



الأثر الإيديولوجي في تقديم النصوص السياسية خلال الربيع العربي

The Ideological Effect in Rendering Political Texts During the Arab Spring

السنوسي إبراهيم السنوسي عبد السيد

محاضر مساعد بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة درنة، ليبيا

Elsanousi.abdulsaid@uod.edu.ly

عضو هيئة تدريس محاضر بكلية التربية بجامعة عمر المختار

 <https://www.doi.org/10.58987/dujhss.v2i4.35>

تاريخ الاستلام: 2024/07/23 : تاريخ القبول: 2024/08/30 : تاريخ النشر: 2024/09/01

المستخلص:

الترجمة باعتبارها إعادة كتابة للنص الأصلي، مع الاعتراف بالمترجم ككاتب يقوم بتعديل وتغيير النص الأصلي وفقاً لأيديولوجيته، وموقفه السياسي، أو اهتماماته العامة. تهدف الدراسة إلى معرفة ما إذا كان الخلفية الإيديولوجية للمترجم تؤثر على ترجمته، وإظهار وجود أثر إيديولوجي مخفي في خطاب الأخبار حول الأحداث السياسية. تفحص العلاقة بين عدد من النصوص فيما يتعلق بالأيديولوجيات، ووسائل الإعلام، والخطاب السياسي، واللغة، والترجمة. يتم استخراج أمثلة توضيحية من الخطاب السياسي الذي تم التواصل به خلال الربيع العربي. تستخدم الدراسة تحليل الخطاب النقدي كإطار نظري. كما تُظهر ما إذا كانت الأيديولوجيات المخفية تُعاد إنتاجها حتى ضمن نصوص الأخبار التي دورها ببساطة إبلاغ الجمهور. المنهجية المطبقة في هذه الدراسة تحلل وتحقق في النصوص المتوازنة من الإنجليزية إلى العربية والعكس بالعكس، بهدف إظهار ما إذا كان هناك أي نوع من التحولات الإيديولوجية من قبل المترجم. أظهرت النتائج أن المترجمين استخدموا، في ترجماتهم، بعض التعبيرات والمصطلحات التي تتماشى مع الخلفية الإيديولوجية لجمهور اللغة المستهدفة، وتوصي الدراسة بأن يكون المترجمون محايدون عند التعامل مع التقارير الإخبارية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الترجمة، الأيديولوجيا، والخطاب السياسي.

Abstract: This research regards translation as a form of textual reworking, acknowledging the translator as a writer who adjusts and alters the original text based on their own ideologies, political views, or general interests. Its objective is to investigate whether the translator's ideological standpoint influences their translation and to reveal the subtle ideological impact embedded in news discourse on political occurrences. The study explores the interplay among various texts concerning ideology, media, political discourse, language, and translation, drawing illustrative instances from political discourse surrounding the Arab Spring. Employing Critical



Discourse Analysis as a theoretical framework, it examines whether concealed ideologies persist even within news texts intended solely for public information. The methodology employed examines and scrutinizes parallel texts translated from English to Arabic and vice versa to determine if there are any ideological shifts on the translator's part. Findings indicate that translators incorporate expressions and terms in their translations that align with the ideological background of the target language audience, suggesting that translators should maintain neutrality when handling news reports.

Keywords: Translation; Media Translation; Ideology; political discourse

Introduction

Translation is not merely a mechanical process of converting words from one language to another; it is a nuanced act of recontextualization influenced by the translator's ideologies, beliefs, and perspectives. In the realm of news discourse translations, where accuracy and neutrality are paramount, the translator's ideological standpoint can wield a significant impact on the portrayal of political events, shaping public perceptions and understandings. The Arab Spring, a series of uprisings that swept across the Middle East and North Africa, serves as a poignant backdrop for examining the interplay between translation, ideology, and news discourse. As the region underwent seismic political transformations, news reports played a crucial role in shaping global narratives and public opinions. However, behind the seemingly objective veil of news translations lie subtle ideological undercurrents that can sway the narrative in profound ways. This study seeks to delve into the intricate web of ideological influences in news discourse translations, with a specific focus on the Arab Spring. By investigating how translators' ideological leanings permeate their translation choices, we aim to uncover the nuanced ideological biases embedded in news translations. Through a critical lens, we seek to unravel the implications of these ideological shifts on the accuracy, neutrality, and fidelity of information conveyed to the public. Through a comparative analysis of news translations from English to Arabic and vice versa, we endeavor to shed light on the extent to which translators' ideological standpoints shape the transmission of information, especially in politically charged contexts.

The Evolution of Meaning in Translation

Translation is an activity that aims at conveying meaning or meanings of a given-linguistic discourse from one language to another, rather than the words or grammatical structures of the original. We should look briefly at the most significant and recent developments in the study of meaning or semantics. Our interest here lies in the shift of emphasis from referential or dictionary meaning to contextual and pragmatic meaning. The meaning of a given word or set of words is best understood as the contribution that word or phrase can make to the meaning or function of the whole sentence or linguistic utterance where that word or phrase occurs. The meaning of a given word is governed not only by the external object or idea that particular word is supposed to refer to, but also by the use of that particular word or phrase in a particular way, in a particular context, and to a particular effect. (accurapid.com/journal). In this regard, it is better to show some different types of meaning such as (i) literal meaning in which the sentence means what it says. Also known as utterance meaning, (ii) logical meaning is the meaning of the sentence which



is determined by a set of logical inferences, such as composition and subordination. Also called word order, (iii) pragmatic meaning is the relationship between signs and their users, (iv) connotative meaning which means what readers think about when they read it, sometimes known as sense, (v) denotative meaning means what the sentence is about, and (vi) metaphorical meaning is determined by metaphor and not actual reference. (translationdirectory.com).

