

The Problematics of Literary Translation between Scholars and Creative Writers: Haddad's Example

Prof.Sabbar S. Sultan
Dr. Nurma Nawaf Yousif A l Zayed
Middle East University,
Amman, Jordan

Abstract

The present paper seeks to study Fawaz Haddad's novel, Al Mutarjim Al Khain (The Treacherous Translator)(2008) as representing the problematics of literary translation which constitutes its main theme.No doubt this is a very old and controversial topic about which there is no specific consent among practitioners in the field of literary translation. It comprises some basic sections. First, it gives a brief account of the different novels dealing with translators and translations, especially those published in the twentieth century. The second is about relevant issues in translation studies as raised by different scholars in the field. The third is devoted to giving some views about Fawaz Haddad's novel and its protagonist highlighting the irreconcilable contentions about literary translation. The fourth explores how the conflicts faced by the protagonist reflect closely the issues brought up by scholars in literary translation. The last one is a very brief synopsis of the remarks inferred from exploring the various aspects of Fawaz Haddad's novel and the precarious position of its protagonist.

Key words: *literary translation, treachery, freedom, alienation*

إشكالية الترجمة الأدبية بين المختصين والمبدعين
رواية المترجم الخائن لـ"فواز حداد" أمودجا

الملخص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة رواية "فواز حداد" " المترجم الخائن " (2008) بوصفها عملا إبداعيا إشكاليا ، إذ تطرح إشكاليات ترجمية انطلاقا من تيمتها الرئيسية ، التي تعد موضوعا قدينا جديدا ما يزال النقاش فيه محتدما إلى يوم الناس هذا. وقد اقتضت الخطة الإجرائية للبحث مناقشة الإشكالية في خمسة محاور أساسية ، تناولنا في الأول فكرة عن الروايات التي تتناول تيمة الترجمة والمترجمين وخاصة الترجمات التي ظهرت في القرن العشرين ، وفي المحور الثاني تناولنا الموضوعات ذات الصلة في دراسة الترجمات كما تم عرضها لدى المترجمين ، وفي الثالث ناقشنا الآراء الخلافية للترجمة الأدبية التي انصبت حول رواية " المترجم الخائن " . أما المحور الرابع فقد خصصناه لمناقشة مسألة الصراعات التي خاضها البطل في رواية " المترجم الخائن " في علاقتها مع الموضوعات التي أثارها المترجمون . وكان المحور الأخير خاتمة رصدت أهم الملاحظات المتعلقة بالروائي " فواز حداد " من جهة وموقف بطل الرواية المحفوف بالمزالق من جهة ثانية .

الكلمات المفتاحية : الترجمة الأدبية, الخيانة, الحرية, الاغتراب

Nothing is more serious than a translation

Jacques Derrida

Introduction

Worldwide narrative fiction has tackled throughout its relatively long history many types of social sectors---educators, academics, workers, philosophers, scientists, artists, peasants, spies, politicians, athletes, priests, warriors, government officials...etc. Out of this long list, the translator's absence as a major character in fiction is conspicuous. Only in the last sixty years or so does one notice a growing attention paid to the figure of the translator as he/she grapples with his/her thankless and bitter-sweet job. This is largely due to the prevalent misconception that translation itself is a derivative work. As has been rightly pointed out, it is "much less creative than the act of writing an original work"(Lang,P.2009:2). It is also believed that "there are also some constraints" which are "much more

than those in an original work"(Boarse-Bier,J.&Holman,M.1998:2).In his comprehensive history of translation, Lawrence Venuti shows that 'invisibility' is the translator's lot whether in the publishing rights and contracts or even in the position of the translator's name in the bibliographies where his/her name always follows the original author. It is only when there is a remarkable extent of fluency and transparency that there is a brief reference to and appraisal of the translator's work. His conclusion is apt, "the translator's invisibility is thus a weird self-annihilation, a way of conceiving and practicing translation that undoubtedly reinforces its marginal status in British and American cultures"(1995:27).It is in the light of such contradictory views regarding the act of literary translation and outcomes that Fawaz Haddad's novel *Al Mutarjim Al Khain (The Treacherous Translator)*(2008) is investigated. The study stresses the fact no matter how competent the literary translator may be, the final achievement will always remain subject to different controversies and interpretations in accordance with the perspective adopted by the reader or recipient.

