim legitimacy, emphasise Mahfouz’s involvement in their translations and, ultimately, show that they had the better understanding of his novel’s content continued in the epitext. For example, in an article published on his website, Stewart (no date, no pagination) states that Mahfouz helped him with his translation:
My translation was made in Cairo in 1962, two and a half years after the novel first came out as a serial in the newspaper Al-Ahram [sic]. The author, whose memory was still fresh, gave me every assistance. (my italics)

This statement seems to serve two aims. The first is to accrue legitimacy for Stewart’s translation by highlighting its pioneer status and emphasising that it conveys the meaning closest to Mahfouz’s intentions. It highlights that the translation was made with Mahfouz’s assistance and was produced in the same cultural setting (Cairo) within close range of its production in Arabic. The second is to perhaps question the legitimacy of Mahfouz’s help with Theroux’s translation (flagged in the latter’s text, as explained above) by tacitly questioning the memory of Mahfouz, who was 85 years old when Theroux’s translation was published. The battle to attain distinction continued in another article by Stewart, also published on his website in 2001. In this article, he states:

I was sent to represent Britain at the Cairo ceremony in honour of Mahfouz. He greeted me with great affection, told me he believed I was his best translator and said ‘You are my son’. (Stewart, 2011, no pagination, my italics)

Once again, this could be understood as an attempt on Stewart’s part to distinguish his translation in relation to not only Theroux’s translation, but also all other produced translations of Mahfouz’s works. By invoking Mahfouz’s comment that he perceived Stewart as his ‘best translator’ and ‘son’, Stewart seems to endeavour to single himself out to secure legitimacy and consecration for himself and his translation. In fact, Stewart went as far as to comment on Theroux’s translation on Amazon (see Image 13). After rating the translation one star (out of five), he discredits it by arguing that it was produced ‘without the author’s participation’ (Stewart, 2000).

Theroux also used the epitext to assert his direct access to Mahfouz and, hence, his better understanding of ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā. In his two articles about his translation, he states that:

Mahfouz never expressed to me any explicit opinion on whether he thought a new translation to be necessary or not, but he was always open to queries about the language of the book, and enjoyed hearing passages from the new translation read aloud—more accurately, barked into his left ear. (Theroux, 2001/2002, p.669)
In the above quote, Theroux clearly questions the legitimacy Stewart’s translation by invoking the matter of the ‘language of the book’. This could be interpreted as an attempt to delegitimise Stewart’s understanding of Mahfouz’s intended meanings and, hence, to delegitimise the translation altogether. The verb ‘enjoyed’ further substantiates this argument, suggesting that Mahfouz perhaps found Theroux’s translation to be better than Stewart’s.

Image 13: Stewart’s review of Theroux’s translation on Amazon.7

6.7.3 Claiming to have produced a better translation

Both Stewart and Theroux claimed, in some form, to have produced a better translation. They did so by communicating that they had based their translations on the full version of the source text, by emphasising their dedication to producing a faithful mirror of the source text and/or by flagging the deficiencies in the other (re)translation.

The introduction of Stewart’s translation—and, indeed, the translation itself and the commissioning/production of a new translation—kept changing over time to reflect the

internal and external factors affecting the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, other intersecting fields and the agents operating within them. In all versions, however, what is evident is Stewart’s investment in symbolic capital through his emphasis on the positive or superlative qualities of his translation.

In the introduction to his 1981 edition, Stewart stated that:

This translation aims to produce a similar effect in the English dialogue, while in the narrative passages an attempt is made to transmit the local colour without resorting to footnotes and the transliteration of Arabic words. (Stewart, 1981, ix)

In his 1995 and 1997 editions, he wrote:

The translation here offered is aimed at the general reader with no prior knowledge of the Arab world; no words have been used that cannot be found in a good English dictionary. (Stewart, 1995, x, 1997, xviii)

The above quotes demonstrate how Stewart highlighted his translational and professional competence. Such pronouncements portray Stewart as a faithful and talented translator, endowing his translation with a prominent position in the field. These examples, as well as others in the introductions, could be perceived, in the Bourdieusian sense, as a position-taking: a strategy to amass objectified and embodied cultural capital that could later be transformed into symbolic and/or economic capital.

By contrast, Theroux claims distinction for his translation by implicitly criticising Stewart. After stating that he knew a translation already existed when he agreed to undertake the retranslation, he poses the following rhetorical question:

Why did Doubleday not use it? AUC Press officials implied that they and Jacqueline Onassis (…) preferred not to republish that translation, which was the work of Philip Stewart. The truth may have been that AUC wanted to commission a new edition that—unlike Stewart’s perfectly adequate work—would produce income for them. The new translation of the book would be commissioned by AUC Press, but—like Stewart’s pioneering work—would not be available in Egypt. (Theroux, 2001/2002, p.668, my italics).

The above statement indirectly discredits Stewart’s translation, delegitimising its popularity among readers and its usefulness among publishers. It also suggests that the motivation behind the commissioning of a new translation was primarily financial gain (i.e. economic capital). Further, it insinuates that Theroux’s translation was meant to overcome textual deficiencies and/or deviations from Mahfouz’s original text in Stewart’s work or to produce a new translation that was more accessible to the target culture and its readers at a
particular point in time. It is noteworthy that neither the AUCP nor Doubleday officially\textsuperscript{8} published Stewart’s translation. Moreover, although Theroux’s description of Stewart’s translation as a ‘perfectly adequate’ and a ‘pioneering’ work could be said to be truthful, there is evidence to suggest that these statements were made either to prevent further tensions or to mock the earlier translation. This is evident in Theroux’s other article, published in 2011, in which the above excerpt was altered as follows:

I acquired a copy of Awlad Haratina [sic] in Cairo in 1990 and was quick to agree to translate it when the American University in Cairo (AUC) Press offered me the job. A mostly complete translation of the Egyptian text already existed at that point; it was titled Children of Gebelaawi. The work by an Englishman, Philip Stewart, had not yet been published. The new translation of the book would be commissioned by AUC Press, but like Stewart’s work, would not be available in Egypt. (Theroux, 2011, p.400)

This last quote contradicts what Theroux said in 2001; hence, a few notes are in order. Despite describing Stewart’s translation as ‘perfectly adequate’ and a ‘pioneering’ work in 2001, in 2011, Theroux described Stewart’s translation as a ‘mostly complete translation’, which is a clear case of questioning the legitimacy and discrediting the authority of Stewart’s translation and claiming distinction for his own. Theroux also claimed to have had no previous knowledge that Stewart’s translation was published when he undertook his translation in 1990. This claim could be interpreted as an attempt to delegitimise Stewart’s translation and throw it ‘out of history’, hence distinguishing his own translation’s pioneering status and inserting it firmly ‘into history’. Moreover, by (inadvertently or not) using the title of Stewart’s revised augmented editions of 1995 and 1998 (i.e. Children of Gebelaawi instead of Children of Gebelawi), which Stewart (no date, no pagination) claimed to be ‘the only complete version in any language’, Theroux seems to discredit and delegitimise Stewart’s work altogether. His use of the qualifier ‘Englishman’ to describe Stewart, despite all of his academic capital, further substantiates this claim. If one were to reconstruct Theroux’s words without the jargon, it would read: ‘A mostly complete translation already existed in 1990—which was titled Children of Gebelaawi, the work of an Englishman, Philip Stewart—but had not been yet published’.

