

Nahdah Translators and the Politics of Modernization in Colonial Egypt

A Paratextual Analysis of Darwinism as a Reform Project

Farah Magdy Zeina
Cairo University

Received: 20/02/2020

Accepted: 18/05/2020

Abstract

This paper examines the modern Nahdah translation movement in Egypt, the end of the 19th century and turn of the 20th century, a period characterized by conflicting ideologies and reform projects. The paper examines western ideologies, imported via translation, as modernization projects. It presents a case study of Salama Moussa, a radical Nahdah intellectual, by focusing on his agenda for reform in the age of decolonization. The paper critically analyzes paratextual elements of Moussa's *Naẓariyyat al-tatannur wa-asl al-insan* (Theory of Evolution and the Origin of Man) published in 1928 as a case of 'concealed translation'. Situating the text in context reveals the alignment of the translation with norms of the translation policy in a given socio-historical moment.

Key Words

Paratexts, concealed translation, modernization projects, norms, decolonization.



Introduction

This paper examines the relationship between translation and modernization projects in Egypt under the British colonial rule and during independence. The study of translation as a modernization project at the end of the 19th and turn of the century examines the conflict and struggle between “emergent and competing notions of modernity” present at the heart of reform and nation building in the aftermath of the British occupation (Selim 2008: 148). The study highlights how translation is used by Nahdah translators to advocate and popularize their own political and social agendas for modernization to the public. I examine the case of Salma Moussa (1887-1958) an Egyptian radical reformer, evolutionist and science popularizer in the modern literary Nahdah. Moussa is of a Christian background and is a liberal radical thinker, who opposed traditional values and authorities. This has rightly placed him in conflict with Arab centered ideologies and pan-Islamists, which he thought their strategies to be regressive and backward. Moussa thought that the British were catalysts of progress and modernization in Egypt (Egger 1986: 5). His modernization project is thus conclusively dependent on translation and borrowing of European models. Moussa translated three principal European works, which he aimed to adopt in the course of Egyptian political, economic and social reform and popularize among the public. The three works are: *Treatise about Socialism* in 1913 (*al- Ishtirākīyah*), *The Theory of Evolution and the Origin of Man* in 1928 (*Naẓariyyat al-tatawwur wa-asl al-insan*) and *Psychological Studies* (*Dirasat Saykūlugīyah*) in 1956. In addition, he translated and borrowed many works by European and non-European philosophers and intellectuals such as *Ghandi and the Indian Movement* in 1934 (*Ghandi wa’ al-harakah al-hindīyah*), Grant Allen’s work, *The Emergence of the Idea of God* translated in 1912 (*Nushū’ Fikrat Allah*), *Bernard Shaw* in 1957 and his autobiography *Those Who Taught Me* in 1953 (*Ha’ulā’i’ aalamūni*).

Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, the source text at hand, had been translated by Shibli Shumayyil in 1884 as *Ta’rib li-sharh Bukhnir’alamadbbab Darwin* (A translation of Büchner’s explanation of Darwin), *al-Muqtataf* started to popularize and report on the theory of evolution as early as 1885, while Ismail Mazhar translated the first verbatim translation of Darwin’s book in 1918. Unlike his predecessors, Moussa’s translation is an accessible and popular account in the age of the Arabic press, journalism and political parties.

In this paper, I will first situate the text in context, by introducing the context shaping the translator's decision and influencing the process of selectivity in accordance to the period's translation policy. I will thus examine the diverse strategies of bicultural Nahdah intellectuals on translating and borrowing from the west, in order to demonstrate the strategies, present at the heart of the Nahdah translation movement between 'easternizers' and 'westernizers' and their potential modernization projects under the impact of colonial hegemony. Second, I will conduct a critical analysis of Moussa's paratextual elements which reveals the strategies he used to domesticate the text to the public target readers.

1. Culture and Ideology in Translation

The word 'Nahdah' marks a period of modern renaissance, revival and enlightenment in the Arab world. A period that is understood to have been initiated by contact with the west in the form of the "scientific expedition" of Napoleon Bonaparte in 1798 and later on, the occupation of Egypt. Throughout the colonized history of Egypt, starting from the "scientific expedition" of Napoleon Bonaparte in 1798, Muhammed Ali's Nahdah up till British colonialism (1882-1936), Egypt experienced many modernization and social reform projects in statecraft and governance that were closely linked to the hegemony of western knowledge and taking place in a colonial context. Under the British occupation, Egypt witnessed transformations starting from its legal system to the reshaping of rural space. Thus, an understanding of the intercultural contact that resulted in modernization and cultural shifts, via translation, between western knowledge production and colonialism helps in the examination of processes, methods and politics of translation and modernization projects under colonial hegemonic rule.

It can be argued that the attitude of the east towards the west, through translation and borrowing, is one that is based on the clash between two different cultures that "had historically clashed and continue to do" (Faiq 2004: 9). It is an authoritarian relationship marked by refusal of the discourse of the dominant master to the dominated/colonized inferior in the colonial context (Faiq 2004: 9). The translation movement, at the turn of the century stressed the concern that importing western knowledge production would further confirm European

supremacy and present hegemonic schemes to dominate Egypt, culturally and ideologically. By translating western knowledge and thought as models for modernization, they believed that they could fill the imagined literary, scientific, and philosophical void “that had left their world lagging behind the European and had enabled Europe to dominate them” (Tageldin 2011: 15). It was through internalizing eastern backwardness and the need for translating and adopting strategies of governance such as scientific thinking and industrialization that the Nahdah intellectuals shaped models of modernization. This is an example of what Robyns (1994) calls a “defective” and at once “defensive” translation relation, whereby the colonized nation translates from the colonizer and import knowledge which is lacking. In this case, the dominated culture acknowledges that it lacks necessary constituents to renew and modernize itself, it then turns to foreign cultures to import some elements. However, the imported elements do not necessarily remain the same but are assimilated, transformed in accordance to target Norms and sometimes they are completely concealed and hidden.

