TRANSLATION AS AN IDEOLOGICAL TOOL: AN ANALYSIS OF RASHA ṢĀDIQ'S FEMINIST TRANSLATION OF ROSALIND MILES'S *WHO COOKED THE LAST SUPPER? THE WOMEN'S HISTORY OF THE WORLD*

BY

Dr. Heba Fawzy El-Masry

PhD in Translation Studies

Lecturer of Translation Studies at the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Tanta University

TRANSLATION AS AN IDEOLOGICAL TOOL: AN ANALYSIS OF RASHA ṢĀDIQ'S FEMINIST TRANSLATION OF ROSALIND MILES'S *WHO COOKED THE LAST SUPPER? THE WOMEN'S HISTORY OF THE WORLD*

Dr. Heba Fawzy El-Masry

PhD in Translation Studies

Lecturer of Translation Studies at the Department of English

Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Tanta University

Abstract

The present study analyses an Arabic feminist translation of Rosalind Miles's (2001) book *Who Cooked the Last Supper? The Women's History of the World*, which is the translation that was produced by Rasha Ṣādiq (Miles, 2001/2021). The study analyses the translator's feminist approach towards the translation through developing a method of analysis that is based on Irshad and Yasmin's (2022) categorisation of the ways in which the feminist translation theory is applied in studies about translated novels. The study investigates the ways in which the translator intervenes in the text to manipulate it. It also explores the extent to which the translator's intervention in the text and her attitude towards feminism impact her translation. The study contributes to the field of translation studies by analysing a feminist Arabic translation and thus by trying to meet a growing interest in feminist writings and studies which are becoming increasingly popular in academia. It helps in furthering the understanding of feminist translation praxis in the Arab world, highlights the role that translation can play as a tool that serves an ideology, and clarifies the pros and cons of translating Western feminist texts into Arabic in light of the nature of conservative Arab societies and the needs of Arab women.

Keywords: feminist translation, translation as a tool, intervention in translation, the translator's visibility

ملخص البحث:

تقوم هذه الدراسة بتحليل ترجمة عربية نسوية لكتاب روزاليند مايلز (٢٠٠١) *من طبخت العشاء الأخير؟ تاريخ العالم كما ترويه النساء*، وهي الترجمة التي قدمتها رشا صادق (مايلز،٢٠٢١/٢٠٠١). تحلل الدراسة نهج المترجمة النسوي في الترجمة عن طريق تطوير طريقة تحليل ترتكز على تصنيف إرشاد وياسمين (٢٠٢٢) لطرق تطبيق نظرية الترجمة النسوية في دراسات عن الروايات المُتَرجمة، و تقوم الدراسة بتقصي طرق تدخل المترجمة في النص للتلاعب به ، كما تستكشف مدى تأثير تدخل المترجمة في النص وموقفها تجاه النسوية على ترجمتها. تساهم الدراسة في مجال دراسات الترجمة من خلال تحليل ترجمة نسوية عربية وبالتالي تحاول تلبية الاهتمام المتزايد بالكتابات والدراسات النسوية التي تتنامى شعبيتها في المجال الأكاديمي، كما تساعد في تطوير فهم ممارسة الترجمة النسوية في العالم العربي وتبرز الدور الذي يمكن أن تلعبه الترجمة كأداة تخدم أيديولوجية ما، وتوضح الإيجابيات لترجمة النصوص النسوية الغربية إلى العربية والمآخذ ضدها في ضوء طبيعة المجتمعات العربية المحافظة ومتطلبات النساء العربيات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: *الترجمة النسوية ، الترجمة كآداة ، التدخل في الترجمة ، ظهور المترجم*

Introduction: The Femininity of Translation

For centuries, women and translation have been disparaged as they have historically been considered as "weaker figures in their respective hierarchies" (Simon, 1996, p. 1). Women have often been thought of as inferior or secondary to men while translation has been thought of as a mere mirror of an original text. The relationship between the original author and the translator has been described as one between a lady and a handmaid (Simon, 1996, p.1), an "inventor" and an "imitator", or a master and a "slave" (Wallmach, 1998, p. 15).

The parallelism between women and translation in terms of secondariness is reflected in translational rhetoric where translation has been descried as feminine since the time of Cicero (Wallmach, 1998, p. 15). Chamberlin (1992) observes that the discourse of translation has often created a metaphorical link between gender and translation which reflects the fact that a misogynist perception of gender roles has dominated the representation of translation (p. 57). One recurring concept in the discourse of translation is that of production, which is perceived as masculine and original, and reproduction, which is perceived as feminine and "derivative" (Chamberlain, 1992, p. 57). Simon (1996) explains that the "hierarchal authority

of the original over the reproduction is linked with imagery of the masculine and feminine; the original is considered the strong generative male, the translation the weaker and derivative female". (p. 1). Commenting on the insufficiency of his own translation, Florio (1603) describes it as a "defective edition" because "all translations are reputed females, delivered at second hand" (para. 1). Castro (2009) states that the dichotomy between the active or productive work, which is done by men and authors of the original work, and the passive or reproductive work, which is done by women and translators, gives rise to this dual inferiority of women and translators (p. 67). Chamberlian (1992) notes that reproduction—whether it be of human beings, which is done by women, or of texts, which is done by translators—is typically underestimated in the hierarchal systems which characerise our culture (p. 66).

The concept of faithfulness in relationships is the basis for another example of sexist imagery used in discussions about translation. In this context, Simon (1996) refers to the expression "les belles infidèles" which means that the beautiful are the unfaithful ones (p. 1). For centuries, this metaphor has nourished suspicions about the faithfulness of beautiful translations and has suggested that faithful translations are ugly (Wallmach, 1996, p. 16). Wallmach (1996) notes that the expression has seemingly lasted because it has reflected a cultural comparison between faithfulness in translation and faithfulness of beautiful women in relationships (p. 16).

The heritage of inferiority that translation and women have shared is a point where translation studies and feminism intersect. Simon (1996) observes that many of the fundamental issues of feminism have inspired translation studies; these issues include scepticism of established gender roles and hierarchies, mistrust of laws defining faithfulness, and doubt about universally accepted standards of meaning and worth (p. 8). The two disciplines have focused on studying the ways in which secondariness is "defined and canonized" in language because translation studies and feminist studies are grounded in the dynamics of an era that gave much importance to language (Simon, 1996, p. 8).