\textsuperscript{8} In two letters from Stewart to Herdeck (3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, 20 June 1996; 3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, 10 December 1996), we read that the AUCP may have produced and marketed ‘a pirate edition of [Stewart’s] translation in the 1980s’.
However, Theroux was not the only one to mock or to attempt to send ‘out of history’ the other’s translation. In response to the quotes above, Stewart (2001, no pagination) wrote:

Peter Theroux has described my work as ‘perfectly adequate’. I have to say frankly that I consider his barely adequate. I will not complain about his mistranslations of the Arabic, since I am no doubt guilty of some too (neither of us is a native speaker). It does bother me though that he has reproduced a number of the more improbable ones in my first edition.

Stewart expanded on his statements elsewhere by stating that:

There are places where Theroux reproduces mistakes that I made in my 1981 edition, amounting cumulatively to strong evidence of plagiarism. Of these, the most difficult to scribe to coincidence occurs on page 109, where $\textit{al-mi’rat al-kabira}$ ‘the big mirror’ becomes ‘the old woman’. This is a highly improbable error, combining ignorance of idiom with failure to see an accent that was indistinct in the Al-Ahram [sic] text, which I used, but not in the Beirut text used by Theroux. (Stewart, no date, no pagination)

The linguistic choices of (re)translators can be used, as Hanna (2006, p.223) argues, ‘to partly determine whether or not the new translation is capable of pushing the previous translation “into the past” and hence achieving distinction in the field’. By flagging textual deficiencies in Theroux’s translation, Stewart perhaps aims to achieve distinction and legitimacy for his own work, hence pushing Theroux’s translation ‘into the past’.

Moreover, in his Amazon review of Theroux’s translation, Stewart (2000) wrote: ‘Children of Gebelaawi [sic] is the only version in any language to be based on both the source texts’. In another article published on his website, Stewart (no date, no pagination) adds that ‘One must now question the validity of any translation based on only one version’. Similarly, on the back cover of Stewart’s 1997 translation, we read:

This historic translation of $\textit{Children of Gebelaawi}$, the first of a Mahfouz novel ever to be completed, was made in 1962 with assistance from the author and was first published in the United States in 1981. [The] Passeggiata Press’s 1997 edition (...) can claim to be the only version in any language to take full account of the original sources.

The description of Stewart’s translation as ‘historic’ confers a great deal of symbolic capital on the translation, the translator and the publisher. The dates and location of publication and Mahfouz’s assistance are perhaps mentioned to imply pioneering status and further legitimise the translation and its superiority to that of Theroux. Stewart’s above comment and the last line—which discusses the source texts used for translation and states that
Stewart’s 1997 translation is the only complete version available in any language—distinguish Stewart’s work and insinuate that Theroux’s translation is incomplete and, hence, lacking value.

Since Stewart based his 1997 translation on the versions of *Awlād Ḥāratinā* published in *Al-Ahram* (1959) and by Dar Al-Adab (see sections 6.4–6.5) and claimed that Theroux based his translation solely on the ‘incomplete’ Beirut version (see Stewart, 2001, no pagination; see also Stewart, no date, no pagination), Theroux was quick to indirectly defend his translation’s legitimacy and distinction and to refute claims that it might be incomplete. Specifically, he stated that:

> The Beirut edition—fifth edition, 1986—(...) had the virtue of being, to use the standard redundancy, complete and unexpurgated. (Theroux, 2011, p.400)

Here, the roles of the translation (co)producers, reviewers, critics, publicists, etc. and the ways in which they deployed their marks of distinction to legitimise and consecrate particular translations and/or translators in their rivalries against earlier and synchronous (re)translations cannot be overlooked. Allen (2010, p.479), for instance, set out to pronounce ‘the interesting historical fact that the only version of *Awlad haratina* [sic] that contains the complete text of the original serialised novel is the latest edition of Philip Stewart’s English translation’. Such comments distinguished and legitimised Stewart’s translation at the expense of Theroux’s, giving the reader the impression that Theroux’s translation was incomplete.

Similarly, (co)producers of Theroux’s translation used epitext to push Stewart’s ‘out of history’. For example, Rengger (1996, p.C19) stated that: ‘*Children of the Alley* was originally published in 1959 in Arabic and has now been brought into English by Peter Theroux’. By suggesting that Theroux’s translation was the first to have ever been published in English translation, Rengger (1996) claims distinction and legitimacy for Theroux and his translation and delegitimises Stewart’s by tacitly denying its existence.

**6.8 Concluding remarks**

Chapter six investigated the relationship between the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation and the broader field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. With the concept of field drawn, locating the English translations of Mahfouz’s fiction within the socio-cultural and geo-political contexts of their production, dissemination and reception
was possible. Furthermore, drawing on Bourdieu’s concept of homology enabled an understanding of the isomorphic and reciprocal relationship between these two fields of cultural production and how the forces present in one of these fields affect the other and vice versa. With this isomorphic relation, understanding the logic underlying agents’ practices in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation was possible by focusing the investigation on a smaller scale on the retranslations of Naguib Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Hāratinā. The chapter drew on Bourdieu’s concepts of social ageing, distinction and capital to examine the factors that drive agents operating in the fields of Mahfouz’s fiction and modern Arabic fiction in English translation to undertake a (re)translation, as well as the interactions/struggles between them in the various processes of the (re)translation activity.
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

7.1 Initial remarks

The aim of this chapter is to readdress the research questions presented at the outset of this thesis, to summarise its findings and contributions, and to outline possible avenues for future research.

Chapter one highlighted pronouncements made by (co)producers of English translations of modern Arabic fiction with regards to the untranslatability of ‘Arabic’ and its status as a ‘controversial’ language and hence a ‘hurdle’ in the way of the cultural and literary transfer of modern Arabic works of fiction to English. It was through such narratives that questions pertaining to identifying and investigating the socio-cultural factors affecting the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation were explored, including its structure and agents’ practices as well as the main tendencies of production and reception in this field.

7.2 A recapitulation: Research questions reviewed

The strategic question that was formulated in chapter one to steer the direction of this thesis was as follows:

What are the socio-cultural and historico-political determinants governing the translation activity of modern Arabic fiction into English, and how have the various translation processes been influenced by such forces?

Answering this question entailed separating it into the three interrelated procedural sub-questions that structured this thesis and which will be revisited below.

1- What are the implications of the sociological turn for translation studies? What are the main sociological approaches to translation, and which of them can best guide the analysis of this study?

Chapters two and three addressed these questions. Chapter two investigated the shift in the field of translation studies towards sociological theories, with the aim of understanding the social implications of translations and translatorial agents. The chapter also presented the three sociological theories that have, thus far, most inspired research in the field of translation. These are Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of social practice, Niklas Luhmann’s social systems theory and Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory. Chapter two outlined the advantages and disadvantages of each of these approaches to the study of translations as a
socially constructed and constructing practice and the (co)producers of translation as socially regulated and regulating agents. The chapter concluded that Bourdieu’s sociology holds the greatest potential for guiding the investigation of the socio-cultural determinants and practices of social agents operating in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. This is due to its ability to problematise the socio-historical and geo-political conditionings of cultural products. That is, Bourdieu’s sociology provides the means for (re)conceptualising translation production and reception of modern Arabic fiction into English as a historically constituted, socially regulated activity that is structured around cooperation cum struggle and competition between agents over various forms of capital and not just as a mere linguistic transfer process.