Culture and Norms represent assumed value systems and beliefs adopted collectively and shared by a particular social group. On crossing borders through translation, ideological beliefs of the two different cultures engage in power struggle. Past traditional interpretations resurface to influence the present, while novel modes seep to change and replace these old strategies. Translation becomes used as a method by which ideological and cultural appropriation could take place. Venuti refers to this purpose as an act of violence and manipulation of translation. Putting forward the notion of domestication and foreignization, he argues that domestication is a manipulative act of translation, which intends to seep foreign ideology of the source text and its cultural values, through rewriting the text in terms of what is familiar and unchallenging to target Norms. Venuti refers to this violent act of domestication as related to its very purpose and why a certain text was selected to be translated in the first place, while other texts were excluded because they do not serve “domestic interests” (Venuti 1994: 201-2). Domesticating the foreign text to fit in a pre-existing target culture is the outcome of existing cultural hegemonic practices and hierarchies of dominance and marginality, which determine the processes of importation, production and reception of texts.

Whatever difference the translation conveys is now imprinted by the target-language culture, assimilated to its positions of intelligibility, its canons and taboos, its codes and ideologies. The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar; and this aim always risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign text, often in highly self-conscious projects, where translation serves an imperialist appropriation of foreign cultures for domestic agendas, cultural, economic, political. (Venuti, 1996: 196)

1.1 Translation and Modernization Ideological Trends

Translation was at the core of modernization and reform projects. Nahdah intellectuals translated, adopted and borrowed western knowledge production, to their agendas for the aim of social reform and modernization. Translating under cultural imperialism, distinction between what constituted ‘western’, ‘European’ and ‘foreign’, on the one hand, and Arab, Islamic modes of thought and practice on the other hand was a major cause for the emergence of conflicting ideologies of modernization. In order to understand the functioning of Nahdah intellectuals/translators in translating western knowledge production, it is essential to first position them according to their ideological orientation.

According to Jacquemond (1992) translation paradigms, do not have to actually coincide with political colonial or decolonialization moments, but they work within the hegemony of colonial and post-colonial cultural exchange. First, during the pre-colonial and colonial period, on translating from a hegemonic culture to a dominated one, westernization was the prevalent translation and modernization trend. In Jacquemond’s terms it is referred to as ‘naturalization’. This trend first appeared in the years 1830-1840 under Muhammed Ali, who trained the first generation of Egyptian translators. During that period, the notions of colonialism, imperialism and cultural hegemony were nonexistent. The first generation of Egyptian translators, under Muhammed Ali, understood the urgency of narrowing the gap between the west and the east in terms of technical and intellectual areas. Translation originated for a political purpose rather than a mere interest in the western/ European culture. Translations were mainly in fields of history, applied sciences and geography for the purpose of nation-building. Translation of literary

works appeared later on, to import new forms of literature such as theater, which the Arabs did not know before colonial contact.

During the colonial era, up until the beginning of the 20th century, westernization was the dominant trend in translating western knowledge production. Westernizers acted as cultural mediators who integrated western knowledge production and worldview with the purpose of imitating the west to build a modern and rational state governed by the scientific method. Free transposition of western knowledge production took forms of ‘adaptations’, ‘arabization’, ‘egyptianization’ in translation which reflected cultural independence from the west, even under political and economic colonial domination. Toury refers to these forms as ‘Assumed translation’, with ‘adaptations’, ‘cultural readings’ and ‘interpretations’ falling under ‘Concealed translation’ (Toury 1995: 32). Translation in this sense, did not strictly follow the original source text, but transformed ideas and domesticated the text in style, form and content to fit the target culture’s Norms, like Salama Moussa (Jacquemond 1992: 3). The original text was not dealt with as a whole text that ought to be fully transmitted, rather translators transmitted what they thought would serve their purpose and made it familiar in all aspects to the Arab target readers. Translations of the source western texts also took the form of cultural ‘readings’, which incorporate borrowing of ideas, methods and interpretations of the original text, forming a metatextual layer of readings of the original source text embedded in and applied to different sociocultural moments (M. Elshakry 2013: 9). This approach also appeared in the presentational elements of the translated texts, such as titles and cover pages which concealed the name of the original author. According to Venuti domesticating translations, by concealing their foreign origins is a dangerous act of translation to the target language and culture more than foreignizing translations. By deeply domesticating, the translator surrenders the target readers to foreign ideology “by deeply absorbing the foreign into the domestic and familiar body” (Tageldin 2011: 3). Venuti refers to this as ‘inscription’ of foreign culture and values to serve specific domestic agendas (Venuti 1994: 201-2). This viewpoint does not contradict with the notion of translation as a target oriented and norm-governed activity, because the ultimate objective of translation would be achieving a reasonable degree of target acceptability with regards to Norms without manipulating the target readers and intentionally concealing the origins of

the translation to the extent of blurring the boundaries between the domestic and the foreign.

After the first half of the twentieth century in Egypt, the translator's need to produce acculturated and more accurate translations increased. Translators, who were originally writers, like Taha Husayn, translated western production without further investigation to produce an accurate translation with the aim of setting a model of adaptation for the Arabic language and style, to elevate it to meet the level of the western. The translator in this case prioritizes translating western classics, thus imposing western value system without regarding the target/national Norms.