The growing global appeal of feminism and the strong interest in the phenomenon has been reflected in the increasing number of studies on the subject in the field of translation studies (Irshad & Yasmin, 2022, pp. 3-4). The present study attempts to meet the interest in the topic by investigating the feminist intervention in a feminist Arabic translation produced by Rasha Ṣādiq (Miles, 2001/2021), which is her translation of Rosalind Miles's (2021) feminist book entitled *Who Cooked the Last Supper? The Women's History of the World.* The study depends on the classification that Irshad and Yasmin (2022) created—in which they categorise the methods of applying the feminist translation theory in studies about translated novels—in developing its method of analysis. This method of analysis aims at investigating the ways in which the translator intervenes in the text and how she becomes a collaborator with the author in creating meaning. The study contributes to the growing body of research on feminism by advancing the understanding of the praxis of feminist translation in the Arab world and by highlighting the pros and cons of translating a Western feminist text into Arabic.

Feminist Translation Theory: Genisis, Focus, and Aims

Feminism is one of the movements and ideologies that appeared in different parts of the world towards the end of the nineteenth century (Kamal, 2018, p. 136). It strongly influenced post WWII societies in North America and Europe in the twentieth century (von Flotow, 2018, p. 347), was distinctly shaped within Western academia and by international institutions in the 1970s, and has since moved around the globe (Kamal, 2018, p 136). It has advocated and fought for women's "civic political, personal, cultural, and social" rights and for elevating their status (von Flotow, 2018, p. 347).

Feminism is a problematic term because of its richness and complexity. Goodman (1996) defines it as "a recognition of the historical and cultural subordination of women (the

only world-wide majority to be treated as a minority), and a resolve to do something about it" (p. x). von Flotow (2018) defines feminism as "the theoretical" dimension of the movement which aims at enhancing the women's status in society (p. 99). Frye (2000) states that feminism can be viewed as "a theory –system of concepts, prepositions and analysis that describe and explain women's situations and experiences and support recommendations about how to improve them" (p. 195). Frye (2000) adds that feminism can be understood as "a kind of social movement, one that may generate and be aided by theory", and she explains that the theory and the movement aim at making women flourish and at enabling women to manage sufficient resources to lead a good life (p. 195). Regardless of how it is defined or perceived, the feminist movement is propelled by the feminist consciousness of its members (Kamal, 2016a, p. 18). The concept of feminist consciousness is defined by Lerner (1993) as follows:

> I define feminist consciousness as the awareness of women that they belong to a subordinate group; that they have suffered wrongs as a group; that their condition of subordination is not natural but is socially determined; that they must join with other women to remedy these wrongs; and finally that they must and can provide an alternative vision of social organisation in which women as well as men will enjoy autonomy and self-determination (p. 14).

Therefore, Kamal (2016a) notes that feminist consciousness entails activism and acquiring the adequate knowledge through intellectual awakening, resisting injustice and inequality, and promoting solidarity (p. 6). In this context, the feminist movement, which is based on a feminist awareness, emerges as a movement that is aware of the social power structures that oppress and marginalise women and that is actively engaged in exposing these structures and altering them (Kamal, 2016a, p. 6).

The feminist theory emerged from the feminist movement as a system of ideas that attempts to describe the situation of women, to analyse their lives, and to resist traditional social norms formed by the patriarchy. It emphasises the plurality of women and that women cannot be reduced to a single type (von Flotow, 1997, p. 47).

Since the nineteenth century, studies on language and gender have investigated the idea that the way humans see and experience the world is directly influenced by language to the point that it even shapes it; however, it was during the late 1960s and early 1970s that the feminist theory and movement highlighted the significance of language in defining womanhood (Ergün, 2013, p. 15). The feminist scholars who mainly focused on the representation of women in language were particularly concerned with the notion that patriarchal language, which was based on the standard of masculinity, suppressed and isolated women and made them invisible (Ergün, 2013, p. 15). According to the feminist theoretical perspective, there was two ways to escape the patriarchal language trap: either drastically change and take back language, or fully abandon patriarchal language and develop women-specific language (Ergün, 2013, p. 15).

The work of feminist scholars in the domain of language had an impact on translation studies as it gave rise to feminist translation. The first attempts at producing feminist translations were initiated in the 1970s by feminists translating avant-garde and experimental literary works (von Flotow, 2018, p. 347). These early feminist translations brought about the realisation of feminist politics because they tampered with another culture's management of sexual difference through working with its language; therefore, translation can have an aim and effect that serve the feminist agenda and can generate resistance to the language constructed by patriarchies (von Flotow, 2018, p. 347). Consequently, a translation that is inspired by and serves the feminist movement is a form of social activism.

When feminism started to focus on language and to approach translation, translation studies had already taken a cultural turn due to the shift of scholarly focus from the linguistic

to the cultural aspect of translation (Snell-Hornby, 1990, pp. 81-82). Translation is not done in a vacuum and is influenced by the culture which produces it or the culture which receives it in case the translation is target-culture oriented. The discipline of translation studies was thus ready to explore cultural and ideological issues when it came into contact with other disciplines such as feminism.

Translation and feminist discourse bear similarity to each other. Godard (1989) states that "a radical interrogation of meaning" reveals that feminist discourse is translation in two ways: first, the deciphering "of 'gestural' and other codes" from a previously muted discourse; second, the "repetition" and ensuing "displacement" of the prevailing discourse (p. 46). Through a calculated act of imitation, feminist discourse and translation assume "the feminine role" to subvert the discursive mechanism as they "convert a form of subordination into an affirmation" and challenge dominant notions (Godard, 1989, p. 46). The repetition reveals the hidden "operation of the feminine in language" (Godard, 1989, p. 46), and the visibility of what is hidden resists the invisibility imposed on women in language and on translators.