Other sorts of meaning that recognizes between conceptual meaning, on the one hand, and connotative, complex, compelling, reflected, and collective sorts of meaning on the other. Hence, we classify the final five sorts of meaning beneath one common category of related meaning. There's a clear qualification between the consistent meaning or the lexical reference of a specific word, and between the sorts of related meaning. Such a qualification within the field of semantics between the lexical and the related may reminds us of the qualification between the semantic and the communicative approach as distant as the writing on interpretation is concerned. The reason why there is a distinction, however, is that the conceptual meaning of a word is the type of meaning which could be mainly deduced in isolation from any other linguistic or non-linguistic context, whereas the other types of meaning, whether associative or theoretical, are broadly speaking to be derived from the context of the utterance. Hence, this is relevant to translation and translation theories. (accurapid.com/journal)

The reason also is easier to find the conceptual or the logical meaning of a given word, but that type of meaning is not always telling in the case of translation. However, it is often difficult to obtain even the lexical equivalent of a given item in translation, when the translation is taking place across two different languages that do not have a culture in common, such as translation from Arabic into English and vice versa. Yet, we should not indulge in a tedious and rather worthless search for the lexical equivalent, since, even if such lexical items are easy to come by, they might not be helpful in translation. (translationdirectory.com)

The Multifaceted Concept of Ideology

Ideology is a complex and controversial concept. Difficulties arise because this term has a series of related yet separated meanings. Ideology can be approached and defined in a number of ways according to the specific context it refers to. During the last two centuries, the word ideology has shifted from having a positive meaning to having pejorative one. It has been associated with religious, philosophical, and mainly political theories as well as many others. All these uses of the term ideology reflect different epochs and different lines of thought, Leonardi, (2007: 35). The word ideology was coined by the French rationalist philosopher Destutt De Tracy. He intended it to mean the systematic study of knowledge, beliefs, and ideas (Williams, 1976: 126). De Tracy pleaded for a new science of ideas which was to be open to all and aimed to become "the foundation for establishing humane social policy and constructing decent laws and government" Gee, (1990: 4).

According to Billing (1982: 37):

“ideology itself is not easy to define as it is associated with a number of other notions such as politics, religion and traditions. Traditionally, ideology is associated mainly with the notion of class or to be more precise, class supremacy”.



The term ideology has been always accompanied by its political connotation. According to *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, ideology is "a system of ideas and ideals forming the basis of an economic or political theory". Gurcaglar (2003: 113) argues that

"translation is political because, both as activity and product, it displays process of negotiation among different agents. On micro-level, these agents are translators, authors, critics, publishers, editors, and readers".

However, Marxists like Lenin negatively define socialist ideology as "a force that encourages revolutionary consciousness and fosters progress" Perez, (2003: 4). However, scholars and linguists are not interested in ideology in its political sense. In contrast, Van Dijk (1998: 48) defines ideology as

"a system of ideas, the nature of which is a specific type of (basic) mental representations shared by the members of groups, and hence firmly located in the minds of people".

It is important to consider the definition proposed by Van Dijk for ideology as a framework that is assumed to specifically organize and monitor one form of socially shared mental representation. In other words, the organized evaluative beliefs traditionally called attitudes shared by social groups. Neither the author nor the translator as a reader of source text possesses the authorial power to definitely determine the meaning. Carbonell (1996) points out that since the nature of the context of signification in both the source and target cultures is heterogeneous, meaning changes unavoidably in the process of translation and there will be always possibility of contradiction between the author's intentions and the translator's. Similarly, the cultural background, which makes up the ideology of the translator, can influence the way the translator looks at or understands various issues. An Arab and a Muslim translator, for example, would not render the actions of the resistance movements in Palestine against Israel as *terrorism* unlike a Western translator who would never understand it as *Jihad*. Furthermore, the translation of الخليج العربي literally: Arabian Gulf- into *Persian Gulf* is another example of the effect of ideology on translation. In this case, there is a political connotation, where some people think that the Gulf region is originally Persian and should be described as the *Persian gulf* while others think that it is an Arab since Arabs occupied it a long time ago. It is evident that the various political discourse genres such as laws, slogans, international treaties, peace negotiations, and parliamentary debates are mostly determined by their environment rather than by textual definitions. Political discourse is mostly defined by who speaks to whom, as what, when, and with what objectives. It is not primarily defined by topics or styles. Stated differently, the reasons why political discourse is particularly political stem from its roles within the political process (Van Dijk, 1997). Translators negotiate translation in its cultural, political, and ideological context in real-world translation practice. The term "cultural turn" refers to this trend in translation theory (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 102). The concept refers to addressing translation from a cultural standpoint independent of the language code; that is, the linguistic expressions may evoke values consistent with the target readers' conventions and beliefs but at odds with those of the target language community. When translating a text into a different culture, translators frequently take the ideological



ramifications into account. The way that culture and language interact in translation is explained by Simon (1996: 139):

Translators must constantly make decisions about the cultural meanings language carries and evaluate the degree to which the different worlds they inhabit are the same. In fact, the process of meaning transfer has less to do with finding the cultural inscription of a term than reconstructing its value.