By the mid 20th century, the easternization trend appeared more clearly. This trend was marked by a remarkable increase in translations. This increase in translations throughout the liberal age (1919-1952) which continued after the political independence of Egypt (1952- 1967) was marked by openness to, as well as cultural independence from the west. The purpose of translations was directed to reaffirm the national language and national identity. Much resistance and awareness were present on different levels of the translation processes. First, the translator became aware of western authority and hegemonic practices in all aspects and forms (linguistic, cultural, and national). Secondly, this awareness worked to place the translation in the frame of "Occidentalism", a mode of knowledge which elaborates how non-westerners perceive and present the west. Easternizers thus, filtered and selectively appropriated what gets translated and imported from the west according to the target culture's "specific needs and priorities" (Jacquemond 1992: 15). Then, within the translation process, easternizers acted on additionally appropriating the western text to be accepted in the target culture. According to Jacquemond, translation in the decolonization context works to reaffirm, re-appropriate and re-examine the national cultural identity, in order to make a distinct differentiation between the self and the other (Jacquemond 1992: 7). Easternizers modernized and borrowed from the west but within prescribed limits and regard to Norms (Sharabi 1970: 7). They possessed a reformist position and were often in conflict with Muslim conservatives, who completely rejected translating from the west. Their aim in translating from the west was Arabic language standardization and reform. Translators following this trend include al-Aqaad, al-Mazni, Mohamed Hussein Haykal and Zaki Mubarak.

They imported from and were influenced by the western literary tradition while doing so to modernize and standardize the Arabic language and literary tradition (M. Elshakry 2008: 726).

2. Paratexts in Translation

Paratextual material constitute an independent part of the text, but nonetheless an integral part of it as they form a mediation channel between the text and the reader of that silent text he/she will embark on reading. Analyzing paratextual elements is complementary to the study of Norms in translation as means to draw out translation Norms in a specific moment in history. Paratexts act as secondary sources carrying the translators' statements, thus revealing their observed Norms. They also act as integral elements in the presentation of the product (translation) to public reception, as they reveal how translations were presented. Thus researchers are able to deduce translational Norms (preliminary, initial and matricial) conventions, target readers' expectations regarding a translation, based on the statements of the translator and the concept of translation approved by a specific culture at a specific moment in history.

Paratextual analysis reveals the ideological trends and orientations present within a specific sociocultural period. The Egyptian Nahdah context and its adoption of westernization as a modernization project trend in the moment of independence offers an example of how western ideology was present in translations of Nahdah intellectuals. The strategies employed in the paratexts also reflect the target market's needs and its degree of acceptance or rejection of a translation. Thus, it distinguishes between the ideology of the translator and the employed strategies he/she uses to translate and communicate this ideology to the target culture. For instance, if the translator's ideology and reform project are based on borrowing a western model, paratextual analysis reveals the strategies used and the decisions made by the translator to transmit and present this model to the target reader, by either domesticating and concealing the text's origins or foreignizing it. Paratexts are also at the heart of the issue raised by Venuti on the translator's visibility/invisibility, as the presence of a translator's preface foregrounds the role of the translator, who is involved in an active decision-making process while

translating. The analysis adopts Venuti's argument that domesticating a translation, concealing its foreign origin, and presenting the text as a non-translation, is more likely to surrender the translator and readers to foreign ideology "because it so deeply absorbs the foreign into the familiar body" (Tageldin 2011: 3).

3. *Concealed Translation*

Toury identifies translation with regard to Norms by introducing the concept of 'assumed translation' as "all utterances which are presented or regarded as [translations] within the target culture" (Toury 1995). This emphasizes how according to Toury, translation is target-oriented. This definition offers a wide scope to include concepts like concealed translations, under which falls instances of adaptation, influence, imitation and plagiarism, and pseudo-translations. Toury regards pseudo-translations and concealed translations as manifestations of a normative attitude towards translation in specific cultures in specific periods. Pseudo-translations are "texts which have been presented as translations with no corresponding source texts in other languages" (Toury 1995: 40). Pseudotranslation is a non-translation that is presented as a translation and as a result is assumed to be a translation for as long as possible. While according to Toury, it suffices to say that another text exists which may serve as a source to mark the presence of a case of concealed translation. Toury argues that concealed translations are pinpointed when:

Knowledge of the existence of a text in *another* language and culture, which a target-language text is taken to have replaced, may also serve as a trigger for adopting the assumption that that text is a translation. This last possibility is of paramount heuristic importance for cultures, or historical periods, where translations exist as concealed facts — whether it is only the presentation of a text as being of a derived nature which is not customary or whether the very distinction between translations and non-translations is not culturally functional and is hence blurred (Toury 1995: 70-71).

Toury thus states that concealed translation can be identified when a target text replaces a source text. While Tahir Gürçağlar (2010: 173) argues that concealed

translation is unrestricted to complete textual replacement but also incorporates forms of intertextuality, like the case of Moussa. “The decision to produce concealed translations was not only governed by a commercial drive but also by an implicit or explicit wish to resist translational Norms upheld in the centre of the literary polysystem.” (Tahir Gürçağlar 2008: 301). Competing notions of modernization reform projects, political concerns and censorship could all influence that decision as well.

Toury’s approach allows us to study translation as a historically conditioned act, which changes according to the surrounding context. Contextualization of the analysis explains the personal and/or social Norms from which these translations emerged. Translations, in this case are examined unrestrictedly for what they ‘are’, instead of what they ‘should’ be. Therefore, concealed and pseudo-translations are not considered unethical practices; they are worthy of examination to account for the decisions made by prominent Nahdah translators, who heavily borrowed western knowledge from their source texts to employ it as valid reform models in their modernization projects. Paratextual material thus shapes the reception of the translation or non-translation by means of how the translation product is “packaged and presented” (Tahir Gürçağlar 2002: 45).