Visibility is a key concept because it is one of the points where feminist theory and translation studies intersect. On the one hand, feminist theory and practice encourage the visibility of women in texts as feminist theory "is based on retrieving women from the margins and bringing them center-stage" and feminist practice focuses on the recognition of the experiences of women and the assertion of "their presence and voice" (Kamal, 2016b, p. 63). On the other hand, Venuti (1995) criticises the cultural tendency to prefer fluency in American and British translations which are characterised by their use of "modern" and "standard" English and by avoiding "foreign words" in order to make the produced text seem original rather than translated (pp. 4-5). Fluent translations erase "self-reflexive elements" and supress the translator's presence (Godard, 1989, p. 47). Transparency turns the translator into an unseen hand that automatically renders a message from one language into another (Godard, 1989, p. 47). It makes the translator hide his or her work and thereby becomes invisible (Venuti, 1995, p. 5). Venuti (1995) views preferring transparency in Anglophone translations as "the authoritative discourse for translating" (p. 6). The dominance of conventional ideas about authorship, which view the text as the work of a single entity and a product that accurately represents the intention of its author, leads to viewing the translator as a copyist and the translation as an imitation of an original work (Venuti, 1995, p. 7). In the Anglophone modern context where the conventional perceptions of authorship are dominant, translation is expected to be transparent (Venuti, 1995, p. 7); therefore, the translator is expected to be invisible. Venuti (1995) describes the translator's invisibility as "self-annihilation" (p. 8).

Although equating translation to equivalence is still dominant, contemporary translation theories are increasingly stressing the idea that translation does not revolve around looking for similarity only (Godard, 1989, p. 48). For example, Bassnett (2002) states that the task of the translator goes beyond dealing with language alone and that translation involves "a process of coding and recoding" in which the translator receives the message, analyses it, transfers it, and reconstructs it before presenting it to the target reader (pp. 24-25). Thus, the translator becomes a producer like the author, not a mere imitator. By viewing the translator as the link that ends and begins the communication chains of reception/analysis and reconstruction/reproduction, translation theory overlaps with feminist textual theory as they emphasise the self-reflexive elements that bring the translator's work to the fore (Godard, 1989, pp. 48-49).

From the intersection between the feminist theory and translation theory and due to the impact that the first has on the later, feminist translation theory and practice have arisen. von Flotow (1991) defines feminist translation as a translation method which was developed

by feminist writers in Quebec and which focuses on and criticises male-controlled language (p. 72). Kamal (2016b) observes that von Flotow's definition of feminist translation means that feminist translation has strategies which resemble those of feminist writing and that feminist translation is a part of feminist writing (p. 61). Therefore, feminist translation seems to follow the same ways that feminist writing does when challenging patriarchal authority to empower women. Empowering women can be achieved in the realm of translation when the feminist translator performs an act of resistant aggression and becomes a creative writer that intervenes in the text and exploits the "lexicon" (von Flotow, 1991, p. 81); thereby, the feminist translator deconstructs the conventional patriarchal language that keeps women silent or inferior in language.

Feminist translation theory and practice are founded on the premise that the translator's attitude towards women's issues affects how feminist works are translated (Kamal, 2016b, p. 57). Feminist translation theory tries to explore several issues which include the identifying features of feminist discourse, the areas where the feminist theory and translation studies overlap, and the translation strategies that aid in the preservation of a text's feminism (Kamal 2016b, p. 57). Additionally, it seeks to detect and critique the ideas which keep women and translation inferior to men or to source texts; therefore, it studies the methods by which translation has become "feminised," and strives to disrupt the power structures that have preserved the association between women and translation (Simon, 1996, p. 1).

According to Godard (1989), feminist discourse is characterised by the feature of representing the self and the other (p. 44); it is also characterised by the tendency to question, override, and replace the hegemonic discourse of the patriarchy (p. 46). These features also characterise feminist translation. Consequently, feminist translation does not seek reproducing an equivalent but rather attempts to rewrite, transform, and produce a text which reflects the feminist view (Godard, 1989, p. 47).

Although difference is usually viewed unfavourably in translation—especially in the paradigm of equivalence—it is viewed otherwise in feminist translation because it is central to the critical attitude feminist writers and translators take towards the norms of patriarchal discourse (Godard, 1989, p. 51). The gap between the original text and the translation which is created by the difference between the two is an important element in "cognitive processes" because it makes the new meanings understood and constructed by the translator more obvious in the text (Godard, 1989, p.51). Godard (1989) observes that feminist translation is one where the translator substitutes modesty with self-assertion and emphasises that the feminist translator manifests her presence in the text through manipulating it when she reinforces her critical distinction and reveals her pleasure to re-read and reconstruct the text (p. 51).

In the battle for empowerment, a feminist translator that considers transparency from a feminist point of view is obligated to incorporate the concept of visibility into the practice of translation to make the feminist voices heard (Kamal, 1996b, p. 63). Since feminism values the concepts of visibility and self-assertion and seeks to emphasise the significance of marginalised groups by making their voices heard, the feminist translation practice logically gives "the translator an equal degree of exposure and self-representation as that granted to the author" (Kamal, 1996b, p.63). Visibility in translation becomes an act of subversion for both women and translators because it changes their typical roles as silent, inferior agents in their fields. Since the translator shares the task of constructing the meaning with the author in the feminist translation praxis (Kamal, 1996b, p. 63), translation itself becomes an act of production. It becomes a liberating practice and a transformative act that aims at creating "new meanings" and tries to uncover "ideological modes of perception" by propagating a

message that criticises the patriarchal societies and their male-dominated language (Godard, p.1989, p. 44).

The role that feminist translation can play in instigating social change may begin with choosing a feminist text to be translated. This role is particularly obvious in the case of choosing to translate a Western feminist text into Arabic. Given the fact that the Arab world is predominantly conservative, translating Western feminist texts—which are often revolutionary in the sense that they seek to question all the norms—is itself a form of social activism (Sami, 2020, p. 208). Kamal (1998) emphasises that the roots of feminism can be found in many cultures (p. 137); she states that the use of the word "feminism" in Arabic writings can be traced back to the nineteenth century and can be found in women's journalistic writings which thrived towards the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century (p.138). However, von Flotow (1997) claims that it was North America where studies related to gender and feminism advanced in a different way in the late 1960s—which she specifies as the beginning of a period that she labels the "era of feminism"—during which feminist discourse started to influence academia and culture (p. 1). Kamal (1998) also observes that feminism has crystalised in the prolific research and critical work produced by Western academia since the 1970s (p. 137). Although the West-East direction has not been the only direction in which feminism has travelled since ancient times, it has been the most common direction for feminism as it has travelled across the globe since the 1970s (Kamal, 1998, p. 137). One of the reasons behind the fact that feminism has recently travelled from the West to Arab speaking countries seems to reside in the fact that written works about feminism are sporadic in Arabic (Kamal, 1996b, p. 72).