Novels dealing with translators and translations

Given this shaky position of the translator in actual life, it is not surprising to find his/her representation in fiction or drama is scanty. Two representative works about this topic are Marguerite Duras's autobiography, *L Amant(The Lover)*(1984), a love story between a fifteen-year old girl and a Chinese young man who is twelve years her senior. As the two belong to two different cultures, it is expected to find that the problem of translation and interpretation engages the forefront in the corpus of the novel. The same

holds true to the American Nicole Mones and his best seller, *Lost in Translation* (1998). Here the translator, Alice, gets entangled in the Chinese language and culture and their bizarre worlds.

However, it is in the third world and its great interest in the post-colonial discourse that one notices the emergence of a striking number of novels dealing with translation and translators at work. The Argentinean novelists in the last twenty years explored many issues and difficulties translators encounter in their profession: Pablo de Santis's *The Translation*, Nester Ponce's *The Interpreter*, Salvador Benesda's *The Translator*, Lahiri's "Interpreter of Maladies", Lee Siegal's *Love in Dead Languages*, Demetrinez's *Mother Tongue*, Ward Just's *The Translator*, in addition to the Korean-American Suki Kim's *The Interpreter* (Morau, Ch.2011:192).

Out of this relatively long list of works written within a very short span of time, Pablo de Santis's experiment appears to be of prime importance for the purposes of the current study. His *The Translation* originally written in Spanish (*La traducción*) tackles the repercussions, if not nightmares, of what it means to be a translator. The main character in this novel, Miguel De Blast, a specialist in scientific translation, informs the attendants of a scientific conference about how translation sometimes turns into a compulsive and irresistible obsession that cannot be checked, irrespective of the immense efforts exerted. He tells his audience about a case of a translator whose situation is not completely strange for those involved in the field of translation. He gives an account of a woman whose translational activities have rendered her more or less abnormal. Whenever she hears a word or a statement in one language, her mind automatically becomes preoccupied

with the equivalent of that word in the corresponding language. As a neurologist, he identifies her case as that of "echolalia in which she sees herself compelled to translate every word she hears"(Basnett,I. 2000:2). It goes without saying that this is laudable especially in the field of instant translation, but in her case it has become an intolerable burden so that there is a dire need for seeking a therapy by means of hypnotic sessions. It is through this way that she can overcome the nightmares of translation. Thus the novel is concerned with some of the hazards of this job that entails many sacrifices and efforts.

The Sudanese novelist, Laila abuLaila presents in *The Translator* (2000) her own experience as a Muslim expatriate studying and working in Scotland. Her Sudanese husband dies in a car accident in Aberdeen. She gets married to her colleague, the agonistic Ray, who holds positive views about Islam and its people. In her case it is not only the linguistic and cultural barriers that have to be subdued in this marriage, but also the general view of life and its meanings. The translation in Laila abuLaila's book acquires a further and unexpected dimension—the ability to "translate and transfer to the other one's feelings"(Shafiq,M.2007: 334).

What characterizes Fawaz Haddad's *The Treacherous Translator*(2008) compared to the works already mentioned, is that here the emphasis is laid on the conflict between the opposing demands of the translated text and the translator's idiosyncrasy and subjectivity as will be shown in the following pages.