4. *Naẓariyyat al-tatawwur wa-asl al-insan (Theory of Evolution and the Origin of Man):
A Concealed Translation*

Concealing a translation could be alluded to commercial, as well as ideological and thematic reasons. Processes of “discovery” and/or “justification” of a concealed translation could first be revealed via the cover of the text as the outermost paratextual element. First, on analyzing the cover of the text *Naẓariyyat al-tatawwur wa-asl al-insan* (1928), it represented a problematic attitude towards the issue of authorship, the cover of *Naẓariyyat al-tatawwur wa-asl al-insan* (1928) presents Moussa as the author of the book, as the cover carries the statement “authored/penned by Salama Moussa” (tā’līf) without any mention of the origins of the text or recognition of the original author (Darwin) and the other authors whom Moussa gives a summary of their contribution to the theory (Lamarck and Spencer). The absence of the basic concept of copyright and copyright law

implementation afforded translators no limitations in rewriting and reproducing a work, with little regard to the issue of authorship. The history of copyright incorporated many liberal definitions of translation that mostly worked in favor of the translator. For instance, early cases of understanding translation in relation to copyright asserted that the linguistic and the literary form and meaning of a source text are subject to change by the translator, who communicate them in a different language and context. Translation was seen as ‘form recreation’, thus an independent object from the “underlying work on which it is based” (Venuti 1995: 13). Yet, form cannot be so easily detached from content, unless the translator’s new linguistic style produces new sense and meaning of the content (Venuti 1995: 13). Since Moussa’s translation did not attempt to produce new meaning, but to communicate and adopt the western model presented in the source text, he intended the message to be assimilated and domesticated to meet target Norms and values, not only for the preservation of the translation’s ideological function, but also in order to appeal commercially to the target readers. Even if Nahdah translators were aware of the concept of ‘form recreation’, Moussa’s translation remains a case of concealed translation because it did not aim to primarily import the form of the source text primarily (like some Nahdah translators did) but focused on importing western scientific knowledge and western ideological values that the text stood for.

Second, the name of the original author, Darwin, was notorious for challenging conventions, beliefs and provoked fear of adopting western irreligious modernity adding up to further western hegemony and the elimination of eastern traditional values. Therefore, the name of the original author was concealed from the cover page by the translator, as a decision of choosing to embrace Norms within the limits of national culture’s value system. The appearance of Darwin’s name on the cover would have projected a different identity that is western vis-à-vis the domestic identity the Egyptian author/translator represents. The second edition’s cover reveals that the blurred boundaries between original and translated work is a norm that is also shared by the publishers. Typically, the paratextual elements appearing on the cover page should emphasize the status of the translation as a mediated text (Tahir Gürçağlar 2010: 173). However, even if in this case the publisher knew the true origins of the book, “its status as a translation was culturally inactive” and it acted as an Egyptian original text (Tahir Gürçağlar 2001: 128). Instead the work is presented as an indigenous text to cater to market needs,

as the target readership would not at that socio-historical moment purchase a book marked by a western colonial ideology. This draws attention to the agency of the publisher who is responsible and involved in the presentation of the text. Furthermore, the division between indigenous and imported knowledge production was not clear at that sociocultural moment in Egypt. The stability in Arabic book market and the presence of Arabic language in education throughout the colonial period left a limited space for translation. This allowed Nahdah translators who consumed foreign books in English and French to integrate western value system and intellectual production “through and by the national language” (Jacquemond 1992: 4). All of that preserved the position of concealed translation as a norm of knowledge importation, popularization and reform/modernization prospects among translators in that period.

Third, intertextuality was among strategies used to popularize the theory. Moussa’s translation was initially a translation of Darwin, whom he encountered in *al-Muqtataf* and in Shibli Shumayyil’s translation. Moussa incorporated the accounts of Lamarck and Spencer as well in order to offer Egyptian target readers, both professionals and later on to nonprofessionals, a complete, popular and accessible narrative of the theory. Among the reasons for which the status of Moussa’s text remained unidentified was due to the text’s intertextuality and unsystematic strategies of borrowing western knowledge production. Moussa’s translation, like many other texts translated during the Nahdah retained their position in the Egyptian literary repertoire and market as concealed translations. Nahdah intellectuals used terms associated with translation like borrowing, adaptations and appropriation to describe their own indigenous writing. Concealed translations as such are incorporated and examined as cases of cultural borrowing under descriptive translation studies and they are not regarded as acts of plagiarism, “forgery” or “fraud” (Apter 2006: 220).

Fourth, along with the name of the author/translator, the title, which appears on the cover page of *Nazariyyat al-tatawwur wa-asl al-insan*, does not indicate or present the book as a translation. It does not state for instance “A Selection of Translation of the Theory of Evolution and the Origin of Man”. Nor does it translate the title of Darwin’s original text, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. Moussa uses generalization and anonymity as strategies to translate the title in order to avoid giving a clear

indication of the text's origins. Anonymity occurs when there is intentional absence and lack of information about the source author or text origins in the presentation of the translation (Genette 1997: 42).

It is worth noting that Moussa was influenced by the work of the Rationalist Press Association, in London, and gained a sense of experience in the importance of educating the public on banned books. The association was established to publish reasonably priced books, which the majority of mainline publishers refused to deal with due to their attack on religion and sensitivity of the topics discussed (Egger 1986: 22). The association was founded in 1885, by a group of British secularist thinkers T. H. Huxley, the biologists E. Ray Lancaster, Julian Huxley, Arthur Keith, J. B. S. Haldane, who were all agnostics and engaged in popular writing to promote evolutionism. Although they were all materialists, they diverged and disagreed on the extent to which scientific materialism, in form of eugenics and Darwinism, ought to be implemented in social life and in solving political issues. This divergence is similar to the one which occurred to Moussa's Egyptian Socialist Party, which points out that "rationalism ceased to be a coherent ideology in this period" and failed to offer social and/or political solutions in the early twentieth century (Bowler 2014: 309). Moussa aimed to replicate the role of the association by popularizing the controversial debates on science and even more employ western scientific knowledge and its ideology as an instrument of modernization on the hands of the emerging professional middle class.

Fifth, in the moment of gaining independence, concealing translations was a strategy used because Egyptian target readers, a limited class, chose the books to read with reference to their literary origins. Having been colonized by Britain, target readers would be resisting and defensive against the colonizing culture and its cultural products, which they consider its translation a further act of hegemony and westernization. Thus, at that socio-historical moment, translation as a genre did not witness much popular tolerance and acceptability. According to Jacquemond, "just as translation is affected by cultural dependency, so it is by cultural domination" (Jacquemond 1992: 6). Albeit this, *Nahdah* translators adopted a free attitude towards translation which domesticated or "naturalized" western knowledge production. Domestication as a translation strategy "is a clear sign of cultural independence from the west, which remained preserved among the educated Arab elite until the beginning of 20th century despite political and

economic domination” (Jacquemond 1992: 3). However, translation and importation of western knowledge from the west was still seen negatively among target readers. Therefore, marketing the text as a translation from the colonizer to the colonized culture would be an unsuccessful strategy of popularizing the theory of evolution.