Kamal (1996b) generally views the traveling of feminist ideology into Arabic speaking countries positively and argues that translating feminist texts into Arabic can have "aspects of feminist agency" as it "becomes a process of feminist knowledge generation and production" (p.72). Kamal (1996b) explains that translation can be an empowering tool for Arab women as it increases their awareness and suggests territories for Arab feminists to question and to investigate (p. 72). Such view seems to regard translating feminist texts in general as a way of creating a reservoir of ideas and experiences which may inspire feminists to make changes in their societies regardless of the cultural differences.

Critique of Feminist Translation

The criticisms of feminist approaches towards translation can be classified into two categories: the first category includes those that represent perspectives outside of feminism and support objectivity in academic study, and the second category includes those that come from inside the expanding bounds of feminism (von Flotow, 1997, p. 77).

Criticisms from outside feminism are based on the idea that gender-related matters are overly emotive, overly opinionated, and overly subjective for true research (von Flotow, 1997, p. 77). The criticisms are also directed towards paratexts where the feminist translator intervenes in the text and the critics find these paratexts distracting (von Flotow, 1997, p. 78). Arguments against paratexts are based on the concept that a text should be independent and that it is faulty if it needs additions (von Flotow, 1997, p. 78).

Criticisms of feminist approaches to translation from outside feminism partly reside in the criticism of global feminism as a tool of cultural imperialism. Davis (2002) explains that global feminism has been denounced by those who regard it as a sort of cultural invasion in which a paradigm of Western feminism is forced upon women outside the West under the flag of "universal sisterhood" (p. 223). Millán (2016) states that there are global agendas which are fashioned by international and private organisations which seek to control national and local policies around the globe in order to gain political and financial benefits (p. 11). These agendas include a global model of feminism (Millán, 2016, p. 11). The problem with global

feminism is that it disregards the individuality of the experience of each woman and thereby disregards how different women may need different things and face different challenges, even within the same society.

Mohanty (1984) clarifies that the criticism of Western feminist discourse as a form of cultural imperialism is based on three arguments (p. 336). The first argument is that Western feminists seem to regard women as one unified group whose members have the same goals and desires despite their social class, race, and ethnicity (Mohanty, 1984, pp. 336-337). The second argument is global feminism's "uncritical" employment of certain methods to prove the universality of the model of feminism it has created (Mohanty, 1984, p. 337). The third argument is the creation of a division between women in the model where Western women are armed with freedom and knowledge while women in Third World countries are consistently oppressed and denied access to tools of empowerment (Mohanty, 1984, p. 337). Such division echoes the concept of the superiority of the West which has been the basis for Western imperialist moves that raise suspicion among non-Westerners.

Since feminist translation is an extension of feminist writing, it is regarded as a tool of cultural imperialism because it helps White, Western feminist ideas to travel to non-Western societies and may encourage their enforcement in societies where feminists have different concerns. This criticism may apply to the Arabic translation produced by Rasha Ṣādiq on which this study focuses (Miles, 2001/2021). In the Arabic translation, the translator keeps all the topics that Rosalind Miles (2001) discusses in her book, even those which are generally regarded as off-limits in the majority of Arabic speaking societies which are still predominantly socially and religiously conservative. For example, Miles (2001) dedicates parts of her book to attacking the three major Abrahamic religions from a non-theistic point of view that claims that women had more power before the advent of these religions (pp. 79-101); Ṣādiq translates all these parts into Arabic in spite of the fact the majority of the expected readers of her translation are followers of these religions and regardless of the fact that the societies which receive her translation may be sensitive towards attacks on religion (Miles, 2001/2021, pp.113-138). Miles (2001) also encourages the concept of a woman having more than one sexual partner (p. 40), and Ṣādiq translates parts about female sexual freedom although the societies which receive her translations are predominantly conservative regarding female sexuality (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 64). The nature of most Arab societies makes the priorities of Arab feminism different from those of global White feminism. They revolve around other issues such as getting equal rights to work and education and speaking up against traditions which may affect women's bodies and even threaten their lives. Giving wings to some of the concepts of global White feminism may be rather more shocking than useful to the expected audience whose needs in the battle for empowerment are influenced by the circumstances in their societies.

Criticism from inside feminism is based on three arguments. The first argument is that experimental feminist writing is characterised by elitism and that it mainly targets an educated audience that knows about the feminist movement (von Flotow, 1997, p. 79). The second argument is that feminist translators are opportunistic in the sense that they exploit the context that has been created by feminism to give importance to their work (von Flotow, 1997, p. 81). The third argument is related to the standardising approach that Western feminists take towards the translation of Third World literature and ideology. Spivak (1993) argues that when Western feminists become democratic with the minorities by giving their non-Western counterparts the right to speak in English through translation, their act of translation cannot be viewed as noble or benevolent but rather as an act of decorum (p. 182). Spivak (1993) observes that Western feminist translations of works from Third World countries are careless and homogenising that they make the literature produced by an Arab

woman resemble that produced by a man from the Far East (p. 182). Spivak (1993) states that this democracy in translation benefits the Western feminists because they use it to free themselves from the West's "imperialist past" and "often racist present" (p. 180).

Womanhandling Texts

Feminist translators intervene in texts in order to manipulate them to fight the patriarchy in language and give women voice. "*Womanhandling*" is what Godard (1989) calls such feminist manipulation of a translation (p. 51). Godard (1989) explains that when a feminist translator womanhandles a text, she actively participates in the text's production and shows off her presence in it (p. 50). Kamal (1996b) observes that womanhandling is defined in terms of the concepts of "visibility" and "self-assertion" which violently clash with the concepts of transparency or "invisibility" and "equivalence" that characterise translation practice (p. 16).