Relevant issues in translation studies as discussed by scholars in the field

This in turn brings us to the question of the marginality and invisibility of the translator. Definitely there are many seminars, symposia, meetings and annual conferences held in different parts of the world about the different tasks and challenges facing the translator. They are meant to upgrade and substantiate the role of the translator in his/her daily activities. The main task informing all these attempts is the view related to the impossibility of reading all texts in their own languages. B.J.Epstein brings home this point:

If translation is treason, then I think it is a necessary sort of treason. Language often separates writers from their readers, and readers from information or enjoyment... We translators can only do our best to make the treachery as small as possible. (April,17,2006)

Equally in the same vein runs the view that conceives the translational field as an actual betrayal of all parties concerned: reader, author and translator. All this is commonly practiced for fear of not being loyal to a certain norm presumably inviolable,"As we betray the author we are automatically betraying our variegated readership... Lastly, we betray our best hunches in favor some pedestrian norm"(Rabassa,G. 2005:4).

In this regard, the German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher comments on the polar opposition between the demands of both author and reader and the translator's own predicament in satisfying the two. In a lecture he gave in 1813, he raised this issue openly " Either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader towards him;or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the author towards

him"(Lefevere,A.1977:74).Obviously, as the following pages will show,Haddad's premise opts for the first suggestion, namely taking into account the needs and expectations of the reader even if this comes at the expense of the ethics and basic norms of translation.

However, Haddad's view, albeit exaggerated and at times far-fetched, reiterates the attempts of some translators in this regard. Some of them, for instance, are keenly aware of the subtle balance between the requirements of the translational act and the translator's own preferences. The American translator Norman Shapiro, to choose only one salient example, finds in an interview held with him that the successful translation is an art of "collaboration with the author". He adds that, "certainly my ego and personality are involved in translating and yet I have to try to stay faithful to the basic text"(Kratz,D. 1986: 27).This oscillation between the subjective and objective planes of experience brings to mind the common duality of language/ culture. It is a problem that brings the reader to the controversial claims and judgments of the literary translator in considering himself/ herself as the only person or "de facto concerned with differences, not just with language...but with the same range of cultural factors" (Tymoczko,M. 1999:21).

The above-mentioned arguments are just examples of the plethora of difficulties, fallacies, challenges besetting the translator's work. What is most striking here is the charge often raised against the translator that he/she is essentially "a traitor", unfaithful to the original text. Indeed one of the prominent practitioners of literary translation in the present age, Roger Allen, sees himself ironically as "the happy traitor" and acknowledges that literary translation is "a maximal act of interpretation"(Allen,R.2010:472), involving

a number of specialists in both source language and target language. The Italian maxim 'the translator is a traitor' is related to the ancient conception of the translator when he "was the only voice of communication between states and that he was literally taking his life into his own hands everyday he went to work" (Bellos, D. 2011: 2).

Before expounding the fictional treachery depicted in Haddad's novel, it is relevant and necessary to show that in actuality there are translators who find it hard to keep themselves aloof and detach themselves from the work being translated whether in its events, characters or situations or intellectual orientation. A glaring example of this is the Chilean –American novelist Isabel Allende (b. 1942). At a certain moment in her life she worked as a translator of romance novels from English into Spanish. At the end she was fired for making unauthorized changes to the dialogues of the heroines, "to make them less passive and have more independence" (Axelrod-Contradu, J. 2011: 18). In other words Isabel Allende implements the tenets of both feminists and advocates of post-colonial discourse. Whether consciously or not, she embodies what Gayatri Spivak argues elsewhere, "the act of translating into the third world language is often a political exercise of a different sort" (Spivak, G. 2004: 378). Such translational activities put in practice the assumption that "translators are not only neutral impersonal transferring devices. Their personal experiences-emotions, motivations, attitudes, associations—are not only allowable in the formation of a working TL text, they are indispensable" (Cary, M. 1949: 438).