Chapter three critically explored Bourdieu’s theory of social practice. It reflected on the use of its key concepts in the field of translation studies and examined the critique postulated in relation to some of these concepts and provided responses to each of the criticisms made. It was argued that the dynamic nature of Bourdieu’s theory enables it to account for the ratiocinated internal and external forces as well as the unbalanced power relations that may have affected the genesis and development of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. This is despite the shortcomings of some of its concepts, which were outlined and critically evaluated in section 3.6.2. It is important to note, however, that Bourdieu’s sociology is heuristic in nature and that the conceptual tools used in the analysis of this study are heuristic constructs, the objective of which in this study was to help investigate the translation phenomenon of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a socially situated activity. Being heuristic, Bourdieu’s sociology does not aim to attain reality but aims to offer a fresh perspective from which to view the real (Gouanvic, 2002a, p.99). It is, therefore, hoped that this approach has shielded the analysis presented in this study from reading English translations of modern Arabic fiction as mere replicas or simple reflections of social reality, seeing them instead as the products of a whole nexus of internal and external forces that conditioned their production, circulation and reception. That is, while the socio-cultural and historicopolitical forces affecting the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and its activities were investigated and taken into account, their implications were always perceived within the context of the field’s structure, as well as in the context of its agents’ practices and the logic underlying those practices, and not in a vacuum.
Investigating this field of cultural production as a site for the interplay of the various forces that affect and are affected by its structure, the positions available in it, the (co)producers of translations occupying these positions and the position-takings they deploy to maintain or attain the forms of capital they strive for was the concern that underpinned the second research question.

2- What are the factors informing, conforming and/or transforming the practices in and structure of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation through its various phases of development?

Chapters four and five set out to answer this question. These chapters examined the trajectory of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation as a historically constituted, socially situated phenomenon. Building on Altoma (2005) and Khalifa and Elgindy (2014), these chapters divided the social history of the field into four distinct phases with overlapping features: the initial phase (1908–1967), the expansion phase (1968–1988), the post-Nobel phase (1988–2001) and the post-9/11 phase (2001–2014). In order to (re)construct a field of cultural production, ‘one must identify the forms of specific capital that operate within it, and to construct the forms of specific capital one must know the specific logic of the field’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.108). To investigate the logic of practice of a field, it is imperative to identify the various positions available in it and its efficient characteristics—or ‘active properties’ as Bourdieu (1985b, p.724; see also Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pp.107–108) calls them—which constitute the fundamental principles of its construction. The key characteristics of all the four phases of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation were identified and the positions and practices of agents within the field were outlined and critiqued. Significantly, some of the characteristics of the field were perennial and repetitive across all phases, which attests to their deeply rooted position in the field’s structure, as well as their long-unquestioned dominance and status in the field. Having gone unquestioned for a long time, these characteristics appear to have become inherent in the field’s structure, thus forming part of its doxic beliefs (see section 3.3.4). Unveiling the characteristics and questioning the tacit rules of the field, which govern the dynamics and logic underlying its practices and agents’ interactions, facilitated the understanding of the socio-cultural and historico-political forces that conditioned the processes of translation production, circulation and consumption within it.
The early stages of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation—the initial phase and the expansion phase—were mapped out in chapter four. Contrary to Altoma’s (2005) conceptualisation of the initial phase as starting in 1947, this chapter traced the first English translation of modern Arabic work of fiction back to 1908. Since this phase spanned for some 60 years, the chapter attempted to reconstruct it by dividing it into two sub-phases: the embryonic sub-phase (1908–1947) and the formative sub-phase (1948–1966). Informed by the bibliography compiled for this thesis (see Appendix A), the chapter traced the social genesis of and translation activity within the field, explored the various socio-cultural forces that have affected the velocity of its expansion and identified the various agents, their practices and the positions they occupy, as well as the forms of capital they strive to accumulate therein. The chapter also investigated the development of the field’s structure and the events that ushered it into its expansion phase, showing that historico-political forces were primarily responsible for increasing the volume of activity in the field and the rise of a predominantly academic interest in English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction as a direct result of such events. The emergence of such publishers as Heinemann Educational Books and Three Continents Press in the field during its expansion phase not only aided the process of the field’s development but also increased the Anglophone reading public’s awareness of the existence of works of literary merit in the modern Arabic fiction tradition. The expansion of geographical and gender representation in translation during this phase was also examined, as well as the reasons for this expansion and the structural changes they produced in the field. The diversification in the field’s agents and products expanded its boundaries and saw it coalesce as a fledgling field of cultural production, in the Bourdieusian sense, in its own right.

Chapter five explored the socio-historical trajectory of the developed phases of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation: the post-Nobel phase and post 9/11 phase. It was shown that the rumours surrounding the award of the Nobel Prize in Literature to an Arab, which became particularly rife from 1984, caused a significant increase in the number of English translations of modern Arabic fiction in the years immediately preceding 1988. Awarding the Nobel Prize in Literature to Naguib Mahfouz in 1988 was an important milestone in the history of the field. That is because it triggered an increase in the number of translation reprints—primarily of Mahfouz’s works—and sustained the interest fuelled by the rumours—which were circulating in the literary field prior to 1988—in the field, its products and its agents for a few years. It also introduced new forms of capital in the field.
and, subsequently, structural changes to its boundaries, especially with mainstream publishers, such as Doubleday, starting to take part in the field. Securing translation rights of modern Arabic works of fiction and, needless to say, those of Mahfouz himself, subjected the field to new forms of struggle between avant-garde and newcomer agents. The implications of such struggles, especially in relation to the primacy of Mahfouz in translation, gave rise to new niche publishers and initiatives in the field, brought about new positions in it and expanded its boundaries. It was shown that interest in modern Arabic fiction in English translation faded soon after the Prize, especially when publishers realised that the public interest was nothing but a temporary phenomenon.

However, a number of socio-cultural and geo-political events continued, on occasion, to revive the Anglophone reading public’s interest in English translations of modern Arabic fiction, which motivated some publishers to continue to take part in the field. Among such events were the Lebanese Civil War, the Gulf War, the Palestinian Intifada and the 1993 World Trade Centre bombing. It was demonstrated how the number of translations rose in response to such events. The factors informing the practices in the field and (trans)forming the hierarchal strata within it and its other interconnected fields were investigated. It was argued that similar geo-political events ushered the field to a new phase, which this study identified and referred to as the post-9/11 phase. The tragic events of 2001 and their aftermath brought unprecedented interest in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, represented by a quantum leap in the number of translations and reprints published annually, when compared with the previous phases. Wanting to understand how Arabs think and function, the Anglophone world sought answers to their questions about Arab culture and people by reading English translations of modern works of Arabic fiction. Despite the motives of this interest—described by Antoon, in an interview with Lake (2010), as a ‘forensic interest’ and discussed in section 5.3—it is argued that it did diversify and expand translation production in the field. Different fiction writings from different Arab countries started to feature in English translation. Other socio-political events that followed, such as the so-called ‘Arab Spring’ and the Syrian Civil War, likewise increased interest in modern Arabic fiction in English translation. It is argued that since these socio-political events are on-going, the field will continue to evolve and transform in response to them.

No structure of a field of cultural production exists in a vacuum. Rather each field is recognisable only when looked at in relation to the positions available in it, in conjunction
with the relationships between the various agents and forces operating in it. In order to examine how the socio-cultural and historico-political forces identified in chapters four and five mediate agents’ practices and interactions, as well as the structure and characteristics of the field, the thesis narrowed its focus to the study of Naguib Mahfouz’s works of fiction in English translation, especially the retranslations of his ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā into English. The third question, which motivated chapter six, was:

3- What can the retranslation of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā reveal about the socio-cultural dynamics of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and the mechanisms by which agents operating within it interact with each other?