Kamal (1996b) identifies two central voices in the feminist translation, namely the voice of the author of the original text and the voice of the feminist translator (p. 71). Kamal (1996b) observes that the biggest challenge that the feminist translator faces is to make her voice heard without muting the author of the original text (p. 71).

There are many strategies that feminist translators employ. One of these is foreignization which Venuti (1995) presents as a method that preserves the difference of the source text by disturbing the cultural conventions that exist in the target language (p. 20). Kamal (1996b) considers foreignization as a strategy that reflects the feminist ethics because it makes the translator visible while preserving the voice of the original author (p. 64). Kamal (1996b) adds that foreignization can also "give space for the stylistic specifities of women's writing", preserve "feminist jargon and terminology" and allow for the expression of feminist ideas and principles stated in the language specific to feminists (p. 64). Although von Flotow (1991) states that there are many feminist strategies of intervention in translation (p.74), she focusses on three of them; these are supplementing, prefacing and footnoting, and hijacking (pp.74-80).

Simon (1996) defines supplementing as a process that "compensates for the differences between languages" and states that it corresponds to what many translation scholars refer to as compensation which is a recognised translation procedure (p. 13). It is widely used by translators in general, but feminist translators are often more concerned with using it to transfer expressions related to gender (Chen & Zhang, 2016, p. 603).

Footnoting and prefacing have lately become commonly used in feminist translations due to the impact that feminism has on the translator's visibility in the text (von Flotow, 1991, p.76). Feminist translators are no longer modest, and they tend to discuss their work or flaunt their presence in paratexts (von Flotow, 1991, p. 76). Footnotes give the feminist translators the space to clarify and explain culture-specific elements and allow feminist translators to add information when they feel necessary or to comment on parts of the texts. Therefore, von Flotow (1997) views explanations and comments in footnotes as a form of guidance that makes the feminist translator play an educational role (p. 41). It must be noted that the feminist translators can also manifest their presence in the translation by using typographical features such as italics (Godard, 1989, p. 51). Espasa (2008) describes such employment of typology to intervene in the text as creative (p. 4), suggesting that it also contributes to constructing the meaning of the text.

Hijacking is "the appropriation of a text whose intentions are not necessarily feminist by the feminist translator" (Simon, 1996, p. 14). The translator mainly intervenes to correct the text deliberately (von Flotow, 1991, p. 79), and the correction involves deviating from the original text and modifying the segments which have anti-women connotations (Chen & Zhang, 2016, p. 604).

Methodology

In order to analyse the feminist translation of Miles's (2001) book which was produced by Ṣādiq (Miles, 2001/2021), the present study depends on the tripartite classification of Irshad and Yasmin (2022) which they created to review the methods of applying feminist translation theory in studies about translated novels (pp. 3-4). Irshad and Yasmin (2022) state that they have found three ways of applying feminist translation theory: the first is "the impact of gender consciousness and ideology of the translator on the translation activity", the second involves the feminist strategies of intervening in the translation, and the third is "the transference of gendered language" in translation (p. 4).

Gender consciousness makes translators who have feminist sympathies realise that they belong to a subjugated group that is controlled by men and understand the women's need to join forces to make social change (Irshad &Yasmin, 2022, p. 5). In the realm of language, men shape and govern language and form perceptions about the world by using aggressive language that stifles women's voices. The awareness of gender inequality in language and translation helps translators and translation scholars to detect the way male translators with patriarchal views mould women's experiences as described in language in accordance with the dominant discourse. Such awareness also encourages feminist translators to intervene in texts to shape the narrative in accordance with their ideology and to manifest their presence.

The feminist strategies of intervention are the three strategies of womanhandling texts—namely supplementing, prefacing and footnoting, and hijacking—which von Flotow (1991) focuses on (pp. 74-80). The transference of gendered language or using gendered language involves using gender markers such as nouns and pronouns to foreground the feminist identity in the translation (Irshad & Yasmin, 2022, p. 10). Such practice can be found in case some parts of speech of a source language—such as English—do not reveal the referent's sex (Di Sabato & Perri, 2020, p. 363). Translators intervene in the text to manipulate the gender markers in order to subvert the male-as-norm practice which can be found in languages such as Arabic and Spanish. For example, the masculine form is often chosen when the sex of the referent is not known in Arabic. The masculine form is also used in Spanish to refer to a group if this group consists of many women and only one man. Feminist translators can use the female forms in these cases to emphasise the female presence.

The study adapts the classification of Irshad and Yasmin (2022) into a method that can be used to analyse Ṣādiq's feminist translation (Miles, 2001/2021). The analysis explores how she preserves the feminist character of the original text and how her own attitude towards feminism is reflected in her Arabic translation. The method of analysis has three steps:

    1-identifying selected feminist elements in the translation.

    2-categorising the translator's ways of intervention in the text in light of the classification of ways of applying feminist translation theory in studies about translated novels that has been made by Irshad and Yasmin (2022).

    3- discussing how these ways of intervention preserve the feminist character of the original text, reflect the translator's own attitude towards translation, affect the translation, or help global feminism to spread.

The order in which these steps are followed may differ from one selected example to another in the analysis section. The steps are numbered for clarity.

The analysis aims at furthering our understanding of the ways in which the feminist translator intervenes in the text to keep its feminist character, how she cooperates with the author in creating the meaning of a feminist text, and how her work may help global feminist concepts to travel to Arabic speaking societies by presenting them and by attempting to normalise them through translation.

Analysis

Ṣādiq's feminist sympathies are obvious from the very beginning of the translation as they are reflected in the way she translates the title (Miles, 2001/2021). The first part of the title of Miles's (2001) book is "*Who Cooked the Last Supper?*", and the English verb does not reveal the sex of the subject. When referring to an unknown subject in Arabic, it is the norm to use the masculine form of the verb or referent. However, Ṣādiq translates the title as " من طبخت العشاء الأخير " (Miles, 2001/2021). The particle "ت" or "tā'" which she adds to the verb "طبخ", which means "cooked", makes it clear that the book revolves around women. The translator uses gendered language and her intervention in the translation subverts the male-as-norm practice in the Arabic language and highlights the feminist nature of the original text.