A brief account of Fawaz Haddad's novel and its protagonist

Fawaz Haddad's *Al Mutarjim Al Khain* (*The Treacherous Translator*) (2008) represents many ideas and judgments related to translation and its prescriptions and proscriptions. By means of involving the protagonist, Hamid Salem in the intricacies of translating contemporary novels from English into Arabic, the novel explores the different manifestations of post-colonial discourse firmly present here. He is not content with the neutral act of transferring words from one language into another. He aspires to include his own visions and understanding of what is right and wrong in his translation. The process of modifying, deleting and tweaking costs Hamid his sole means of living and his family, even though at heart he feels quite satisfied that he is doing his readers and perhaps the translated texts an invaluable service. Choosing a pseudonym, Halfawi, Hamid finds himself in a better position financially and socially even though his discontent remains unabated. He realizes regretfully that he has betrayed his own hunches and priorities. Now he finds that his new translation is totally lifeless and lackluster. It is between these two poles and their wide-ranging implications that the lessons or morals of this 'treachery' or unfaithfulness are unfurled.

Indeed the translator shown in the novel, Hamid Salem, concretizes fully the debate about being faithful/unfaithful to the original text and responding to the translator's inner voice and preferences. His problem lies in his strenuous pursuit of freedom in a craft that abounds with a host of restrictions and prohibitions. His physical description suggests that he is not destined to practice a mechanical act of replacing one phrase by another in the target language, a

point that is stressed from the very outset, "He is of the sort that does not think of anything, theoretical or empirical, that has anything to do with abstract ideas"(p.12).

The author identifies Hamid's merit or, to be more exact, demerit in his sturdy belief that he is not totally right in his predilection but also he is ready to pursue this enterprise, irrespective of the drastic consequences that might ensue. Again the author's preliminary hints and notes are helpful in showing his propensity in translation which runs counter to what is expected of the translational act to be—precision, skill, mastery of both source language and target language and faithfulness to the original text. Hamid Salem pinpoints the formidable problems facing the translator when he does not curb his inner voice concerning the necessity of intervening in the events and thoughts to be translated into another language. Although the author himself (Fawaz Haddad) is a graduate of the Department of Law, his arguments about the feasibility and limits of translation are convincing enough. He appears to be well-versed in the field of translation and its burdens. Hamid or his pseudonyms tackle many thorny issues in the theory and practice of literary translation:

His problem rests in his conviction that he is often right. This is something which is not always safe, particularly in the field of translation. It is a work that demands persistence, flexibility, manipulation and rectification of error or even perhaps of what is right. This is felt through the recourse to dictionaries, ransacking their meanings and artfulness in transferring dirty slangy words into Arabic or dropping

them altogether from the text...It is a work that necessitates cudgeling one's brain or even hesitation.(p.13)

The arguments raised here about the types of burdens and troubles the translator has to put up with in his daily practices of this exhausting job show unmistakably that the author is quite familiar with the translational field and its rewards and buffets. In professional terms, Hamid Salem is qualified enough to be a successful translator. However, his sole drawback is that he follows his own hunch and understanding of the possibilities and requirements of what translation should be. He always has in mind the possible harmful effect of translation on readers in the target language (Arab readers) and the cultural factors imported by translation. His guiding principle in literary translation is simple enough: he allows himself to intervene in the translated text and inserts the modification he deems necessary—intellectually, aesthetically and morally. As he sums up this matter," I do not only translate the book coming from a different place and time, but also I translate what ties it to the current place and time ; both get dovetailed and intermingled"(p.89).

The outstanding feature of his translational practices is this unprecedented identification between the translator and the literary material in question. His ruminations show that he considers himself a co-producer, a collaborator, not simply a vehicle for transferring the text into another language. By implication, his work is devoid of the sense of secondariness characterizing that of his peers:

Sometimes I become so much attached to the characters and get involved with

I begin to share their pains, and pity their misfortunes
or injustice inflicted on
them. I like to give them another chance. This drives
me to reconsider the novel,
its events and style, and modify things which the
author has unintentionally
overlooked.(p.89)