Drawing on Bourdieu’s concepts of field and homology, the relationship between the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation and the field of Modern Arabic fiction in English translation was examined and it was shown that there is an extensive isomorphic relation between these two fields of cultural production. Moreover, the interactions and rising tensions between dominant and dominated agents were investigated and the strategies they employed in their battle over legitimacy and dominance/distinction, especially following Mahfouz’s Nobel in 1988, were examined. It was argued that the dynamic state of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and the struggles and interactions amongst its agents, which found expression in the emergence of retranslations in it, could be better understood through the lens of a case study. The chapter also critically investigated the traditional views on the retranslation hypothesis and an alternative understanding of the occurrence of retranslations was proposed. Bourdieu’s concepts of social ageing, distinction and capital aided in providing the alternative understanding of the (re)translations of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Ḥāratinā as something more than a simple act of linguistic improvement on an existing or previous translation. The existence of the retranslation phenomenon in the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, and consecutively the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, was found to be engendered by socio-cultural and geo-political forces affecting it and other, interconnecting fields. These two fields of cultural production were perceived as a site for struggle between agents, who used the act of (re)translation as a tool of distinction and domination. (Re)translations were used in the field to raise the status of certain publishers and/or (co)producers of translations while discrediting others, to legitimise particular source texts used for translation while delegitimising others and to consecrate specific translators and
their translations while deconsecrating others. Claiming/flagging distinction was manifest in the paratextual elements used. Being one of the most impactful marketing and communication tools at publishers’ disposal, the paratextual elements of both source texts and retranslations of ‘Awlād Hāratinā were analysed and situated within the broader socio-cultural and historico-political circumstances of their production and reception. It was demonstrated that the internal and external factors operating in the larger field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation not only affected its structure but also the status of some of its products, as manifested in the retranslations, reprints and editions of Mahfouz’s ‘Awlād Hāratinā in English. The findings of this chapter also vindicated Bourdieu’s argument that practices fashioned by agents’ (dis)positions not only reproduce the field’s structure but also attempt to cause changes within it.

7.3 Contributions, limitations and future research

The main contribution of this thesis has been to reconstruct the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and interpret its development phases as a historically constituted, socially constructed activity and the individuals and institutions operating in it as socially regulated and regulating agents. Contrary to the belief that the flow of English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction has always been hindered primarily by the Arabic language, this study demonstrated that there has been a progressive production and publishing of translations since 1908. However, the velocity and volume of this translation flow have fluctuated in line with various other internal and external socio-cultural and historico-political forces that affected the translation production and consumption, and consequently the development and structure of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, as well as its agents’ practices. Given this finding, English translations of modern Arabic works of fiction should always be perceived within, and not in isolation from, the larger contexts of their production, circulation and reception.

In the process of mapping out the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, the thesis suggests alternative dates and a different structure to the phases identified by Altoma (1996, 2000, 2005). It also investigated several under-researched socio-cultural and historico-political factors that have affected and conditioned the translation activity in the field but which were not mentioned in Khalifa and Elgindy (2014). The names of the phases identified by Altoma were not altered here because the primary aim was not to discredit
previous research but to build on it, and Altoma’s phases are now widely recognised in the field. Nevertheless, a few notes are in order here.

The first English translation of a modern Arabic work of fiction was traced back to 1908. This phase was divided into two sub-phases: the embryonic sub-phase (1908–1946), in which translation activity was haphazard and occurred at long intervals, and the formative sub-phase (1947–1967), in which translation activity became more systematic and frequent. The initial phase is thus set between 1908 and 1967, which differs from Altoma’s previously suggested period of 1947–1967. Moreover, the ‘phase of expanding’, as identified in prior studies (see for instance, Altoma, 2005, p.55), covers the period from 1968 to 1988, which this study calls the ‘expansion phase’. The number of translations in the field increased in the years immediately preceding 1988 (from 1985 to 1987) following rumours about the possibility of an Arab winning the Nobel Prize in Literature (see section 5.2.1 and Graph 9). Awarding the Nobel Prize in Literature to Mahfouz in 1988 mainly sustained, to an extent, the level of interest in the field and its products—particularly in the works of Mahfouz himself—for a few years. The award also motivated mainstream publishers, such as Doubleday, both to take part in the field and to immediately commission translations in 1988. Therefore, the end boundary of this phase should be re-drawn from 1988 to 1987. Similarly, while Altoma (2005, pp.57–58) identified a post-Nobel phase from 1988 to 2003—the final year of analysis in Altoma’s study—this thesis identified a new phase in this field of cultural production—i.e. the post-9/11 phase—and examined its dynamics and agents. The 9/11 attacks and their aftermath had an immediate effect on the number of reprints, while the number of translations were also affected in the years that followed. For instance, writing in November 2001, just two months after the attacks, Radler (p.12B) reported that books on Islam and the Middle East were ‘selling quickly’ and that American readers turned to literary works, such as those of Mahfouz, to find answers for their questions about the Arab world and the Middle East in general (see also section 5.3). Since the effect of these events on the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation began immediately following the events in 2001, it is argued that the post-Nobel phase should be from 1988 to 2000, the year prior to the attacks.

Based on this research, the phase boundaries of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation have been re-drawn as follows:

1- The initial phase (1908–1967). It consisted of two sub-phases:
a. The embryonic sub-phase (1908–1946).


4- The post-9/11 phase (2001–2014)—the last year analysed in this thesis.

Having re-drawn the phase boundaries of the field, it is important to note that the statistical analyses followed this new arrangement of the dates.

Moreover, the study has identified and critically examined the various positions available in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. Identifying these positions has helped the process of sketching the main trends and tendencies in the field and the types of capital that agents pursue. It is argued that these positions could be identified in fiction translation fields for other languages and hence facilitate the work of other researchers in the field of translation studies.

Another key contribution of this thesis is the complementarity of the qualitative and quantitative research methods employed. In addition to having mapped out the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation from a sociological viewpoint, the thesis has produced, and based its analysis on, the most exhaustive bibliography of translations published from 1908 to 2014 (see Appendix A). Given the lack of reliable, up-to-date data on English translations of modern Arabic fiction and of studies that correlate statistical data and social realities, this bibliography fills an obvious gap. The study has also made use of archival and historical materials, some of which have not previously been scrutinised, which facilitated in discerning some of the (co)producers’ motivations in taking part in the field, which may not otherwise have been identified. That is, this thesis, contrary to the majority of existing studies of this field of cultural production, bases its findings on empirical facts and statistical analyses rather than mere assumptions or unfounded arguments. This, in conjunction with the use of Bourdieu’s sociological concepts, has helped to provide a more nuanced, theoretically informed analysis of the determinants shaping the field, its agents and its products.

The thesis also reconstructed the field of Mahfouz’s fiction in English translation, specifically examining the (re)translations of his most controversial novel, ‘Awlād Hāratinā. The study explored and investigated how the (co)producers of these retranslations interacted, how they affected the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and how they were
affected by it and the forces operating in it. The agents’ struggles over legitimacy in the field were also examined by flagging their marks of distinction. As demonstrated in chapter six, paratextual elements do serve a purpose and communicate a narrative to readers, which sometimes contradicts the actual narrative of the translated work. Bearing in mind the reciprocal relationship between the readership and the (co)producers of translations, I can foresee the need for more research on the factors that inform the (co)producers’ production of paratexts and whether or not they are impacted by consumers’ expectations. Similarly, there is a need for more reader-response, reception and memory studies, entailing different methodologies, such as interviews and questionnaires, to evaluate what the Anglophone reading public reads from available translations of modern Arabic works of fiction, as well as when and why.