Translators should not only consider the cultural aspects presented in a text, but they often do negotiate the ideological meanings embedded in that text.

Exploring the Intersection of Ideology and Translation

Some scholars have discussed the interaction between ideology and translation from various aspects. They are: Nitsa (2000), Hatim and Mason (1990), Lefevere (2004), and Abdulla (1999). Nitsa (2000: 43) says that the ideological manipulation in translation could refer to "any interference with the text, be it cultural, religious, political or otherwise, imposing modifications that are not textual constraints, for the purpose of indoctrination". Hatim and Mason (1990: 240), in their research on ideology in translation, define discourse as "modes of speaking and writing which involve participants in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of socio-cultural activity (e.g. racist discourse and officialese)". Hatim (1997) also states that ideology encompasses the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups. Lefevere (2004) also points out that ideology functions as a tremendous constraint in the act of translation. Ideology is not limited to the political sphere, it is "the grillwork of form, convention and belief which orders our actions" (Ibid: 16). According to Venuti (1998), translations that are overseen by institutions with significant social and cultural clout have a bigger impact on the target society's identity formation and social mores. Stated differently, the target text is controlled by a newspaper firm that plays a significant role in the process of the target society establishing its identity. The translator of the target text is also involved in this process. Because of this, he or she is severely limited in their ability to modify or rewrite the original material in order to comply with the ideological and social mores of the target society.

According to Abdulla (1999), ideology is defined as (a) ideas, value concepts, and assumptions—whether cultural or political—that are connected to the authority and power of individuals or organizations within a particular society. (b) Ideology in this context encompasses more than just political ideas; it also refers to "the propositions, assumptions we hold consciously and unconsciously about ourselves which guide our actions" (Ibid: 37). Lefevere (2004) states that translation is an activity carried out under the restrictions of patronage, poetics, and ideology started by the target systems. Translation is produced based on an original text with the intention of adapting the original to a certain ideology or poetics of a different audience. As such, it is the act of rewriting an original text to make it compliant with goals established by the system that is receiving it. Furthermore, he notes that among the various adaptations that writers frequently do such as translation, criticism, commentary, historiography, and anthologies translation is the most visibly obvious kind of rewriting that has a significant impact on projecting and spreading the image of original writers and their works outside of their culture of origin. Ideology has an influence on every link and aspect of translation. Translation is the product of ideology and cannot free itself from it. Fawcett (1998: 107) points out that "throughout the centuries, individuals and



institutions apply their particular beliefs to the production of certain effect in translation". The term ideology has been always accompanied by its political connotation as it is evident in its dictionary definition as "a system of ideas and ideals, especially one which forms the basis of economic or political theory and policy (The Oxford English Dictionary, 1989). In this regard, translators are always preoccupied by the idea of preserving formal equivalence, that is producing an identical copy of the original. However, translators often intervene to mitigate the ideological load in the original. For instance, in changing the term *terrorists* into *gunmen* the translator unloads the message of its ideological impulse. Nida (1964: 159) states that "in translating we seek to find the closest possible equivalent". However, he (Ibid.) suggests two types of equivalence: formal and dynamic. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. This means that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the message of SL. The type of translation which most completely typifies this structural equivalence might be called a gloss translation in which the translator attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original. A gloss translation of this type is designed to permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression. Dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that the receiver understands the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message. A dynamic equivalence may be described as a bilingual and bicultural person can justifiably say, "that is just the way we would say it" (Ibid. 1964: 164). It is important to realize, however, that dynamic equivalence is not merely another message which is more or less similar to that of the source. It is a translation, and as such must clearly reflect the meaning and intent of the ST. One way of defining a dynamic equivalence translation is to describe it as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message". (Ibid: 166). Lefevere (2004: VII) states that:

"translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and such a manipulate literature to function in a given way in a given society; that is translation is determined by two basic factors: the translator's ideology and the poetics dominant in the receiving culture. Therefore, ideology dictates translation choices and translation strategies".

Nord (2003: 111) maintains that

"almost any decision in translation is consciously or unconsciously-guided by ideological criteria. Ideological factors are very decisive in defining the target text intended purpose and selecting appropriate strategies by the translator, based on the expectations of the translation clients".

Tymoczko (2003: 182) contends that

"the ideology of translation is a combination of the content and the various speech acts relevant to the ST, layered together with the representation of the content and speech acts relevant to the target context".



She (Ibid.) further explains that the ideology of translation resides also in the voicing and stance of the translator, and its relevance to the receiving audience.

Language as a Cultural Construct

Language is perhaps the most remarkable communicative instrument people have ever created, partly because of being the key instrument of socialization, but also most chiefly because it plays a vital role in the construction of what is called reality. When people communicate with each other, their discourse is informed by the beliefs and values they have acquired as members of a given culture. From this perspective, language is also an instrument of control as it "fixes a world that is so much more stable and coherent than what we actually see that it takes its place in our consciousness and becomes what we think we have seen" Hodge and Kress (1993: 5). They (Ibid,) suggest that "language has an unusual power to construct realities and control social behaviours". This assumption was also established by Sapir (1921: 134) who claims that:

"the fact of the matter is that the real world is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group [...] we see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation".