Admittedly, this is not a traditional way of translating literary texts. Hamid is assuming here the position of the critic who finds himself entitled to add, delete or modify many important details in the novel he is translating into Arabic. His justification for such malpractices is that he believes firmly that he is doing the text a service and safeguarding his target readers the harmful impacts of foreign cultures. Underneath, one notices that when Hamid is stripped of all these sloganizings, overpromises, and raising the banner of gracious acts and interests, he is essentially a poor budding translator in a competitive place. He seeks to attain a niche, a safe place for securing his right of freedom. In this particular side, he evokes some remote "images of the characters in the fiction of Kafka, Camus and Dostoyevsky,"(Qandil,Kh.2103). Uncommon and hazardous as it is, this position adopted by the young translator is not entirely new. Already there have been considerable theoretical arguments and debates about the need for 'domesticating ' texts so that they would be accepted by their new readers. Diego Saglia, for instance, traces this practice and its far-reaching effects on the translated material "early nineteenth-century "domestications" of Austen's novels seemingly neutralized their quintessential Englishness. If this feature made Austen's narratives appealing to foreign audiences, it also

appeared to hinder their diffusion"(2013:74).However, Hamid's practices are flagrant violations of the alphabet of translation, irrespective of the justifications of their validity or invalidity.

Hamid's conflicts and their relation to scholarly arguments about literary translation

Arguments of this sort and practices of the type Hamid recommends point to the intricacy and ramification of the translation of literary works. Obviously it is no longer a neutral activity. InHaddad's novel, the practicing agent is not bound by the original text for the sake of warding off its harmful and alienating effects. Hamid's abortive attempt belongs to what Burke calls "cultural translation", a term that resonates with the arguments of cultural criticism. As he puts it," it is a work that needs to be done by individuals and groups to domesticate tradition and the strategies and tactics they employ"(Burke,P. 2009: 58).

No doubt Hamid capitalizes heavily on the inaccessibility of the translated literary novels in this part of the world (the Arab region).As in the actual case of the Chilean writer, Isabel Allende, Hamid feels free to manipulate many details in the translated texts. He sees that the true translation is the one that encompasses the original work and bestows upon it certain 'cosmetic touches'.What he means by that is ,"the romanticization of the sentimental situations, the suspense of the crucial moments, a streak of melancholy characterizing certain ruthless and sensitive characters and a reasonable extent of joy marking his carefree and happy characters"(p.45).

As a remarkable study of literary translation and its general cultural context, *The Treacherous Translator* sheds

illuminating light on the translator's moments of self-encounter and self-exploration. Hamid is unable to rationalize, let alone, justify the reasons and motivations that drive him to this unequal confrontation with the translation establishment and its set norms and rules. The reader could guess that he himself could have been a creative writer if his circumstances had been favorable enough. This is perhaps the reason behind putting himself on equal footing with the original writer. He keeps ruminating about the privilege of the creative writer to say what he/she likes while the translator is completely bound by what he translates. The stark irony is that he is seen by his colleagues and directors as an inexperienced lackluster young man who fails to fulfill what is required of him. He in turn has his own enterprise about literary translation, a point that evokes the practices of writers like Isabel Allende or Robert Graves. In fact these two have written their own texts although they ostensibly translate from one language into another. Already there have been references in this article to the former, but there is a need to add a few things about the latter. One of the main arguments of poetic translation and how it is preferably done by poets inevitably evokes the name of the British poet and translator, Robert Graves. It is a tautology to say that he is even critical of Fitzgerald's translation of Omar Khayyam's *Rubaiyat*. He finds that his own translation is closer to the original Persian text, even though it turns out to be no more than "a made-up one, having been taken from Heron-Allen's 1899 work"(Martin,W.&Mason,S.2011: 128).The reason behind Graves's new attempt is the fact he has his own interpretation of Khayyam's world. For instance, the translator sees" the universal cup in the poem as the symbol of the concave sky and the wine as the symbol wisdom of

the whole world" (Abdulla-hel-Baqui, G. 2012:2). The purpose behind this casual note is that all what has been said about Graves's speculations of the translated text holds true to the position of the fictitious personae in the present novel. Hamid Salem keeps reiterating queries and arguments which are vital to the translational act:

Why does my translational competence compel me to intervene in the style of the

novel? What is the motive? Is it believable that none has ever thought of the trouble

I endure in introducing these modifications and improvements by means of which I

distill my talent? (p.21)

The only clue he could provide in this regard is what would happen if he ceases his customary practice of inserting a number of changes within the corpus of the target language (Arabic). In his imagination, the inevitable outcome of the absence of such a strategy is to have:

a dull and awkward translation that keeps the author's text intact, whether

good or bad, lest there should be a trespass. It decrees the translator should

stand bound, bowing his head respectfully. What would one get? A cold text,

lacking warmth and taste... That reasonable extent of intrusion is the arbiter not

only of the translator's mastery of the details of both English and Arabic, but

also of the penetration of the deep recesses of the work itself. (p.25)

It is interesting to note that Hamid's apology for his recurrent interpretations and intrusions transcends the

traditional scope of translation and finds that the creative work itself is an act of translating the outside world in one way or another:

Is not creativity throughout all ages a transference of the images of the real

concrete life into other visionary, audible and readable forms? A transference in

which every act has its own tools? To be more general, is not that essentially a

process of translation?(p.21)

The protagonist here (and perhaps the author behind him) echo some scholars in the field of criticism and cultural translation and their emphasis that almost every activity practiced by man involves an act of translation or understanding of what we see or perceive. Although put in an exaggerated way, Bassnett's argument moves in this way, "*all* texts are translations of translations of translations and the line cannot be drawn to separate reader from translator"(Bassnett,S.2002:91)(our italics).

If translation is viewed by its theorists in the way suggested in Bassnett's statement, it becomes logical and appropriate that Hamid takes the act of translation as simply a collabratory one in that he is entitled to include his own views within the translated text. Hamid never stops reminding the reader of the incalculable sacrifices offered by the translator, even though they are often depreciated by both publishers and readers alike:

His work as a translator moving from one language to another is no more

than an incessant shifting between two different linguistic contexts. Thus

intentionally or not, he adds a further burden to his job:
that of carrying
thoughts and modes of living from one environment to
another , from
one society to another...As regards its hidden aspect,
it is the ever-widening
gap between people. Therefore instead of becoming a
means of
communication, language becomes a means of
mystification. In the original
language the author writes in his own language to a
reader he/she knows.

It is logical that he does not take into account an
unknown reader about
whom he/she has little information.(p.23)

All these justifications are meant to be Hamid's rationale or
excuse for following a totally different procedure in
translating texts English novels into his own Arabic
language. It is a way of translating that does not rule out the
translator's interests, priorities and predilections. His
apology is definitely reader-oriented in that he conceives his
act as a cultural must, given the tacit requirements of his
readers:

The very unknown reader of the original author is
known to the translator. Thus
the main priority of the translator is to seek bridging
the gap between environments
and languages. This could be attained by means of
exerting his inferences on the
original work through his own type of translation.(p.22)

Obviously Hamid's uncommon practices in translation
capitalize on the public's ignorance of the original works or

their inaccessibility. However, this ethically and professionally unfavorable practice or even malpractice is not destined to last long. There is a moment when the truth is disclosed. It is the time when Hamid undertakes to translate a novel by a famous African writer. In the original text, the protagonist, after getting his degree, stays in Britain and gets married to his white lover. The translator's exasperation springs from the fact that the protagonist is a sort of traitor in his refusal to go back to his country and serving it. Thus Hamid "changed the conclusion so as not to mar a great novel. Thus it had a positive meaning when the black protagonist returned to his black Africa, leaving his white mistress behind"(p.23).