Referring to her impressions about Joan of Arc and Elizabeth I when she was young, Miles (2001) writes: "their muscular but austere spinsterhood held few attractions for my girlish mind" (p.1). Ṣādiq translates this sentence as "وعنوستهما الذكورية المتقشفة، كلها لم تستهو خيال البنت الصغيرة التي كنتها آنذاك" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 15). By translating "muscular" as "ذكورية" which means "masculine" or "patriarchal", the translation suggests that the idea of women's spinsterhood— which has negative and even offensive connotations about unmarried women—has been created by men. The translator's intervention sharpens the image of a world whose norms are dictated by men. Although Miles (2001) does not directly state that men are behind the creation of the offensive idea of spinsterhood (p. 1), Ṣādiq uses a term that immediately establishes the link between the offensive idea which belittles unmarried women and the patriarchy (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 15). The translator's intervention can be understood in light of the impact of the gender consciousness and ideology of the translator on her work. As a woman, she belongs to the dominated group and her feminist translation seems to attempt to expose the role of the dominant patriarchy in creating the norms which control or belittle women.

When commenting on the lack of focus on women in history books, Miles (2001) writes: "I was not the only one pondering women's absence from the history books" (p. 2). Ṣādiq translates the sentence as "لم أكن الوحيدة التي يؤرقها غياب النساء عن كتب التاريخ" which literally means that the author was not the only woman who could not sleep as she was thinking of women's absence from history books (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 16). The Arabic translation of the sentence applies the feminist theory in two ways: first, by changing the form of the adjective that modifies the referent; and second, by substituting the verb with another one that intensifies the feeling towards documenting women's presence in history. As for the first way, Ṣādiq uses the feminine form of the adjective "وحيد" which is "وحيدة" (Miles, 2001/2021, p.16), and her choice substitutes the gender-neutral adjective "only" (Miles, 2001, p. 2). The manipulation of the gender markers in the translation emphasises the women's presence in the text. The second way in which Ṣādiq emphasises the feminist character of the book is when she uses the verb "يؤرق" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 16), which literally means "making someone not able to sleep", to translate the verb "ponder" which Miles (2001) uses (p. 2). The change of the verb makes the subject in the translated sentence too concerned about women's lack of representation in history to the extent that she cannot sleep. Even if used figuratively, the verb used in the translation reflects a greater feeling of concern than the one used in the original text. The intensified feeling of concern towards women's issues can be explained in light of the translator's gender consciousness and ideology and reflects her feminist sympathy and the role she plays as a co-author that collaborates with the original author in creating the meaning.

Talking about the little mention of women in history, Miles (2001) asks: "[who] knows now…that generations of battling queens in India and Arabia helped to make their countries what they are today?" (p. 4). Ṣādiq translates this question as " من يعرف اليوم... أن أجيالا

"من الملكات المتحاربات في الهند والسعودية، ساهمن في صنع الصورة الحالية لبلادهن؟!" (Miles, 2001/2021, p.19). By substituting Arabia with "السعودية" or "Saudi Arabia", the translator stresses the idea of marginalising women as she chooses a country that has often been associated with the marginalisation of women in the feminist discourse. The change she makes can be understood against the backdrop of her ideology as she sharpens the image of the marginalisation of women in history by focusing on women in a society where they have most typically been thought of as an oppressed or marginalised group. Additionally, the use of the exclamation mark at the end of the question reflects her condemnation of women's marginalisation in history, and the creative use of typology is one of the strategies of feminist intervention in translation which reflects the translator's feminist sympathies.

When discussing historical male figures' treatment of women, Miles (2001) states that "Ghandi had… abused women" (p. 4). Ṣādiq translates this sentence as "غاندي كان يغتصب النساء" which means that Ghandi used to rape women (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 19). Although abusing people generally means mistreating them which may include being unjust to them or even being verbally violent, the choice of sexual violation of women intensifies the cruelty and injustice experienced by women, and the translator's choice seems to be triggered by her ideology which makes this part of the translation even more radical than the feminist source text.

Listing the ways in which women in the East are oppressed, Miles (2001) states that "in Kuwait, women are still denied the vote" (p. 8). Ṣādiq translates the sentence as " في الكويت، حصلت المرأة الكويتية على حق " and she adds the following footnote: "لم تحصل النساء على حق الاقتراع الاقتراع عام ٢٠٠٥، أي بعد أربعة أعوام من صدورالطبعة الأولى لهذا الكتاب. المترجمة" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 24). The footnote can be backtranslated as "Kuwaiti women obtained the right to vote in 2005, four years after the publication of the first edition of this book. The translator". By using the strategy of footnoting and clarifying that she is the one who inserts additional information, the translator flaunts her presence in the translation and rejects the status of secondariness which is often forced on women and translators who are expected to be in the shadow of men and original authors. The educational information about Kuwaiti women's voting rights which she provides for the readers makes her cooperate with the author in creating the meaning of the text.

Commenting on what women did every time they revolted against the patriarchy and tried to change the norms, Miles (2001) claims that "on each occasion of new revolt, everything had to be rediscovered and reinvented" (p. 10). Ṣādiq translates this sentence as "في كل ثورة جديدة، كان على المرأة أن تكتشف الأشياء من جديد وأن تخترعها من الصفر" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 26). The term "reinventing" means making "something new that is based on something that already exists" (Cambridge English Dictionary, n.d) but " تخترعها من الصفر " means "creating something from scratch" or "inventing something entirely new". The translator's decision augments the efforts women put into their struggle for change as they need to begin from scratch with each revolution. Her decision reflects the impact of her gender consciousness and ideology on the translation as she chooses the words which emphasise the great effort women put into making the social change happen.