Halliday (1978: 89) states that "language in the news is a powerful social construct that reflects not only the way readers perceive the world but also inevitably reflects the power relations that shape and govern the world". He (Ibid) adds that, language is first and foremost an ideological social construct; because "language is controlled by the social structure, and the social structured is maintained and transmitted through language".

Ideology Through Values and Beliefs

Whatever the differences between the people of a group who share the same ideology, they are more likely to share the same systems of values, since the notion of value is usually culturally based. Van Dijk (1998: 76) asserts that, "basic social opinions are constituted from values when applied to specific domains and issues in society". In the discussion of ideology there is a tendency to use the notion of ideas, beliefs, and values extensively. It is thus imperative to comprehend their meaning in relation to ideology. When one says ideas one usually means; fresh, original, new and sometimes unacceptable thoughts. Van Dijk (Ibid: 16) states that:

"specific groups of people, namely academics, scholars, writers, politicians and naturally journalists and editors, often aim to control these socially shared ideas favouring their interests by penetrating into the social discourse".

The most significant notion associated with ideology is the notion of *belief* which will be approached as the notion of *judgments* or *opinions* held by individuals about objects or events, based on their *knowledge* or, based on what people as group, community, culture, instance or institution take to be *true beliefs* according to certain grounds or *truth* criteria. (Ibid: 1998)

Van Dijk (1998: 16) believes that "it soon become evident that all these notions constitute what can be characterized as *common sense* or else the beliefs and values one tends to take for granted without questioning their origin". He (Ibid.) adds that these types of *beliefs* and *values* are usually classified under one name: knowledge. The possibility, however, of characterizing a group's or culture's beliefs as knowledge, and thus assigning to them the value of *truth* is in contrast with



the definition of ideology. Unless of course it is claimed that all knowledge is ideologically based as there is no safe way of establishing what is really true or not. Foucault (1980) sees that the concept of truth is fundamental as it can assume a central role in what is perceived as reality. Economic and political institutions, scientists and philosophers, scholars and media producers, all seek the truth. Van Dijk, (1998: 111) adds that

“taking into consideration the value of truth above, it should be claimed that whatever is assigned the property of truth and thus power, is essentially defined or presented as knowledge”.

What is striking is that knowledge may on occasion represent the false beliefs, half-truths or one-sided true beliefs that favour specific groups, and that are directed against others.

Aims of the Study

1. Investigating the influence of the translator's ideological background on their translations.
2. Revealing the subtle ideological impact present in news discourse regarding political events.
3. Analyzing the presence of concealed ideologies within news texts meant for public information.

Questions of the study

1. How does the translator's ideological background affect their translation choices?
2. What are the underlying ideological influences in news discourse on political events?
3. Do hidden ideologies persist within news texts designed for public information dissemination?

Literature Review

In the past decade, the intersection of ideology and translation has garnered increasing attention within translation studies. Scholars such as Baker (2018) have emphasized the pivotal role of ideology in shaping translators' decisions and the resultant impact on translated texts. Baker's work underscores the significance of considering translators not merely as linguistic conduits but as active agents who imbue texts with their own ideological positioning. Building upon this foundation, Jones (2019) delved into the complexities of ideological influences in translation, exploring how political ideologies can permeate translated materials, especially in the realm of news translation. Jones highlighted the nuanced ways in which translators navigate ideological currents while rendering news content, underscoring the need for critical awareness in translational practices.

Moreover, recent studies by Smith et al. (2020) have shed light on the implications of ideological biases in news translation for public perception and understanding of global events. By analyzing news translations across various languages, Smith et al. elucidated how ideological nuances can subtly shape the portrayal of political occurrences, ultimately impacting audience interpretations.



Methodology

The study investigates the rendering of English political discourse into Arabic and vice versa. In order to prove the hypothesis, it is necessary to identify a sufficient number of parallel texts English and Arabic, that are amenable to examination. The texts are selected to cover two cultures but in the essence of two languages, English and Arabic. The data of this research is drawn from various sources such as newspapers, journals, and TV channels when covering some political events of the world. It should be mentioned that the texts used for the analysis are not expected to attach to particular groups of people, but rather that the examination of texts would serve as a depiction of the topic or hypothesis indicated as an object of research and study. Thus, the reader of this study will discover that each reporter, type of newspaper, country and culture has its own techniques of interpreting and reporting particular events of political significance. More details about both the methodology and the data will be given in due course of the discussion, i.e. in the third chapter (the analysis).

The procedures that are applied to the examples of parallel texts given in the analytical part of this study will have an introductory explanation. This introductory explanation of the general meaning of the example(s) under scrutiny will be followed by: (i) the source language text SLT (the original), (ii) the target language texts TLT (the translations) and (iii) a commentary highlighting the implemented strategies applied by the translator. In order to prove that a certain linguistic feature is a purposeful stylistic phenomenon rather than a co-incidental occasion and hence is worth investigating, several examples for each feature will be cited. This in return has made this chapter a lengthy one as each example is accompanied by translation version to demonstrate cultural reflections. Reducing the examples to the minimum extent possible, may negatively affect the findings of the research in terms of the phenomenical level.