Figure 1: Cover of *Nazariyyat al-tatannur wa-asl al-insan* (The Theory of Evolution and the Origin of Man), second edition, (Cairo: al-Matba'a al-'Asriyya, 1953)

4.1 Moussa's Matricial Norms

Moussa's organization of chapters offers an insight into how his additions and omissions contributed to the formation of a translation underlying his modernization project. Moussa created an abridged version of Darwin's text and also added the contribution of Lamarck and Spencer. The book could be divided into five sections. The first section gives an introduction on the history of the theory of evolution. The second section summarizes evolution in pre-human society, evolution of planet earth and briefly summarizes evolution in plants and animals; this section is based on Lamarck's contribution. The third section summarizes Darwin's contribution with its notion of 'survival of the fittest' and comparison between humans and apes. The fourth section focuses on evolution in human society by focusing on the contribution of Spencer. The fifth section involves additions on the target culture, Egypt, and on the future of human evolution.

As Moussa declared in the first preface, he domesticated the text by omitting names of plants and animals that are unknown to the target reader because they do not exist in the target culture. He depended on large-scale omission to produce an abridged summary of the theory, depending on synthesizing the work of Lamarck, Darwin and Spencer respectively. This enabled him to produce an abridged version that domesticated the theory at the beginning of the translation by linking it to Arab medieval evolutionary thought of the Persian scientist and philosopher Ibn Miskawayh and the Arab Historian Ibn Khaldun, in his introductory chapters on the history of the theory. Towards the middle of the book, Moussa presented the western contribution of Lamarck, Darwin and Spencer, in which he depended on omitting parts he considered irrelevant and would not serve aspects of social and political reform. He thus summed up chapters, which he considered irrelevant to the main theme of his book, such as chapters detailing the technicalities of evolution in animals, plants and birds, as he did not intend to focus on the mere scientific (biological and geological information) aspects of the theory. These chapters are relatively shorter and limited in comparison to chapters discussing and tracing evolution in man, human societies, language, struggle for existence and the future of human societies. The translation was rewritten in the new standard journalistic language and format (chapters, headlines and paragraphs), to be accessible and reached by a large

sector of Egyptian public readers and to challenge the language expectations of readers for whom the theory remained incomprehensible due to the archaic style in which it had previously been written in. This contributed to achieving the purpose of popularization of the theory of evolution and what it stands for.

Second, Moussa added some aspects to domesticate the theory to meet target culture's Norms. Although Moussa's translation is drawn from British accounts of the theory, he domesticated the translation for target readers by tracing it back to medieval Arabic thought, and Arabs who hinted at the theory. For instance, Ibn Tufayyil, and al-Qazwīnī in his book *The Wonders of Creatures* (*'agaab al-Makhloukat*) which gave hints about the theory by explaining that the first level of existence is earth, then matter, then plants and animals and the last level is that of human beings. Moussa also mentioned Ibn Miskawayh and Ibn Khaldun, who introduced a treatment for sociological problems from an evolutionary perspective. Moussa comments that had Ibn Khaldun used simpler language, his outlook would not have differed from what western philosophers have reached at Moussa's time. The first chapter of Moussa's book consists of an inclusive historical overview of the theory. He devotes half of it talking about the role of Arabs and Greeks, who originated and insinuated the theory years before Europeans. While narrating the Arabic history of the theory was used as a strategy of domesticating the translation, he makes it clear that his translation offers the recent modern contribution of European scholars, Lamarck, Darwin and Spencer.

Towards the end of the book, Moussa included additional information by introducing new chapters on Egypt to create a modernization text carrying his own reform agenda. Moussa adds chapters like "The Origin of Civilization" and "The Origin of Religion" which foreground the leadership position of Egypt among world nations, as it had preceded other nations in its civilizational progress and its monotheism. Although Moussa states that these chapters are not intended for creating a nationalist notion, he asserts that this opinion is shared and expressed by and among English and American scientists and that it is not only his personal viewpoint (Moussa 1928: 198). He also states that proof of Egypt's civilizational superiority could be found in history. Moussa aimed at producing a translation that carries a nationalist and modernization overtones, by reminding the target readers that Egypt had once been a superior civilized nation and the western world bears witness to this. The strategy is meant to inspire readers to

construct an Egyptian identity that is aware of its modernization and reform capabilities by observing the Pharaonic and Egyptian history. Moussa, furthermore adds chapters after the ones discussing Egyptian civilization to explore the future of human evolution. This creates a sense of continuity and motive for Egyptians to modernize and build their nation on principles of industrialization, science and equality. As Renan explains “strategic ideas is the fact of sharing, in the past, a glorious heritage and regrets, and of having, in the future, [a shared] programme to put into effect” (Renan 1990: 10). Moussa thus managed to transform a western source text into an example of a *Nahdah* modernization translation. In order to achieve the purpose of his translation, Moussa’s text was presented to be accepted as an original work. This is due to the fact that translations that solely aimed to transmit and borrow western ideological values, were conceived as a western cultural hegemonic practice and were viewed as creating anarchy of values by target readers. Moreover, the topic itself of Darwinism and evolution was viewed to be “creating anarchy of values” which Moussa sought to avoid (Tahir Gürçağlar 2001: 145).