This is a climactic moment in Hamid's career as a translator since from this moment on all his earlier practices in translation are disclosed.. He has to leave this field and finds himself and his family in financial straits. The only option open before him is to hide his real identity and choose different pseudonyms by means of which he gets success , wealth, and the admiration of his reading public. Now he has to say adieu to his former conception of the literary translations as " a means of dialogue with the translated texts, interrogating them, disclosing their faults if they do not fit our societies"(p.38).It is true that there are those who assign to the translator a further task ,that of being "an author in his own right"(Zanotti,S. et al,2011:7).However, this new capacity should not neutralize or distort the authority and intellectual orientation of the original text as seen in Hamid's distorting practices.

This is in brief the main postulate of Haddad's novel: apology and promotion of the view that sees translation as an activity that involves further tasks other than the mere act

of transferring a particular text into another language. This new controversial role of the literary translator assumed by Hamid is not exempt from grave consequences. Inevitably he will sooner or later find himself in direct clash with the establishment that does not permit such unnecessary violations. Sharif Husni, the influential and awe-inspiring journalist attacks Hamid relentlessly, stripping the latter of any serious intent. Husni's bitter criticism and intimidation of the budding translator centers on "distorting novels when he translated them with idiosyncratic and even exhibitionistic tendencies that eventually "render them dubious"(p.18). His advice, or rather implicit imperative, is that Hamid is to enroll in intensive translation courses that "would instruct him the alphabet of translation and lessen his incompetence"(p.18).

Faced with a massive pressure, the poor translator has to resign and hide under the pseudonyms Halfawi and later Hafnawi. If Halfawi is a false entity and a mere pretext for Hamid's survival, the same holds true to his literary translations. Halfawi assumes a different character and literally follows what is expected of him to do in translation. The real person, so to speak, can only express his dissatisfaction and exasperation at such servile practices. In other words, the author here spells out vividly the dichotomy between the conscious and unconscious egos in an irreconcilable contradiction. Hamid is in fact resentful to see his alter ego's full conformity to the outside proscriptions and their debilitating impacts," Halfawi's translations have become a routine work that needs no skills. Their superficiality cannot hide the sentimental weaknesses, while the inherent naivety does not provide any space for interpretation"(p.160).

However this peaceful cohabitation and symbiotic relationship between the professed and concealed sides of Hamid's character will not last. A crucial moment in the evolution of the novel looms when his alter ego, Halfawi, translates an American novel that is openly hostile to the Arab and Muslim sensibility and feelings. It is at this moment that Hamid's concealed ego can no longer remain so. Here the intellectual level of the whole book becomes manifest. In complete contrast to what people do and expect of translation, the situation in Haddad's novel is topsy-turvy. This ironic situation is shown by the cultural critic Abdulla Ibrahim in his statement that "If treacherous translation is needed for the protection of society and native culture, it is also needed for safeguarding the local society against aggression transferred by faithful translation" (Ibrahim, A. 2011:323). Hamid's description of the practices of his pseudonym (Halfawi) betrays the sharp split in his ego between what he wants and what society needs," His (Halfawi's) work does not only betray incompetence, short-sightedness, naivety, but also sheer failure to create even the tiniest ingenious risk, let alone a creative translational risk, encompassing the power of imagination and creativity concurrently" (p.156).

Concluding remarks

The ordeal of the translator exemplified by Haddad's work lies in this confusing and irreconcilable duality: self-gratification vs. social and cultural discontent or personal dissatisfaction vs. public approval. There is no compromise or rapprochement between these two polar opposites if we read the novel in its own terms. In both cases, the translator's dismay and bewilderment remains unabated or unresolved.

Haddad's novel embodies the major obstacles facing the translator of literary works and their cultural and epistemological challenges in the third world. Exaggerated and farcical at times, *The Treacherous Translator* is very serious in its vivid presentation of this intricate world of literary translation and its priorities. Indeed, the seriousness of (*The Treacherous Translator*) can be felt through its different and striking exploration of the manifestations of the literary translation..Indeed it brings to the fore the arguments about the centrality of the translator and the dire need for getting rid of the "invisibility" or marginality often attributed to the translator.