Researching the agents operating in the field and their practices has produced some results worthy of further analysis. The archival and historical data and some of the resources consulted in the course of this analysis indicated that some translators worked for British intelligence, the CIA or similar organisations. For instance, we read in Johnson-Davies’s (2006a, p.33) memoirs that Abba Eban was a ‘British army intelligence officer’ when he undertook the translation of Al-Hakim’s *Maze of Justice* (see section 4.3.2). Moreover, we read in the Heinemann archives at the University of Reading Special Collection that Johnson-Davies himself, the leading translator in the field in terms of number of translations published and contributions, used to work in the Political Agency of the British Foreign Service, which was stationed in Dubai (Johnson-Davies to Currey, HEB 23/8, 11 January 1970). In the Three Continents Press Archives at the Harry Ransom Centre in Texas, we read in the correspondence between Herdeck and Stewart (3CP, Box 13, Philip Stewart, 25 March 1996) regarding Raymond Stock, a prominent translator in the field and a biographer of Mahfouz that:

> He is a good poet, seems to know Arabic fairly well, has an M.A. from Michigan in Arabic Studies, etc. etc. However, *he is a mysterious guy; who knows but that he may be CIA or akin to that*. Be on your guard but don’t let him see or hear of this letter. (my italics)

The following line in the same correspondence reads: ‘As for Somekh - - [sic] he seems a [Raymond] Stock type’.¹ We also read in MacPhee (2015, p.49) that Donald Herdeck himself

---

¹Sasson Somekh, as previously stated, is an Iraqi-born Israeli academic and one of the leading translators of Arabic literature into Hebrew.
was an American ‘Foreign Service officer in Africa’. Such comments raise more than an eyebrow. However, due to the limitations of time, space and the orientation of the research, it was not possible to investigate the above observations in detail.

This study was primarily concerned with investigating the socio-cultural and historico-political determinants of translating one Arabic literary genre (fiction) into one world language (English) and published in one publishing medium (book formats). It may be possible to expand on this study by including other literary and non-literary genres, and examining its findings in relation to translations into other languages, published in other mediums (online, literary magazines, and international anthologies—an under-researched area in its own right—etc.). This could help elucidate more details about translation activity in the broader field of modern Arabic literature in world languages, as well as the agents operating in it and the logic underlying their practices. Examples of genres that could be further studied include English translations of Arabic children’s literature or of the oral tradition, which were excluded from this study due to limitations of space and time.

Furthermore, although the bibliography of English translations of modern Arabic fiction attempted to be as exhaustive as possible, it only included translations published in book form. It excluded translations published online, in literary periodicals or magazines—except in the case of Mahfouz. Moreover, data on translations published from 2015 to present were not included. It is, therefore, recommended that future researchers expand the existing bibliography and add translations of modern Arabic fiction works into other languages to it. It is noteworthy, however, that the appended bibliography could facilitate future research pertaining to canon formation of translated modern Arabic fiction in the Anglophone world, which could not be addressed here due to the practical constraints of the study. Of particular importance are issues pertaining to the role that translation plays in canon (trans)formation, legitimisation, marginalisation and exclusion, especially in relation to modern Arabic works (and authors) of fiction.

An important factor that ought to be studied separately is the potential impact of globalisation on the field and whether or not it affects the field’s dynamics and the logic of its structure. Such investigation would be most valuable if focused on both the proliferation of English translations of modern Arabic fiction and the reviews and commentaries on them published online. Another related area of research that deserves attention in future studies is to reassess, perhaps in a few years, the impact of the ‘Arab Spring’ and its aftermath on
the field and its activities, and whether or not they have ushered the field into a new phase of development.

Although this study has briefly discussed the emergence of several literary prizes in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation, especially during its last phase, it did not discuss them thoroughly because of the scope set for the research. The use of Bourdieu’s interrelated concepts of *illusio*, *misrecognition* and *symbolic violence* (see section 3.3.5) could help unravel the potential reasons behind the proliferation of literary prizes dedicated to modern Arabic fiction (and literature generally) in translation. This is particularly important given the concerns raised by some within the Arabic literary field, who perceive these prizes as ‘threats’ (Mehrez, 2008, p.12) and tools for domination. Examining the types of (translated) fiction works selected for literary prizes may decipher the misrecognised beliefs about—and symbolic violence exercised on—the Arab world and Islam in the Anglophone world. These beliefs have perhaps been constructed through literary illusion (i.e. the belief that literary texts constitute a reality that is preferable to and more accredited than the actual reality of the Arab world and Islam). The evidence presented in this study suggests that several modern Arabic works of fiction were translated more because of their sociological/anthropological significance than their literary value. Hence, such analyses could assess the extent to which the reality of the Arab world (and Islam, given the umbilical relationship between ‘Arab/ic’ and ‘Islam’) is perceived not for what it is but misrecognised and interpreted through certain translated fiction/literary works promoted through prizes in a way that is seen as legitimate.

The thesis detected a rise in the number of self-published translations, self-translated texts and retranslations in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation. While the study and its bibliography (see Appendix A) have identified these and briefly examined some of them, it did not offer an in-depth analysis given the orientation of the study. I can envisage the need for more prosopographical studies profiling self-translators/publishers, as well as other translators/publishers operating in the field. To the best of my knowledge, little research has been carried out on these topics, and they would offer fruitful subjects for future research. Moreover, further research on social network analysis of translation networks existing in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation could illuminate the complexity of relationships between various translatorial actors operating in these networks and their development through space and time.
Another ripe area for future research is the quality of English translations from Arabic generally—and of modern Arabic fiction specifically—and the (quality of) language practices of translators. In addition, it would be useful to investigate in further detail the effect of translations produced locally in the Arab world and whether they have as much influence on the field as those produced by mainstream international publishers. Production of a typology of publishers operating in the field is another area that deserves further study.

7.3.1 Some theoretical reflections

As far as the theoretical dimension is concerned, I was able to reflect on the key concepts of Bourdieu’s theory and the viability of their application, at least in part, in translation studies. Modern Arabic fiction in English translation has proved to be a supranational field, with agents operating from various social spaces. Because of this, Bourdieu’s conception of a field as a national arena has been critiqued (see section 3.6.2) and an alternative understanding proffered. It is hoped that this will encourage further research into the global nature of the fields of cultural production.

Moreover, a number of issues related to Bourdieu’s theory were raised that may open new avenues for future research. Notable among these are the following. Despite the emphasis of Bourdieu’s sociology on the idea that a struggle between agents is inherent in all fields of cultural production, it was shown that some agents operating in the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation resorted to cooperation in order to consolidate their positions and strengthen the field’s boundaries. This gave rise to a question: Could cooperation rather than confrontation create or alter the dynamics of a field and define the nature of interactions between its agents without having to disrupt its laws of functioning?

Another issue is to do with Bourdieu’s idea of capital (trans)formation. Although it is generally assumed that one form of capital could be transformed to another, it has been shown that the presence of capital may not always generate a positive outcome or facilitate the generation of more/other types of capital. For instance, Salma Khadra Jayyusi once reported that she received no support from Arabs for her project of translating Arabic literary/cultural material into 10 languages, despite the cultural and symbolic capital attached to her name and her work in the field (see section 4.4.7). Evidently, her cultural and symbolic capital could not be translated into another form of capital, due to, as Jayyusi puts it to Al-Shukr (2014, p.18), her being a ‘woman’. This gives rise to the issue of whether or not an agent’s gender could affect the acceptance and effectiveness of their capital at
any time. Similarly, Johnson-Davies’s proposal to publish a collection of Egyptian short stories in English translation was rejected by Doubleday (Hussein, 1997), despite all the capital he possessed. It could be said that the lack of expected financial gains from these proposals rendered Johnson-Davies’s forms of capital inactive. More research is, therefore, recommended on when, how and why forms of capital cease to be effective in a field of cultural production.