Data selection and Collection

Different news reports which exhibit indications of power and ideology deeply embedded in the communication between journalists and readers, will be examined in detail. As already mentioned in the methodology, a selected number of newspapers, magazines, TV news, and websites are investigated according to criteria. The selection of the texts was neither coincidental nor chosen randomly. The news reports are expected to cover the clash of ideologies. That is, the news reports are about particular events, such as terrorism, security, fanaticism and racism. The use of words and phrases carries implicit sociopolitical judgments and values expressing the interests of one community as opposed to another. The examples provided demonstrate that the use of what seem rather neutral words is often presupposing the concealment or the emphasis of important information about the speaker or the group presented. In a few words, cases of classification and presupposition as well as tools of exclusion discussed in the previous chapter will be examined. It will be established that these notions very often overlap in their function as ideological tools for the construction of news reality. For the investigation of news, the study will be strictly limited to political news which are retrieved from their sources in the world wide web. It is also to shed some light on the different ideological presentations of news between different types of newspapers and cultures. As stated earlier, the data of the analysis will be, however, mainly peculiar to the political discourse only. Exclusion of other worthy material in the analytical chapter has been due to space constraints, as they fall outside the scope of the focus of this study



which gives a clear view of the rendition of the ideological aspects of the political discourse. Thus, the data of this chapter is based on translations of the newspaper reports.

According to Cronin (2003: 28) the focus will be on whether or not there is a push towards different ideology between the two languages, as a result of some forces of mass-media, satellite in particular as well as information technology. Before commencing the analytical process, it should also be stated that it is neither the intention nor the purpose of this study to assess the already-existing versions of translations. The purpose of this analysis is never to judge or to find every single fault that has occurred. Rather, the main reason for analyzing the English versions is to draw attention to the cultural gaps between the two languages in question which may lead to ideological shift and to identify what strategies have been applied by the translators in order to bridge such gaps. However, comments and remarks made here on the examples of a somewhat judgmental nature are not meant to belittle the efforts or qualities of those translations. The comments are merely to illustrate how the ideological constraints are differently utilized in the translations throughout different sources of mass-media and by translators belonging to different cultural backgrounds.

Discussion

The presence of ideological biases in translations may distort the public's perception of political events, emphasizing the need for transparent and unbiased translation practices. One of the most common ways of assigning qualities to groups of people in news reporting is the use of pronouns. According to Van Dijk (1998: 203), pronouns are "the best known grammatical category of expression and manipulation of social relation, status and power, and hence of underlying ideologies". The most frequently used examples found in newspaper texts are the pronouns *us* or *we* versus *them* or *they*. These pronouns exhibit polarization vs. (divergence) and, when used, carry implicit information about the groups they represent; that is their identity, their common characteristics and all that which differentiates the object pronouns *us* from *them*. In this context, the discourse structures that include these pronouns exhibit group interests and are ideological since it is common for the speaker's utterances to be filled with details about *our* good acts and *their* bad acts, which identify the latter as a subgroup and so on. This ideological polarization manifests itself in several ways in the following instances, depending, of course, on who is speaking. The translator looking at the situation where there is a peace process which is going nowhere, and he was simply using the Palestinian issue in an attempt to mobilize Muslims against the United States, when using the pronouns *we* and *our* in his speech. The findings raise concerns about the neutrality of translators and the potential for ideological biases to seep into news discourse translations, compromising objectivity.

1a. ST:

/استشهد اليوم فتى فلسطيني وجرح آخر في غارة إسرائيلية على قطاع غزة مما يرفع إلى 17 عدد الفلسطينيين الذين استشهدوا في غارات إسرائيلية منذ الجمعة الماضية... وكان المتحدث باسم لجنة الإسعاف والطوارئ تحدث عن استشهاده مواطن وإصابة آخرين بجروح في غارة صهيونية شرق غزة. (Aljazeera Arabic, Mar 28, 2012).



2b. TT:

“seventeen of the Palestinians *killed* since Friday were identified by medical officials as fighters and five as civilians. Medics said another strike *killed* a 15-year-old boy and injured six other students near a school in northern Gaza”.

(Aljazeera English, Mar 14, 2012)

“Al-jazeera satellite channel is an Arab channel which favoring the Palestinian cause. In addition, it justifies this kind of action, because following the teaching of Islam, it considers it as a holy War against the occupiers”.

The Palestinians who killed by the Israeli strikes are martyrs, and their opposition of Israeli occupation is invariably described as *مقاومة* or resistance. Aljazeera channel gave the Arab Muslims audiences the impression that the discourse is meant to serve some religious purposes. While the term *killed* used in the translation have the effect of stigmatizing by associating the act of martyrdom with violence and crime and even fanaticism. In such news report, the focus is on what is called by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) the situation managing, i.e. the dominant function of the text is to manage or steer the situation in a manner favourable to the text producer's goals.

Another example reads:

During the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990.

2a. ST:

"... most of the Kuwaiti ruling family *fled* to Saudi Arabia".

(BBC Special Report, February 19, 1998)

2b. TT:

غادرت معظم العائلة الحاكمة الكويتية إلى السعودية.

(BBC Arabic Special Report, February 19, 1998)

“Using the verb *غادر* (left) instead of the verb *فَرَّ* (fled) in the TT is intended by the translator to be neutral because the English verb *flee* is stigmatizing and evaluative”.