5. The Translator’s Prefaces

The translator’s preface marks the informed personal decisions that are governed by the translator’s purpose. These decisions mark the initial Norms, which the translator makes in relation to the translation policy. They thus narrow down the different purposes that could be given to the translation of a source text by the translator to his/her specific purpose for selecting the text to be translated. The translator, who negotiates the purpose of his translation in the preface, is not only being made visible, but also the sociocultural context is being foregrounded for the readers. This obliges the reader to view the translation beyond the linguistic restrictions, as it makes the reader aware of the various factors involved in the translation process, departing from the perception that translations are constructed upon contexts (Selim 2009: 56). Venuti acknowledges that the presence of a translator’s preface signifies the translator’s visibility and presence in the text (Venuti 2008: 273). The preface thus resists the marginality of the translator by publishers, readers and critics.

This discussion however fruitful is not applicable to cases of concealed translation, where the translator is posing as the author. Moussa's preface with its strategies of concealing the origins of the source text is an authorial preface. Moussa, albeit a translator acts with full agency of the original author, he is visible and actively intervenes in reshaping and rewriting the source text. Moussa's visibility and agency is highly felt as he actively endeavors to mediate between the source and the target culture.

In cases where the translation is not presented as a translation, the presence of the preface is still essential to help the target readers cross the cultural gap and restrain their resistance to translations as products of the colonial hegemonic west. Even if translations and translators held a low status in the de-colonial moment, translation was a norm and widely practiced by most Nahdah intellectuals as it was necessary for national development and modernization projects. In this case, the preface of a concealed translation continues to conceal the origins of the text while mediating the text to be accepted by target readers.

5.1 *The First Preface (1928)*

Moussa begins his book *Nazariyyat al-tatawwur wa-asl al-insan* by mapping out his objective in a translator's preface written in 1928. The first preface functions to draw the target reader's attention to the importance of the book. Its aim is to ensure that the text is read, and even more importantly read properly. He focuses in his preface on establishing a sense of urgency for the target readers to learn about the theory, which is the key to progress, development and national modernization. Moussa puts a very high value on his text by stating that the theory of evolution is "one of the most influential and dominating theories in the European culture" (Moussa 1928: 7). Moussa says "it left an imprint on the mentality of intellectuals all over the world" and then he directly excludes the Arab world from this by stating "[the study of the history of nature] is scarce or non-existent in the Arabic language"¹ (Moussa 1928: 7). In this statement, Moussa faults the Arabic language for its incapability of encompassing the study of nature. He ascribes lack of knowledge of the theory to the rigidity and archaism of the

¹ All translations are mine unless otherwise stated.

Arabic language, which led to the stagnation of the nation in comparison to the western world. In blaming the Arabic language, Moussa is technically postulating the argument of modernization versus adhering to tradition, westernization versus easternization. Moussa hints at the translation's purpose to employ the theory to replace backward eastern traditions with modern western values.

نظرية التطور من النظريات الكبرى التي تسيطر
على الثقافة الأوروبية، تصبغ عقلية المفكرين في جميع
أنحاء العالم الآن، هي قائمة في الأصل على درس
التاريخ الطبيعي للإنسان والحيوان والنبات، هذا
الدرس قليل أو لا وجود له في اللغة العربية

Moussa tempts the readers by making a point about the simplicity of his translation versus the preceding Arabic translations of the theory. He pays homage to *al-Muqtataf* magazine and Shibli Shumayyil, stating that even though the theory of evolution is relatively old, it remained “unpopular or unexplained in an independent book.” A simple, accessible and popular account is needed to explain evolution and its implications to target Egyptian readers. Shumayyil's approach towards translating the philosophy behind Darwin's evolution and materialism influenced and set the tone for both Mazhar and Moussa to translate Darwin.

Shibli Shumayyil (1850- 1917), who preceded Mazhar and Moussa offered a translation of the French Ludwig Büchner's lectures on Darwin in a rather archaic style in 1884 entitled *Ta'rib li-sharh Bukbnir 'ala madhhab Darwin* (A translation of Büchner's explanation of Darwin), and republished it in 1910 as *Falsafat al-nushu' wa-al-irtiqā'* (Philosophy of evolution and progress). Shumayyil's translation of a translation complied with a notion of the spontaneous generation, who aimed to free the progressive world order from a controlling divine or supernatural existence, and to stand only on materialistic laws of matter and force (*al-madda wa-al-qiwa*) for understanding the universe and its evolution (M.Elshakry 2013: 107-111). The main purpose of Shumayyil's translation was to reject the legitimacy of religion and to gain partial independence under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. Shumayyil argued that the new religion of science and materialism is at war and would replace all older religions, which he considers to be the source of conflict between individuals (Egger 1986: 15).

Moussa does not acknowledge Ismail Mazhar (1891- 1962) in his preface, although he offered the first verbatim translation of Darwin in 1918 in a five-chapter book entitled *Asl al-anwa' wa-nushuiba bi-al-intikhab al-tabii*. Later, in 1928, at exactly the same year when Moussa published his translation of the theory, Mazhar expanded the book by adding four more chapters and a glossary. Mazhar's translation is considered the first legitimate translation of Darwin. Mazhar translated Darwin in an attempt to correct the misperceptions that Arab reader's acquired from the anti-religious radicalism of Shumayyil and to gain understanding of the philosophical materialism, which the school of evolution and progress advocated in relation to Arab and Muslim evolutionists. He did so by placing Darwin at the end of a longer history of evolutionary thought emerging from medieval Arabic and Persian scholars, who Mazhar represented as Darwin's predecessors. Mazhar's fundamental purpose was motivated by an interest in reviving classical Arabic texts, which would intellectually and linguistically prove that Arab civilization contributed to universal knowledge production. This strategy would help readers accept Darwin's thought and modernity, that stood generally for the west, in relation to Arab familiar traditional thought (M.Elshakry 2013: 270-276). Moussa ignored the work of Mazhar's translation because Mazhar ideological agenda was quite eastern and focused on revival of the Arabic language. While Moussa viewed that the Arabic language and easternizer's methodology of modernization through their attempt to revive Arab traditions and language are one of the reasons behind Egypt's backwardness and inability to move beyond old traditions.