Giving examples of influential women, Miles (2001) mentions "riveting Rosies" (p. 11). Ṣādiq translates this phrase as "روزي المُبَرْشِمة (٢)" and she refers the readers to a numbered footnote in which she explains that Rosie the Riveter was the star of a campaign that aimed at recruiting women to work in defence industries during WWII and became an icon of American women; then, she ends the footnote with the word "المترجمة" or "the translator" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 27). The translator resorts again to footnoting which is one of the feminist strategies of intervention in transition, and the repetitive use of footnoting continues to make her visible in the translation and to subvert the norm of being secondary to

men and to the original author. Adding educational information about the role of an iconic woman during the WWII in a footnote also makes the translator cooperate with the original author in constructing the meaning of the text.

Miles (2001) describes bias against women as "unconscious prejudice" (p.13), and Ṣādiq translates the phrase as "التعصب المعشش في اللاوعي" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 29). The Arabic translation can be backtranslated as "bias that is anchored in the unconsciousness". The change that the translator makes can be understood in light of the translator's ideology, and her intervention in the translation reflects her feminist sympathy by intensifying the degree to which the prejudice against women is deeply rooted in the unconsciousness of societies that have been predominantly controlled by men.

Talking about women who lived during the Stone Age, Miles (2001) explains that women were so burdened that not many early women were "post-menopausal" (p. 21). Ṣādiq translates this phase as "ممن تجاوزن سن الضهي" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 41). The most used term for "menopause" in Arabic is "سن اليأس" which literally means the "age of despair". The term may sound offending to women because it suggests lack of productivity. The use of the less commonly used euphemistic alternative seems to be inspired by the translator's gender consciousness as her choice avoids using a term that may offend a wide category of women.

Referring to shrines of ancient goddesses in archaeological sites, Miles (2001) states that the incarnations of the goddesses on a site in Turkey are those of the "maiden, mother and crone" (p. 36). Ṣādiq translates "crone" as "عجوز" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 59). Thus, she decides to choose a word which simply means "old" instead of using a term that includes the component of meanness included in the meaning of the source language word and found in an Arabic equivalent such as "حيزبون". The decision of not using an offending word to describe a female seems to result from the translator's gender consciousness which makes her avoid using offending words to describe women in some parts of the translation.

Miles (2001) narrates the story of a Scottish factory girl named Mary Slessor who left her country and travelled to Africa as a single woman and worked there as a missionary and had a life full of adventure, and she observes that if Slessor had not left the traditional life back home, "she would have been still at her loom in the mill" (p. 207). Ṣādiq translates this sentence as "لظلت ماري مجرد عاملة بائسة في مصنع" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 263). The insertion of the term "بائسة" which means "desperate" emphasises the image that the original author portrays for women who succumbed to the traditional life of women back then. The intervention seems to be the result of the impact of the translator's ideology on her translation as she attempts to cooperate with the feminist author in constructing the meaning of the text and driving their point home.

Miles (2001) refers to a claim that men are smarter than women because they have larger heads and brains (p. 134). Ṣādiq translates this claim; then, she adds "لا تعليق!" or "no comment" which is not in the original text to voice her disapproval of the claim (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 177). The impact of her gender consciousness and ideology on the translation is revealed in her obvious intervention in the text as she comments on the author's ideas within the body of the text itself. Her intervention makes her play a role in constructing the meaning in cooperation with the author.

Miles (2001) states that men continued to enforce their patriarchal rules on women in the new colonies of the British Empire and that unmarried women in the new colonies used to be called "unprotected females" (p. 209). Ṣādiq translates this phrase as "الإناث الوحيدات اللواتي لا يحميهن رجل" (Miles, 2001/2021, pp. 265-266), and the phrase can be backtranslated as "the lonely females who are unprotected by men". The translator inserts the adjective "الوحيدات" or "lonely" to emphasise that the lack of protection results from their being unmarried, and she clarifies the source of protection for women by clearly stating that that these lonely females

are unprotected by men. The translator's intervention can be understood in light of her ideology and the words she adds clarifies the patriarchal idea which helped men to control the lives of women even in the new colonies.

Listing the causes behind men's "dissatisfaction with women's progress", Miles (2001) mentions the ability of women to learn men's skills which helped in "demystifying masculine competence" (p. 278). This phrase can be translated as "يعري/يكشف فكرة كفاءة الذكور", but Ṣādiq translates it as "ستتدمرخرافة الكفاءة الذكورية" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 347). This part in her translation can be backtranslated as "the myth of masculine competence will be destroyed". By using a verb which has a stronger effect and by inserting the term "خرافة" or "myth" to describe male competence, the translator's choices weaken the idea of men's competence and magnifies the effect of women's progress on the continuity of the idea of men's superiority. The translator's decision can be explained in light of her gender consciousness and ideology as her feminist sympathies make her tend to portray a stronger image of women.

Miles (2001) states that women have emerged victorious from "the sex war" (p. 14), and Ṣādiq translates the phrase as "معركة الجندر" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 31). The term "sex" has a direct equivalent in Arabic which is "جنس" or "نوع". However, the translator chooses to use the loanword "الجندر" or "al-jindar" which comes from the English word "gender", and the choice of a foreignizing strategy of translation is significant in the context of Arabic feminist writings and translations. Commenting on the history of using the term "الجندر" in Arabic translations, Kamal (2018) explains that the English term "gender" was first introduced to Egyptians in the documents of the United Nations in the 1990s and that it was immediately studied and explained by feminist academics who viewed it as a label of a social construct of sex rather than a simple equivalent of sex (p. 142). Kamal (2016b) states that translators first used the term "الجنوسة" or "al-gonūsa" to translate the term into Arabic (p. 68). Since the feminists appropriated the term and the concept which was a product of Western feminism, they have been using the term "الجندر" as a loanword that carries the socio-cultural implication of the Western travelling concept and reflects its history in their Arabic translations for over two decades (Kamal, 2016b, p. 68). Kamal (2016b) herself states that she prefers foreignization when translating feminist texts, says that she has been using the loanword which "maintains the term as a foreign concept loaded with its own history", and observes that Arabic allows for coining derivatives from its root (pp. 68-69). Having explained the history of the adoption of "gender" into Arabic, it becomes obvious that the translator's choice of "الجندر" as a translation of "sex" reflects her ideology. When Miles (2001) refers to "sexual division" (p. 23), Ṣādiq translates the phrase as "التقسيم الجندري" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 43). She thus uses a derivative of "الجندر" instead of using the direct equivalent of the term which is "sexual". Her use of the foreignizing strategy is a continuation of the feminist praxis that is followed in the translation of feminist texts. It preserves the feminist character of the original text and shows that the term is a Western feminist concept that she helps to travel to Arabic speaking countries through translation.