Works Cited

- Abdulla-hel-Baqi,G.(2012). 'Rubaiyat-e-Omar Khayyam: A New Approach to His Philosophy',*Khulna University Studies*,Khulna University, 2(1):1-5.
- Allen,R.(2010). 'The Happy Traitor: Tales of Translation', *Comparative Literary Studies*, Penn State University47(, 4):472-486.
- Axelrod-Contrada,J.(2011).*Isabel Allende*. NY: Marshall Cavendish Corporation.
- Barnett,I.(2000). ' The Translator as Hero'.(www.biblit.it/translator-hero).Retrieved on July,13,2014.
- Bassnett, S.(2002). *Translation Studies*. London & NY: Routledge.
- Bellos, D.(2011).*Is That a Fish in Your Ear?* Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Boorse-Bier, J.& Holman, M.(1998).*The Practices of Literary Translation:Constraints and Creativity*.Manchester: St.Jerome Publishing.
- Burke, P.(2009).*Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Cary, M. et al 1949).*The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Epstein,B.J.W.(2006). 'Translational Treason'.[www.brave-new-words.blogspot.com /2006/translation treason](http://www.brave-new-words.blogspot.com/2006/translation%20treason).Retrieved onOctober,10,2014.
- Haddad, F.(2008).*Al Mutarjim Al Kha'in (The Treacherous Translator)*. Beirut: Riyad al-Rayyes Books
- .Ibrahim,A. (2011).*Assardwa Ali'trafwa Al Hiviyya (Narrative, Confession and Identity)*.Beirut: Arab Centre of Studies.
- Kratz, D.1986)."An Interview with Norman Shapiro",*Translation Review*,19:27-28.

- Lang, P.(2009).*The Problems of Literary Translation: A Study of the Theory and Practice of Translation from English into Spanish*.Berlin: International Academic Publishers.
- Lefevere,A.(1975).*Translating Poetry:Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Martin, W. et al(2011).*Edward Fitzgerald's Ruba'iyyat of Omar Khayyam: A Famous Poem and its Influence* .London:Anthem.
- Morau,Ch.(2011).*Cosmodernism:American Narrative,Late Globalization and the New Cultural Imaginary*. Michigan :University of Michigan.
- Qandil,Kh.(2013).'Khiyanat Al Mutarjim (The Translator's Treachery), *Emirates Today* August,29.
- ,Rabassa, G.(2005).*If This Be Treason: Translation and its Discontents: A Memoir*. NY: New Directions
- Saeed, E.(2005). 'Darj Ism LailaabalailadhmnLai'hatJai'zat Orange Al Britanyyah'(Adding the Name of Lailaabalaila to the Short List of British Orange Award Nominees).*Addustour*,June 6,Amman.
- Saglia, D. (2013)'Austen and Translation:National Characters,Translatable Heroines and the Heroine as Translator', *Novel*,Duke University Press,46(1):73-92.
- Shafiq, M..(2007). 'Ardh Al Majallat al Amrikyahwa AlBritanyyah (A Review of American and British Periodicals).*Fosoul*,The General Organization of Books ,Cairo(70):333-334.
- Spivak,G.(2004).''The Politics of Translation'.Ed. Lawrence Venuti,*The Translation Studies*.2nd edition. London . &NY:Routledge:369-388.
- Tymoczko,M..(1999).''Post-Colonial Writing and Literary Translation'.Ed. Susan Bassnett &Hansil Trivedi *Post-Colonial Translation*. London & NY: Routledge:19-40.
- Venuti,L..(1995).*The Translator's Invisibility: History of Translation*. London &NY : Routledge.
- Zanotti,Serenella. et al.(eds.)(2011).''The Translator as Author': *Perspectives on Literary Translation*. London:Transaction Publishers.