A similar example is as follows:

3a. ST:

وصول أفراد من عائلة القذافي للجزائر.

(Aljazeera News, 2011)

3b. TT:

Qaddafi's wife and 3 of his children flee to Algeria.

(www.nytimes.com/)

“Aljazeera tried to be neutral by using the Arabic noun *وصول* (arrival) whereas the English version gave the exact contextual meaning by using the verb *flee*”.

Consider this news item taken from Aljazeera during the Egyptian revolution on 25 January 2011:



4a. ST:

المتظاهرون

في ميدان التحرير يرفضون خطاب مبارك ويطالبون بالرحيل.

(Aljazeera Arabic Channel, Jan,10,2011)

4b. TT:

“Demonstrators in liberation square *continue* to call for Mobark to leave”.

(Aljazeera English Channel, Jan,10,2011)

“The translator in this example used the verb *continue* (يستمر) instead of the verb *reject* (يرفض) more indicating verb. Thus, by selecting the verb *reject*, the translator tries to tell the readers that not only what the speakers has simply said but also how the readers are expected to respond to it.

The translator succeeded to be neutral when he translated the prepositional phrase *بالرحيل* into the English infinitive *to leave*. By so doing, he toned down the role of ideology which is similar to that of the ST.

Another similar example is as follows:

5a. ST:

مئات الآلاف من المتظاهرين مازالوا يحتشدون في ميدان التحرير وسط القاهرة مطالبين بالرحيل مبارك.

(BBC Arabic Channel, Jan,10,2011)

5b. TT:

“Thousands of anti-government protesters in Cairo's Tahrir Square *reacted angrily* to Mobark announcement.

(BBC English Channel, Jan,10,2011)

In contrast with the above example, the translator here tries to convey the attitude of the protesters in Cairo's Tahrir Square by using the adverbial phrase *reacted angrily* which is translation to the Arabic verb (يحتشدون).

It is obvious that the TT is not an accurate translation of the ST.

A more accurate translation could be:

Hundreds of thousands of demonstrations are gathering in Tahrir Square in Central Cairo, demanding the departure of Mobark.

The addition or replacement of words with lexical items that perform evaluative actions is a common element in news reporting.

6a. ST:

“*Al-Quds Al-Arabi Newspaper* has claimed on several occasions that our aim behind the current foreign intervention in Libya is to lay our hands on the Libyan oil”.

(www.alquds.co.uk/)



6b. TT:

زعم الكثير في مناسبات عديدة بأن التدخل الأجنبي الحالي في ليبيا غايته رغبتنا بوضع أيدينا على النفط الليبي.

(<http://digital.ahram.org.eg/>)

The translator used the Arabic anonymous subject term *الكثير* (many) instead of the name of the Arabic newspaper (*Al-Quds Al-Arabi*). In this regard, Scollon (1998), among others, has mentioned that the use of quotations or terms is the way translators tell the readers who has the responsibility for their stories while at the same time they (the translators) retain the power to construct the utterances of the spokespersons for the construction of these stories. Here the translator tried to avoid any clash with *Al-Quds Al-Arabi* and his newspaper.

7a. ST:

... بالدسبة لمن يؤمنون بنظريات المؤامرة أعتقد أنه ربما لا شيء أقوله قد يقتنعهم بما يخالف تصورهم... أن كانت غابتنا هي النفط الليبي، لكان من السهل جدا علينا أن نتجاهل الانتفاضة، والاحتفاظ بعلاقات وطيدة مع *فاشيستان* الذي نعرفه خير من اتخاذ خطوة نحو المجهول... والحكومة التي تتخذ قرارات قذافي... *العقيد القذافي* مواجهة رأي قوي للأغلبية تكون إما جريئة أو ساذجة... ومهما يتبين لنا خلال الشهور القليلة القادمة، فإن الأقلية فقط سيجادلون بأن العصر الذي كان يعتبر فيه ذلك التصرف طبيعيا أو مسموحا، بات يوشك على نهايته.

(www.alquds.co.uk/)

7b. TT:

“(...) I believe that nothing I say will perhaps convince *them* of anything different (...) If our object was the Libyan oil, it would be very easy for us to ignore the uprising and maintain close ties with *Colonel Al-Qadhafi* (...) *The devil* that we know is better than taking a step into the unknown.

(...) The Government that takes decisions in the face of a powerful opinion by *the majority* is either bold or naive (...) No matter what becomes clear to us in the next few months, only *a minority* will argue that the age when that behaviour was normal or permissible is about to end”.

(<http://digital.ahram.org.ed>)

The translator initially used the pronoun *them* to refer to those who support the government and he uses two terms to describe the Libyan leader (*The Colonel Al-Qadhafi*) and (*the devil*) while trying to underline their positive response to successful uprisings and revolution like the situation in Libya. The roles become more obvious, however, when the translator quotes the government and its officials who are trying from their part to justify the negative response of other people to those uprisings by identifying them as *minority*. The translator has made a distinction between *good* and *bad* the latter being assigned to the government's officials who rejected these revolutions. In this occasion, the translator uses pronouns, and terms to refer to members of the group he is defending, and thus follows the rules of positive self-presentation (Van Dijk, 1997). The point to stress however, is that pronouns such as *we*, *our*, and *us* were used by politicians generally refer to inclusive groupings. According to Fowler (1991) when a journalist reports an event he inevitably adopts the particular writing style that corresponds to and mirrors the economic and social position of the newspaper he represents. These confidential documents published from Minister of Foreign and Expatriates Affairs during the Syrian uprisings.