The study also reflected on the view that Bourdieu’s theory overlooks nonhuman agents and argued that Bourdieu’s sociology engages with nonhumans in a rather complex way (see section 3.6.2). I would like to note that the lack of a consistent metalanguage when it comes to understanding and conceptualising the sociological aspects of translation is an often-neglected problem that needs to be addressed. That is, one of the limitations of the ‘social turn’ in translation studies is the lack of a consistent metalanguage to reflect its concepts. For instance, the concept ‘nonhuman’ could be understood as meaning one thing in one study and something entirely different in another. It is worth noting that the concept of nonhumans was introduced to the field of translation through the studies that apply actor-network theory, either on its own or to complement another sociological theory—Bourdieu included. In light of the studies that applied ANT’s concept (see section 2.4.3 for a critique of Latour’s conception of the concept), nonhumans are to be understood as ‘anything that can induce, whether intentionally or not, an action’ (Buzelin, 2005, p.197). Technical artefacts, such as translation memories and computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools (Hekkanen, 2009, p.12), or written texts, like the source and target texts (Abdallah, 2012, p.24), for example, are also perceived as nonhuman agents by ANT advocates.

Moreover, there is a great deal of overlap between several other sociological concepts existing in the field of translation. By way of illustration, the concepts of doxa and norms share fundamental similarities—although it must be said that their application in the field of translation has proclaimed one of them agentless (i.e. norms) and the other as taking account of agents’ practices (i.e. doxa). This could be interpreted as a form of struggle to maintain the distinctiveness of a theory (and its proponents) in the field. Such practices in the field of translation serve to restrain its boundaries rather than widen them. That is, the

---

2 The postulation that nonhumans can predict, induce and/or plan actions or have intent, in the first place, is quite contentious. I have commented on the idea that nonhumans have intent and questioned the perception that this intent can, for example, influence any of the translation processes and/or translatorial networks and their construction in section 2.4.3.
existence of power relations within the field of translation studies ought be studied and evaluated, the theoretical distinction between concepts and theories illuminated and lack of consistent metalanguage bridged.

7.4 A self-reflexive note

At every stage of writing this thesis, I have been conscious of Bourdieu’s emphasis on the importance of self-reflexivity and the relationship between the observer and the observed. As such, I have endeavoured throughout to objectify my own objectifications through both reflexive and reflective practices. That is, I have tried to the best of my ability to be mindful of my personal and intellectual biases and my pre-conceived ideas and understandings of the field of modern Arabic fiction in English translation and its agents. Despite my endeavours to maintain an assiduous self-reflexive approach throughout this study, and despite seeking to safeguard the objectivity of the research through several reflective means, it could still be argued that this thesis is shaped by my dispositions. It is potentially the product of the kaleidoscope of my experiences and set of internalised beliefs, that is to say, my habitus.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A:
Bibliography of Modern Arabic Fiction in English Translation
1908–2014
1908


1932


1941


1943

1946


1947


1948


1950


1951


1952


1956

1. *The Modern Arabic Short Story: Its Emergence, Development, and Form. Translated by Abdel Aziz Abdel Meguid. Cairo: Dar Al-Maaref, pp. 148 [Text], 253 [Supplement]. Notes: 1. Originally a PhD thesis at the University of Manchester. 2. Supplement includes modern Arabic short stories, many of which are translated, at least in part, within the text. [Arab World, MIXED].
1957


1959


1961


2. *Modern Egyptian Short Stories*. Translated with an introduction by Louis Morcos. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop, pp. 100. **Note**: All stories included here were later republished in a different collection in 1982. The 1982 has five more stories, in addition to the ones in this collection. [Egypt, MALE].
1962


1964


1965


1966


1967


1968


1969

1970


1971


**1972**


2. *Mahfouz, Naguib [Egypt: Najīb Maḥfūẓ نجيب محفوظ]. Naguib Mahfouz: A Selection of Short Stories*. Cairo: Ministry of Culture and Information [**Series title:** Prism Supplement Series no. 5], pp. 95. **Note:** Translator’s name is not listed on the book. [**MALE**].

**1973**


2. *Afro-Asian Short Stories: An Anthology, Vol. II*. Cairo: Permanent Bureau of Afro-Asian Writers Afro-Asian Literature [**Series title:** Afro-Asian Literature Series], pp.343-464. **Note:** Editor’s name is anonymous. [**Arab World, MALE**].


1974


1976


1977


6. *Middle Eastern Muslim Women Speak.* Edited by Elizabeth Warnock Fernea and Basima Qattan Bezirgan, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press [Series title: Dan Danciger Publication Series], pp. xxxvi, 402. **Note:** Includes translations of modern Arabic short stories and novel excerpts. [Arab World, MIXED].

7. *Modern Egyptian Short Stories.* Translated with a critical introduction by Saad El-Gabalawy. Fredericton: York Press [Series title: Arabic Literature and Scholarship Series], pp. 81. **Note:** There exists a different publication with the same title, see 1961. [Egypt, MALE].

---

1978


1979


1981


1982

1. *A Selection of Egyptian Short Stories*. Giza: Foreign Press and Information Department, Egyptian Ministry of Culture, Editorial Offices of Prism Publications [Series title: Prism Literary Series, 1], pp. 253. **Notes**: 1. Editor’s name is anonymous. 2. Includes an introduction by Yusuf Sharouni. [Egypt, MIXED].


6. *Selected Egyptian Short Stories.* Edited by Rashad Rushdy. Cairo: Anglo Egyptian Bookshop [Series title: Lotus Books], pp. 144. **Note:** 1. Translators names are not indicated. However, the first nine stories are translated by Louis Morcos and the last five are translated by Rashad Rushdy. 2. Involves self-translation. **[Egypt, MALE].**


1983

1. *Abdullah, Yahya Taher* [Egypt: Yaḥyā al-Ṭāhir ‘Abd Allāh]. *The Mountain of Green Tea and Other Stories,* selected and translated by Denys Johnson-

Arabic title: جبل الشاي الأخضر [Jabal al-Shāy al-Akhḍar]. [MALE].


   **Arabic title:** [al- Ṣabbār: Riwāyah]. 
   **Note:** A PROTA Sponsored Translation. [FEMALE].

    **Arabic title:** [al-Sammān wa-al-Kharīf]. [MALE].

    **Arabic title:** [Bidāyah wa-Nihāyah]. [MALE].

    **Arabic title:** [al-Numūr fı al-Yawm al-‘Ashir wa-Qiṣaṣ Ukhrā]. [MALE].

    **Note:** Includes translated short stories and novel excerpts by Arab women writers. [Arab World, FEMALE].

1986

   **Arabic title:** [al-Ḥarb fı Barr Miṣr: Riwāyah]. 
   **Note:** A PROTA Sponsored Translation. [MALE].

   **Arabic title:** [Ḥikāyat Zahrah: Riwāyah]. [FEMALE].

   **Arabic title:** [Waqā‘i’ Ḥārat al-Za‘farānī: Riwāyah]. 
   **Notes:** 1. Includes an introduction by M.


5. Galal, Mohamed [Egypt: Muḥammad Jala‘l]. *Trial at Midnight: A Novel,* translated by Nehad Selaiha. Cairo: General Egyptian Book Organization (GEBO) [Series title: Contemporary Arabic Literature, no. 1], pp. 120. **Arabic title:** محاكمة في منتصف الليل [Muḥākamah?fī Muntasaf al-Layl: Riwāyah]. **Note:** Includes an introduction by Samir Sarhan. [MALE].