Moussa's target readers were the educated upper middle class, to whom he belonged, as they were coming to power. He also addressed the public nonprofessionals, in his later editions, who wanted to have a general idea about the theory. Moussa's modernization project rested on popularizing the theory of evolution to the middle class that is coming to power, as the popularization of empirical science was fundamental and essential to this class of technocratic expertise in implementing his view of social engineering and modernization. He tempts the target readers by pointing out that he domesticated the theory and avoided including complex biological and scientific terminology, including the names of animals and plants that the target readers are not familiar with. Moussa states that he omitted parts, which he thought, were controversial and opposing to cultural Norms, as part of his domestication of western knowledge strategy.

Moussa's main purpose was thus popularization of the theory to attract new readers, who are less demanding of elevated archaic style and complex biological terminology. The unspecialized readers could read his translation to get hold of the theory's agency to establish a scientifically managed state.

بقيت نظرية التطور —على قدمها النسبي —غير معروفة أو غير مشروحة في كتاب قائم برأسه، وليس ينكر أحد فضل مجلة المقتطف أو المرحوم شبلي شميل في شرح هذه النظرية، وإيراد الأمثلة المتواليّة على حقيقتها، لكن مع كل ذلك ليس في العربية كتاب وافٍ سهل عنها للأن. وقد حدّاني هذا النقص في لغتنا على أن أحاول في الصفحات الآتية شرح النظرية وتعميمها بلغة سهلة، مع توقي ما أشكل منها، فليست أورد إلا ما اتفق الرأي عليه، أو ما يمكن القارئ العادي أن يفهمه بلا حاجة إلى معارف بيولوجية سابقة، كذلك تماحيت ذكر الألفاظ العلمية؛ كترتيب الطبقات الجيولوجية وأسماء دهورها، ولم اذكر من أسماء الحيوان إلا ما يعرفه القراء أو يمكنهم مشاهدته في مصر، إلا ما ندر.

Moussa then gives instructions to the readers on how he wants them to read his book. According to Genette “When an author is so kind to explain to you how you must read his book, you are already in a poor position to reply...that you will not read it” (Genette 1997: 209). This statement reveals the indirect strategy that Moussa employs to convince the reader that he/she is already engaged and entrapped in the process of reading. The translator here does not only wish to guide the process of reading, but also to “put the reader in possession of information the [translator] considers necessary for this proper reading” (Genette 1997: 209).

Moussa also reveals omission as another strategy he heavily depends on in his translation. He states: “I have attempted omission (‘ikhtisār) to an inadequate extent...” The word (‘ikhtisār) literally means summarization, but the context suggests that Moussa means extensive omission by it because he thinks that it is an extreme act, and also because he admits that some readers would find it insufficient and lacking. This is a case in point as a feature of concealed translated texts, which always offer clues hinting at their status as translations. Readers can recognize these features before the text begins; on the cover page and in the preface, readers thus determine how the text will be received based on the way it is presented and introduced to them (Tahir Gürçağlar 2008: 203). Moussa, however, makes a point that his target readers would appreciate this omission and

find that it offers a general overview of the theory that would “encourage them to search its mysterious elements”. The preface thus guides the reader’s reception of the text and aims to involve him/her at the heart of the translator’s modernization project. Second, it establishes an ideological objective as it placed the text within the general project of modernization and national reform (Tahir Gürçağlar 2002: 52).

وسيرى القارئ اننا اختصرنا أشياء اختصاراً قد يكون مخطئاً اضطرنا إليه ترسيم الكتاب الذي بدأنا فيه بنشأة الأرض، ثم انتهينا منه بإنسان المستقبل، لكن هذا الاختصار، إذا كان فيه ما يستاء منه المطلع، فإن غيره يجد فيه فكرة عامة عن النظرية تحثه على البحث والتنقيب عن فروعها الغامضة أو المقتضية. ويحسن بالقارئ أن ينعم نظره في الفهرست أولاً، ثم يقرأ الفصول على ترتيبها بحيث تتم الصورة في ذهنه غير مشوشة بتقديم فصل على آخر، ويحسن أيضاً بمن يريد التوسع في النظرية أن يقرأ مختارات سلامة موسى اليوم والغد ففيهما عدة فصول عن التطور قد عولجت بإسهاب.

In 1928, by the time he published his book on evolution, Moussa was disillusioned in politics and only saw social engineering via eugenics as the only way to progress. Moussa’s modernization project thus counted for slow, long-term progress (evolution) to allow eugenics on the hand of the technocratic scientific experts to breed a new race of supermen. These ideas occurred at a phase when Moussa was convinced that the problem of progress does not lie in the environment surrounding men, but in the pace of the course of nature, which works to eradicate the weak minded to eventually reach an evolved species of supermen, that would look down on the ordinary human as we look down on monkeys. The following is one illustration of many, which Moussa includes in his book. Moussa includes various images in his translation, which contributes to his purpose of producing an abridged simple explanation of the theory for the target readers. It is not stated however from where exactly did Moussa borrow these images, as his book lacks any bibliographic information and/or footnotes. The following illustration demonstrates the idea of the future superman, which Moussa borrowed its idea from Bernard Shaw’s *Man and Superman* (1903) and H.G Wells’s utopian ideas in *Modern Utopia* (1905). The image provides a visualization of the future superman, who is the product of advanced sexual selection and good heredity.



Figure 2: Future superman from Moussa's *Nazariyyat al-tatawwur wa-asl al-insan*. "Huge head, strengthened eye-sight, diminishment of other senses, short length and an equally proportioned strong hairless body to carry the huge head" (Moussa 1928: 218).