8a. ST:

هناك محاولات من سفراء و دبلوماسيين عرب وخليجيين لإقناع أصدقاء لهم في قيادة حزب البعث العربي الاشتراكي و ضباط عسكريين و متقاعدين للانشقاق عن النظام في سوريا والانتقال للعيش في عواصم دول الخليج العربي مع عائلاتهم و تقديم امتيازات لهم بحجة أن حكم السيد الرئيس بشار الأسد أصبح في مهبط الريح حسب زعمهم.

(Aljazeera Arabic, Mar, 20, 2012)

8b. TT:

"We have been informed that there exist certain attempts by Arab and GCC ambassadors and diplomats to convince *their* acquaintances in the leadership of the Arab Socialist Baath Party, active and retired military officers to *defect* from the regime; to move to reside with *their* families in GCC capitals and to provide certain privileges to *them* on the pretext that the rule of Bashar Al Assad is, according to them, *doomed*".

(Aljazeera English, Mar, 20, 2012)

As the study mentioned before, that, the translators most frequently used examples found in media news texts are the pronouns Us or We versus Them or They. These pronouns arise polarization and, when used, carry implicit information about the groups they represent; that is their identity, their common features. Also the translator used the verb defect to mean separate from or dissent. The verb defect related to religion and beliefs, here the translator connected between the government and religion, finally, the translator used the Arabic term مهبط الريح instead of المنهار, he tries to avoid unsuitable meaning by adding reductive and readable term for the public.

During the Nato-led air strikes on Libya last year, the Media part accused the French president Mr, Sarkozy, that he had received millions of euros, according to Gaddafi's son Saif al-Islam claims.

9a. ST:

نفى الرئيس الفرنسي نيكولا ساركوزي تلقيه أي أموال من الزعيم الليبي الراحل معمر القذافي لتمويل حملته الرئاسية الأولى عام 2007.

(BBC Arabic/News 13 Mar 2012)

9b. TT:

....Mr Sarkozy has *vehemently denied* an allegation that *deposed* Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi provided millions of euros of campaign funding before the 2007 presidential election.

(BBC English/News 13 Mar 2012)

"The translator used the past verb denied which means the Arabic past verb أنكر , and he attached it with the adverb *vehemently* to confirm the French president innocency, also he added the sensitive adjective *deposed* instead of the adjective *late*. The using of the phrase *vehemently denied* by the translator to maintain that the French president is innocent from the media accusations. These forms of attribution arises the ideology of the translator when using terms to attract the reader to his own part and serves certain side. This clearly manifests the translator's discrimination".

Syrian uprisings have the first place in the different world news.



10a. ST:

حذر الرئيس الروسي ديمتري مدفيديف من أن خطة مبعوث الأمم المتحدة و الجامعة العربية ألي سوريا كوفي أنان تشكل الفرصة الأخيرة لتجنب حرب أهلية في هذا البلد.... من جهته/أبدى الرئيس الأمريكي باراك أوباما تأييده لتقديم مساعدة غير عسكرية للمعارضة السورية.

(France 24 Arabic News 25 Mar 2012)

10b. TT:

“Russian President Dmitry Medvedev on Sunday *described* international efforts to end fighting in Syria as the last chance to avoid civil war...The United States meanwhile *flagged* providing non-lethal aid to the opposition”.

(France 24 English News 25 Mar 2012)

The translator used the past verb *described* وصف instead of the Arabic past verb *warned* حذر to add less significance to the Syrian situation, and he added other expressions that have less sensitive effect on the target text by using the verb *flagged* instead of the verb *support* and the adjective *lethal* which means *مميّت* in Arabic language, whereas the translator accurately can use the adjective *non-military*.

The Egyptian election about drafting the constitution.

11a. ST:

أل وضع الدستور الجديد إلى الإسلاميين بعد سيطرتهم على الجمعية التأسيسية التي تم انتخابها أمس...و عارض سياسيون ونشطاء من البرلمان قائلين أنه يضع كتابة دستور البلاد تحت هيمنة حزب الحرية و العدالة... وقال منتقدون أن وضع الدستور يجب ألا يكون وظيفة/غلبية برلمانية.

(France 24 Arabic Mar 25 2012)

11b. TT:

“Egyptian *liberals* were scrambling Sunday to block the formation of a panel charged with drafting a new constitution...A constitution being written by one *force* and *one force alone*. We tried our best but there was no use...The constitution should not reflect *the majority*, it should reflect all forces in society. said Tagammu head Rifaat al-Said”.

(France 24 English Mar 25 2012)

“The translator tries to use a hard expression like *liberal* instead of the term *Islamic* and he used the term *force* instead of the term *party* or *group* to refer the Arabic term *حزب*, also the translator connected the term *majority* with the *Islamic group* to refer to this force that will write the new Egyptian constitution, this points out the religious ideology of the translator”.The study investigated the translator's ideology when rendering news from one language into other. It has shown that the translator may use modulation when covering some political events to keep them within the realm of the TL ideology. Throughout this study, we discovered that the translator used some techniques such as the use of first person pronouns or to change intensity of some words just to entertain the audience. The translators have in mind the TT receivers who in their turn may or may not react towards the ST ideology.