**Note:** Ulysses's Hallucinations or the Like is the first part of a trilogy novella by Saad Elkhadem, which was later published in full in 1988. [MALE].

**1987**


3. **Al-Sadr, Amina [Iraq: Āminah Haydar al-Ṣadr].** *In Search of Truth*, translated by M. N. Sultan. Tehran: Islamic Thought Foundation, pp. 28. **Arabic title:** الباحثة عن الحقيقة [al- Báḥitha ‘an al-Ḥaqīqa]. **Note:** The author is also known as Bint Al-Huda Al-Sadr. [FEMALE].


Modern Fiction], pp. 175. **Arabic title**: [Kānat Hiya al-ʿadʿaf: Qiṣṣas]. **Note**: The last three stories in this collection are not in the Arabic edition. [FEMALE].


1988


1989


6. *Arab-Canadian Writing: Stories, Memoirs, and Reminiscences. Edited by Kamal A. Rostom. Fredericton: York Press [Series title: Arabic Literature and Scholarship], pp. 72. Notes: 1. There is no mention as to whether the works were originally written in English or translated from the Arabic. As a number of these works were later reprinted in other
publications, it appears that some of them were not originally written in Arabic. Arabic title: كتّابات عربية كندية [Kitābāt ʿArabiyyah Kanadīyah]. 2. Includes an introduction by Richard Blackburn. [Arab World, Mixed].


1990


7. *Kanafani, Ghassan [Palestine: غسان كنفاني]. All That’s Left to You: A Novella and Other Stories*, translated by May Jayyusi and Jeremy Reed. Austin, TX: Center for Middle Eastern Studies, the University of Texas at Austin [Series title: Modern Middle East Literatures in Translation Series], pp. xxi, 128. **Arabic title:** ما تبقى لكم وقصص أخرى [Mā Tabaqqā Lakum wa-Qiṣaṣ Ukhrā]. **Notes:** 1. Includes an introduction by Roger Allen. 2. (Partial) Retranslation: ‘All That’s Left to You’, see 1983. 3. A PROTA Sponsored Translation [MALE].


Notes: 1. Includes excerpts of Tuqan’s poetry, translated by Naomi Shihab Nye with the help of Salma Khadra Jayyusi. 2. Includes an introduction by Fedwa Malti-Douglas. 3. A PROTA Sponsored Translation. [FEMALE].


1991


13. *Mahfouz, Naguib [Egypt: Najīb Maḥfūz]. The Time and the Place and Other Stories, selected and translated, with an introduction, by Denys Johnson-Davies. Cairo
and New York: American University in Cairo Press (AUCP) and Doubleday, pp. xi, 174.

**Arabic title:** [al-ʿAyn wa-al-Sāʿah wa-Qiṣaṣ Ukhrā]. [MALE].


17. Zangana, Haifa [Iraq: Hayfāʿ Zankanah]. *Through the Vast Halls of Memory*, translated by Paul Hammond and Haifa Zangana. Paris: Hourglass, pp. 79. **Arabic title:** [فﻲ أروﻗﺔ اﻟذاﻛرة: رواﯾﺔ [Fi Arwiqat al-Dhākirah: Riwaʿyah]. **Note:** The novel was later republished with some modifications and an added chapter, see 2009. [FEMALE].

1992


3. Al-Muwaylihi, Muhammad [Egypt: Muḥammad al-Muwayliḥ]. *A Period of Time*, translated by Roger Allen. Reading: Ithaca Press [Published for the Middle East Centre, St. Antony’s College, the University of Oxford, Series title: St. Antony’s Middle
East monographs, no. 27., pp. xv, 403. Arabic title: حديث عيسى بن هشام، أو، فترة من الزمن [Hadith ʿIṣā ibn Hishām, aw, Fatrah min al-Zaman]. [MALE].


12. *Maghreb: New Writing from North Africa. Edited, with an introduction by, Jacqueline Kaye. York: Talus Editions and University of York, pp. 118. Notes: 1. Includes stories and novel excerpts by Arab writers from Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia. 2. Publication of this book was made possible by a grant from the University of York, UK. [Arab World, MALE].


1993


1994

1. *Al-Amir, Daisy [Iraq: Dayzī al-Amīr]. The Waiting List: An Iraqi Woman’s Tales of Alienation, translated by Barbara Parmenter. Austin, TX: Center for Middle Eastern Studies, The University of Texas at Austin [Series title: Modern Middle East Literatures
in Translation Series], pp. xiv, 79. **Arabic title**: [Alá Lā‘īḥat al-Intīzār].

**Note**: Includes an introduction by Mona Mikhail. [FEMALE].


**Notes**: 1. Includes two introductions, one by Robert D. Burrowes and another by ʿAbd
al-ʿAziz al-Maqalih. 2. Includes a preface by Salma Khadra Jayyusi. 3. A PROTA Sponsored Translation. [MALE].

10. *El-Bisatie, Mohamed [Egypt: Muhammad al-Bisāṭ]. A Last Glass of Tea and Other Stories, translated, with an introduction, by Denys Johnson-Davies. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press (AUCP), pp. viii, 139. **Arabic title:** كوب الشاي الأخير وقصص أخرى [Kūb al-Shāy al-ʾAkhīr wa-Qiṣṣa Ukhrā]. **Note:** An extract of this book was published later in 1997 as part of the AUCP’s Little Books Series under the title: On the Brink. [MALE].

11. *Elkhadem, Saad [Egypt: Saʿd al-Khādīm]. Five Innovative Egyptian Short Stories: Khams Qiṣṣaṣ Miṣrīyah, translated by Saad Elkhadem and Saad El-Gabalawy. Fredericton: York Press [Series title: Arabic Literature and Scholarship] [Bilingual], pp. 25 [English]; 23 [Arabic]. **Notes:** 1. Although the title indicates that there are five short stories, the collection includes four short stories and a play. ‘Men’ is a play in four scenes. 2. ‘Men’ and ‘Nobody Complained’, one of the stories included in this collection, were originally written in English and the Arabic versions are translations of them. 3. Involves self-translation. [MALE].


1995


   Arabic title: [Arabah al-Dhahabiyah lâ Taš’ad ilâ al-Samā’: Riwāyah]. [FEMALE].

   Arabic title: [Dhâkirah lil-Nisyān: al-Zamān, Bayrūt wa-al-Makān, Yawm min Ayyām Āb 1982]. Note: Mémoires de la Méditerranée Project. [MALE].


   Arabic title: [Dimashq yā Basmat al-Ḥuzn]. [FEMALE].

   Arabic title: [al-Bi’r al-Ūlá: Fuṣūl min Sirah Dhātīyah]. Note: Winner of the King Fahd Center for Middle East and Islamic Studies Translation of Arabic Literature Award. [MALE].

   Arabic title: [Layālı̄ Alf Laylah]. [MALE].


1996


Arabic title: مملكة الغرباء: رواية [Mamlakat al-Ghurabā’: Riwāyah]. Note: Winner of the King Fahd Center for Middle East and Islamic Studies Translation of Arabic Literature Award. [MALE].


1997


Literature and Scholarship] [Bilingual], pp. iv [Introduction], 24 [English]; 21 [Arabic].

**Arabic title: [الحركة المباركة] [al-Ḥarakah al-Mubārakah]. [MALE].


12. *Tawfik, Mohamed M. [Egypt: Muḥammad Tawfīq]. The Day the Moon Fell, translated by A. Amin. Cairo: Dar El-Fikr El-Arabi, pp.176. **Note: Half of the stories included in this collection were originally written in English. [MALE].