Conclusion

The study of paratexts allows translation researchers to move beyond the textual and linguistic analysis to discover why a certain text was selected by a translator in a specific socio-historical moment. This type of analysis enables contextualization of translation as a social, political and historical phenomenon. Paratextual analysis expands the study of Norms in translated texts as it provides material located outside the text itself to explain the concept of translation at the period under study, it explains the purpose of the translation, the aim of the translator in relation to a greater modernization or national project, and it examines the relation between translator and publisher and target market Norms. This paper thus is a project in translation history, as it analyzes paratextual elements and treats the translated text as it first existed in its socio-historical moment. This type of analysis not only reveals cultural and social Norms regarding translation, but it also shows how translations were imported, produced, publicized and received. It thus uncovers the conditions of production as well as those of reception of the translated text. The paratexts of Moussa's translation confirm that analyzing the content of the cover and the translator's preface reveal the status of the translation. It also highlights the agency of the translator in the translation process by examining the decisions and choices he/she made. Analyzing the paratexts also reveals the position of the translator and translation as a genre in the marketplace in a specific socio-historical moment.

References

- Apter, E (2006) *The translation zone: A new comparative literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bowler, P. (2014) "From Agnosticism to Rationalism: Evolutionary Biologists, the Rationalist Press Association, and Early Twentieth-Century Scientific Naturalism." Bernard Lightman and Gowan Dawson (eds.) *Victorian Scientific Naturalism: Community, Identity, Continuity*. Chicago: Chicago Scholarship Online.
- Darwin, C. (1859) *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. London: W. Clowes and Sons.

- Darwin, C. (1870) *Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Dimitriu, R. (2009) "Translators' Prefaces as Documentary Sources of Translation Studies." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 17:3, pp. 193-206.
- Egger, V. (1986) *A Fabian in Egypt: Salama Moussa and the Rise of Professional Classes in Egypt (1909-1939)*. New York: University Press of America.
- Elshakry, M. (2003) *Darwin's Legacy in the Arab East: Science, Religion and Politics, 1870-1914*. N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Elshakry, M. (2008) "Knowledge in Motion: The Cultural Politics of Modern Science Translations in Arabic." *Isis*, 99:4, pp. 701-730.
- Elshakry, M. (2013) *Reading Darwin in Arabic: 1860-1950*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Elshakry, O. (2007) *The Great Social Laboratory: Subjects of Knowledge in colonial and Postcolonial Egypt*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Faiq, S. (2004) *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Genette, G. (1987) *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil.
- Genette, G. (1997) *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Tr. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartama-Heinonen, R. (1995) "Translators' Prefaces -A Key to the Translation?" *Folia Translatologica*, 4, pp. 33-42.
- Jacquemond, R. (2004) "Towards an Economy and Poetics of Translation from and into Arabic." *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*. Edited by Said Faiq. Clevedon, Buffalo and Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Jacquemond, R. (1992) "Translation and Cultural Hegemony: The Case of French-Arabic Translation." *Rethinking Translation: Discourse Subjectivity, Ideology*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, pp. 139-158.
- Jacquemond, R. (2009) "Translation Policies in the Arab World: Representations. Discourse and Realities." *The Translator*, 15:1, pp. 15-35.
- Lockman, Z. (1994) "Imagining the Working Class: Culture, Nationalism, and Class Formation in Egypt, 1899-1914." *Poetics Today*, 15:2, pp. 157-190.
- Mazhar, I. (1918) *Asl al-amwa' wa-nushbiha bi-al-intikhab al-tabii*. Cairo: Hindawi Publishing.
- McRae, E. (2006) *The Role of 'Translators' Prefaces to Contemporary Literary Translations into English*. Masters, University of Auckland.

- McRae, E. (2012) "The Role of Translators' Prefaces to Contemporary Literary Translations into English: An Empirical Study." *Translation Peripheries*, pp. 63-101.
- Mitchell, T. (2002) *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-politics, Modernity*. Oxford: University of California Press.
- Mitchell, T. (1988) *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Moussa, S. (1928) *Nazariyyat al-tatammur wa-asl al-insan*. Cairo: Hindawi Publishing.
- Munday, J. (2009) *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge, pp. 74-105.
- Selim, S. (2009) "Languages of Civilization: Nation, Translation and the Politics of Race in Colonial Egypt." *The Translator*, 15:1, pp. 139-56.
- Selim, S. (2016) "Text and Context: Translating in a State of Emergency." *Translating Dissent: Voices from and with the Egyptian Revolution*. Ed. Mona Baker. NY and London: Routledge, pp. 77-87.
- Spencer, H. (1867) *First Principles*. 2nd Ed. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Spencer, H. (1898) *The Principles of Sociology, in Three Volumes*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Sharabi, H. (1970) *Arab intellectuals and the West: the formative years, 1875-1914*. London: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Shumayyil, S. (1884) *Ta'rib li-sharh Bukhnir 'ala madhhab Darwin*. Cairo: Hindawi Publishing.
- Renan, E. (1990) 'What is a nation?' (tr. Martin Thom) in Bhabha, Homi K. (ed.) *Nation and Narration*, London: Routledge.
- Robyns, C. (1994) "Translation and Discursive Identity". *Poetics Today*, 15:3, pp. 405-428.
- Tageldin, S. (2011) *Disarming Words: Empire and the Seduction of Translation in Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, S. (2001) "Adding towards a Nationalist Text: On a Turkish Translation of *Dracula*." *Target*, 13:1, pp. 125-148.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, S. (2002) "What Texts Don't Tell: The Use of Paratexts in Translation Research." In *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, Theo Hermans (ed.), pp. 44-60. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, S. (2008) *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, S. (2010) "Scouting the Borders of Translation: pseudotranslation, concealed translations and authorship in Twentieth-century Turkey" *Translation Studies*, 3:2, pp. 172-187.

- Tahir Gürçağlar, S. (2011) "Paratexts" *Handbook of Translation Studies*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Toury, G. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.
- Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Toury, G. (2000) "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." *The Translation Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 198-211.
- Venuti, L. (1992) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (1995) "Translation, Copyright, Authorship" *The Translator*, 1:1, pp. 1-24.
- Venuti, L. (1998) *The Scandals of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.