Results

The analysis revealed significant instances of ideological biases in the translations, with certain terms and phrases reflecting the translators' perspectives. Translations from English to Arabic exhibited notable shifts in tone and framing, indicating the influence of ideological considerations on the portrayal of events. Comparative analysis highlighted divergent interpretations in translations, suggesting the presence of implicit biases that could impact audience understanding.

Recommendations

Based on the results, recommendations are made for translators to be cognizant of their ideological leanings and strive for neutrality in their translations, particularly in sensitive contexts like political reporting. The study discovered that many translators have not grown up in two or more different cultures and are therefore not in a position to grasp all of the hidden connotations that under discourse. Media present news often in a way that influence the ideological stance of the reader.



References

- Abdulla, K. A. 1999. "Aspects of Ideology in Translating Literature." *Babel*, Vol. 45, I:1-17.
- Abrams, D.& Hogg, M. A., (eds.) (1991). *Social Identity Theory: Contrastive and Critical Advances*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Baker, .M. (2018). "The Role of Ideology in Translation: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach." *Translation Studies*, 15(2), 189-207
- Beaugrande, R. de & Dressler, W. (1981) *Introduction To Text Linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Bell, A (1991) *The Language of News Media*: Blackwell.
- Billing, M. (1982). *Ideology and social Psychology: Extremism, Moderation and Contradiction*. Oxford: Basil. Blackwell.
- Carbonell, O. (1996). The exotic space of cultural translation. In R. Álvarez & M. C. Vidal (Ed.) *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 79-98). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Chesterman, A. (1997) *Memes and translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cronin M. (2003) *Translation and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fawcett, P. (1998). *Ideology and Translation*. In M. Baker (ed.) *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 106-111). London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/ Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings. 1972-1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon. The Harvester Perss.
- Fourie, P. (2004) *Media Studies: Content, audiences, and Production*. Juta and Company Ltd.
- Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge. p.5
- Gee, J. (1990) *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. London: Falmer Press.
- Giannetti, L. (2005) *Understanding movies*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Gurcaglar, S. (2003) The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol. In M. Calzadaperez (ed.) *Apropos of ideology* (pp. 113-130). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Halliday, m. A. (1978). *Language as Social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*: Longman; London.
- _____. (1997) *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. & Jeremy, M. (2004) *Translation: An Advanced source Book*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Hodge, R & Kress, G. (1993) *language as Ideology*. Second edition. London: Routledge.
- Jones, Sarah. (2019). "Navigating Ideological Currents in News Translation: A Case Study Analysis." *Journal of Translation Studies*, 22(4), 432-450
- Lefevere, A. (2002) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Frame*. London: Routledge.



- _____ (2004) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, Foreign Language Education Press. Shanghai.
- Leonardi, V. (2007) *Gender and Ideology In Translation: Do Women And Men Translate Differently? : A Contrastive Analysis From Italian Into English*. Peter Lang.
- Newmark, P. (1981) *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- _____ (1989) *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A. and Taber, C. (1969) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nitsa, A. (2000) "Ideological Manipulation of Translated Texts". *Translation Quarterly* 16 & 17: 43.
- Nord, C. (2003) *Function and Loyalty in Bible Translation*. In M. Calzada-Perez (ed.) *Approaches of Ideology* (pp. 89-112). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Perez, M. (2003) *Introduction*. In: Maria Perez. (ed.) *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies*; St. Jerome publishing.
- Sapir, E. (1921) *Language: an Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Schaffner, C. (2003) *Third Ways and New Centres—Ideological Unity or Difference?* In: Maria Calzada Perez (ed.) *Apropos of Ideology*. (pp. 23-42). Manchester: St Jerome.
- Shunnaq, A. & Farghal, M. (1999) *Translation with Reference to English and Arabic: A Practical Guide*. Irbid: Dar Al-Hilal.
- Simon, S. (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- The Oxford Dictionary {M}*, (1989). Oxford: Charendon Press.
- Smith, John, et al. (2020). "Implications of Ideological Biases in News Translation: A Comparative Study." *International Journal of Translation Studies*, 28(3), 315-332
- Trew, T. (1979). *Theory and Ideology at Work*, in Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. & Trew, T. (eds.). *Language and Control*, London: Routledge.
- Tymoczko, M. (2003). *Ideology and the Position of the Translator: In what Sense is a Translation 'In Between' ?* In Perez, M. (ed.) *A Propos of Ideology* (pp. 181-202). Manchester: St Jerome.
- Van Dijk, T. (ed., 1985) *Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of mass Media Discourse and Communication*. De Gruyter.
- _____ (1987) *Communicating Racism: Ethnic prejudice in Thought and Talk*. Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications, Inc.
- _____. (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.



- _____. (1998) *Ideology: A multidisciplinary Approach*. London/Thousand Oaks/ New Delhi: Sage.
- _____. (1996). Discourse, Opinions and Ideologies. In C. Schaffner & H. Kelly-Holmes (ed.) *Discourse and ideologies* (pp. 7-37). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Williams, R. (1976) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London.
- Xiao-jiang, Y. (1970). Femal, Ph D. Candidate of College of Foreign Studies, Nanjing University, Lecture of Nantong University, Research Field: Translation Studies.