19. *Modern Palestinian Short Stories in Translation. Edited by Izzat Ghazzawi and Claire Peak. Jerusalem: Palestinian Writers’ Union, pp. 160. Notes: 1. Translator(s) of each individual story is not identified. However, reference is given to the fact that these stories are translated by Abdul-Fattah Jabr; Tawfiq Ammar; Fuad Banoura; Walid Abu Bakr; Manal Kettaneh and Izzat Ghazzawi. 2. Published under the auspices of the Norwegian Authors’ Union: The NORAD-PCP Series. [Palestine, MIXED].

20. *Voices of Change: Short Stories by Saudi Arabian Women Writers. Edited, with a preface and an introduction, by Abubaker Bagader, Ava M. Heinrichsdorff, and Deborah S. Akers. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. xii, 171. Note: Translator of each individual story is not identified. However, reference is given to the fact that the majority of stories have been translated by the editors and additional ones by Abdul-Aziz Al-Sebail. [Saudi Arabia, FEMALE].


10. *Short Fiction by Saudi Arabian Women Writers*. Compiled and translated by Aman Mahmoud Attieh. Austin, TX: Department of Middle Eastern Languages and Cultures, University of Texas at Austin [Series title: Literature East and West, 29], pp. 170. [Saudi Arabia, FEMALE].


2000


17. **The Complete Mahfouz Library: The 20 Fiction Volumes of the Nobel Laureate in English.** **Note**: Combined edition, see also 2006 and 2011. [Egypt, MALE].

2002


2003


2004


2005


2006


2007

   Note: Includes an afterword by Michael Beard. [MALE].


World Fiction], pp.229. **Arabic title:** [بآء مثل بيت .. مثل بيروت: رواية: Bā’ Mithla Bayt .. Mithla Bayrūt: Riwyah]. [FEMALE].


19. Khalifeh, Sahar [Palestine: Sahār Khalīfah]. The Image, the Icon, and the Covenant, translated by Aida A. Bamia. Cairo: The American University at Cairo Press (AUCP) [Series title: Modern Arabic Literature], pp. 183. **Arabic title:** صورة وأيقونة وعهد قديم [Ṣūrah wa-Aiqūna wa-’Ahd Qadīm]. **Note:** Winner of the Naguib Mahfouz Medal for Literature. [FEMALE].


24. **Mahfouz, Naguib [Egypt: Najiṣ Mahfūṣ]. Three Novels of Ancient Egypt: Khufu’s Wisdom, Rhadopis of Nubia, Thebes at War. New York: Everyman’s Library, pp. xlix, 591. **Arabic titles:** [عبث الأقدار, translated by Raymond Stock]; رادوبيس [Rādūbīs, translated by Anthony Calderbank]; كفاح طيبة [Kifāh Ṭībah, translated by...


2008


**2009**


18. *In a Fertile Desert: Modern Writing from the United Arab Emirates. Selected and translated, with an introduction, by Denys Johnson-Davies. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press (AUCP), pp, xii, 114. [Emirates, MIXED].


[Amāma al-ʿArsh: Hiwār Maʿa Rijāl Miṣr min Minā Ḥattā Anwar al-Sādat]. [MALE].

[149x689]MALE

[216x689]MALE


2010

1. Abdel Aal, Ghada [Egypt: غادة عبد العال]. I Want to Get Married! One Wannabe Bride’s Misadventures with Handsome Houdinis, Technicolor Grooms, Morality Police, and Other Mr. Not Quite Rights, translated, with a note, by Nora Eltahawy. Austin, TX: Center for Middle Eastern Studies, University of Texas at Austin [Series title: Emerging Voices from the Middle East], pp. xiv, 160. Arabic title: عائزة أتزوج [ʿA�yzah Atjawaz]. Note: Includes an introduction by Tarek El-Ariss. [FEMALE].


4. Al-Berry, Khaled [Egypt: خالد البري]. Life is More Beautiful than Paradise: A Jihadist’s Own Story, translated by Humphrey Davies. Cairo: The American University at
Cairo Press (AUCP) [Series title: Modern Arabic Literature], pp. xi, 189. Arabic title: الدنيا أجمل من الجنة [al-Dunyā Ajmal min al-Jannah]. [MALE].


24. Saeed, Mahmoud [**Iraq**]: Maḥmūd Saʿīd. World Through the Eyes of Angels, translated by Samuel Salter, Zahra Jishi and Rafah Abuinnab. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press [**Series title**: Middle East Literature in Translation], pp. ix, 204. **Arabic title**: ﺍﻟﺪﻧﯿﺎ ﻓﻲ ﻋﯿﻮن اﻟﻤﻼﺋﻜﺔ [**al-Dunyā fı̄ Aʿyun al-Malāʾika**]. **Note**: Winner of the King Fahd Center for Middle East and Islamic Studies Translation of Arabic Literature Award [**MALE**].


---

2012


The outcome of a workshop organised by the International Prize for Arabic Fiction for emerging Arab writers. [Arab World, MIXED].

14. *Homecoming: Sixty Years of Egyptian Short Stories.* Selected and translated by Denys Johnson-Davies. Cairo: The American University at Cairo Press (AUCP) [Series title: Modern Arabic Literature], pp. vii, 359. **Note:** ‘Some of the translations in this collection have been published previously’. [Egypt, MIXED]


2013


15. Douaihy, Jabbour [Lebanon: Jabbūr Duwayhī جبور ديويه]. June Rain, translated by Paula Haydar. Doha: Bloomsbury Qatar Foundation Publishing, pp. 310. **Arabic title:** مطر حزيران [Maṭar Ḥazı̄ran]. **Note:** Shortlisted for the International Prize for Arabic Fiction. [MALE].
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Appendix B:
Bibliography of Naguib Mahfouz’s Fiction in English Translation
(Novels, Novellas and Short Stories)
1960


1961


1962


1964


1966


1967

1968


1969


1970


1971


1972


1973


1974


1977

   **Note:** An excerpt from *Mirâmar*.


5. ‘The Mistake’, translated, with notes, by Elizabeth Warnock Fernea and Basima Qattan Bezirgan, in Middle Eastern Muslim Women Speak, edited by Elizabeth Warnock Fernea and Basima Qattan Bezirgan. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press [*Series title:* Dan Danciger Publication Series], pp. 95-123. **Note:** An excerpt from *Bayna al-Qaṣrayn*.


### 1978


2. *Miramar*, translated by Fatma Moussa-Mahmoud, revised by Maged El-Kommous and John Rodenbeck. London: Heinemann Educational Books [*Series title:* African Writers Series, no. 197 and Arab Authors Series, no. 9], pp. xv, 141. **Arabic title:** ميرا مار [*Mirâmar*]. **Note:** Includes an introduction by John Fowles.


### 1979

1981


1984


1985


1986


1987


1988


1989


1991


1992


2. *Sugar Street*, translated by William M. Hutchins and Angele Botros Samaan. Cairo and New York: American University in Cairo Press (AUCP) and Doubleday [Joint Publication],


### 1993


### 1994


### 1995


### 1996


1998


1999


2000


2001


2003


3. Thebes at War, translated by Humphrey Davies. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press (AUCP) [Series title: Modern Arabic Writing], pp. x, 211. Arabic title: كفاح طيبة [Kifāh Ṭībah].

2004


2005


2006

2007


2008


2009


2010

1. *In the Time of Love*, translated by Kay Heikkinen. Cairo: The American University at Cairo Press (AUCP) [Series title: Modern Arabic Literature], pp. 122. Arabic title: [عصر الحب ['Aṣr al-Ḥubb].


2011


2012