The translator often sticks to the foreignizing strategy of borrowing words which have Arabic equivalents, which are related to men's and women's sexuality, and which the original author often relates to men's attempts to control women throughout her book. Miles (2001) states that there is a Western "androcentric account" of women's sexual evolution that claims that this evolution happened for the sake of men and that women invented their own "orgasm" to reward their partners (p. 27). Ṣādiq borrows the term "androcentric" and coins the derivative "الأندروسينترية" because she translates "androcentric account" as "النظريات الأندروسينترية" and she defines androcentrism in a footnote as embracing patriarchal ideas when explaining the world, culture and history which ultimately marginalise women (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 48). Ṣādiq ends the footnote with the term "المترجمة" or "the translator" and

continues to make her presence visible and her female sympathies felt (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 48). However, when she translates "orgasm", Ṣādiq simply transliterates the term as "اورغاسم" without even explaining that it basically means "ذروة النشوة" neither within the body of the text nor in a footnote (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 48). The translator's decision suggests that she depends on the context in explaining that the transliterated word that refers to a sexual act is loaded with sociocultural implications created by androcentrism in the West, and it seems that she not only attempts to translate the term but to keep the sociocultural implications of the concept in her translation. Her use of the foreignizing strategy reflects her ideology as it follows a common strategy in feminist translation praxis and as she attempts to keep the force of the author's feminist commentary on historical accounts in the Arabic translation.

Miles (2001) uses the phrase "The Rise of the Phallus" as a title for one of her chapters (p. 55). In this chapter, Miles (2001) claims that women in ancient civilisations had a great power and a divine status (pp. 55-56), but she claims that women became marginalised and that men became dominant when men realised that they were the cause of pregnancy and that the "phallus" was a tool they could use to dominate women (p. 57). Ṣādiq transliterates the term as "فالوس" and explains in a footnote that the term originally refers to an erected penis but is usually used to refer to any rod whether it be a tool, a sculpture, or a picture; then, she ends her footnote with the term "المترجمة" or "the translator" with which she resists her invisibility as a translator and flaunts her presence as a woman (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 83). Although "phallus" has a direct equivalent in Arabic which is "قضيب", Ṣādiq continues to transliterate the term whenever it comes up later in the text. Her decision to use a foreignizing strategy seems to be dictated by her ideology. This strategy is used to keep the original author's feminist interpretation of words and concepts in the translation.

Foreignizing strategies are also used to translate words that refer to social systems and their members. For example, Miles (2001) states that "paterfamilias" dominated the lives of all family members in ancient Rome (p. 69). Ṣādiq uses the word written in English in the translation and explains that it means "'والد العائلة' حرفيا" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 101). Using a couplet which consists of the English word followed by its definition can be attributed to the translator's ideology which makes her import foreign words used in feminist texts and preserve the global feminist character of the text. Later, Miles (2001) uses the term "matriarchy" to refer to a society controlled by women (p. 43). Instead of using the Arabic translation "النظام الأمومي", Ṣādiq uses the word "ماترياركية" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 69). Likewise, Miles (2001) uses the term "patriarchies" to refer to societies dominated by men (p. 119). Ṣādiq does not translate the term as "الأنظمة الأبوية" but rather uses the word "الباترياركيات" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 119). The translator's feminist ideology seems to be the reason behind the choice of the words which are commonly used in Anglophone feminist discourse and her use of a foreignizing strategy preserves the global feminist character of the text. However, the foreignizing strategies of transliteration and loanwords can be problematic in case the Arabic speaking target reader fails to understand what the foreign words mean exactly and in case the reader is not familiar with feminist rhetoric.

The translator's attempt to convey the feminist author's ideas in the translation and to make the translation part of the body of global feminist writings goes beyond the use of transliteration or loanwords and extends to rephrasing some sentences in the translation. Miles (2001) is against the idea that women should live in the shadow of their husbands and suggests that married women gain admiration by being vulnerable (p. 7). The translator seems to attach what the text portrays as lowering or humble tasks to married women. For example, Miles (2001) observes that modern Western women "have at last been freed from the tyranny of domestic drudgery passed off as female fulfilment" (p. 10). Ṣādiq translates this part as "تحررت النساء——في الغرب على الأقل——من طغيان الكدح المنزلي، الذي يعتبر واجبا من واجبات الزوجة" (Miles,

2001/2021, p. 26). By substituting "female fulfilment" with "واجبات الزوجة" which means "wife's duties", the translator makes the burden of domestic duties mainly specific to married women. Miles (2001) further explains the change in the status of modern Western women by stating that they are "no longer in the home as a warm and welcoming presence along with the smell of fresh cookies and a fire on the hearth" (p. 11). Ṣādiq translates this part as " وعدم تواجدهن في المنزل كـ 'حضور دافيء يرحب بالزوج'، مابين رائحة الكعك الطازج والنار في المدفأة" (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 27). Although the original text does not specify whom the women wait for at home, the translator inserts the term "زوج" or "husband" to portray a stereotypical image in which a woman is expected to cook and warmly welcome a husband in particular, and the inverted commas between which Ṣādiq places " حضور دافيء يرحب بالزوج" which means "the warm presence that welcomes the husband" emphasises the idea. (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 27). The translator's ideology and use of typology make her manipulate the text in a way that projects the original author's radically feminist view of the institution of marriage in certain parts of the text on other parts. The ways in which the translator intervenes in the text sometimes make the translation of some parts more radically feminist than the original book.

When Miles (2001) discusses women's sexual freedom, she states that the Great Mother was "*never* chaste" (p. 40). Ṣādiq translates this phrase as " لا تلتزم بعلاقة جنسية حصرية مع رجل واحد" which means that the Great Mother did not have an exclusive sexual relationship with one man only (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 64). The translator's intervention seems to stem from her ideology and her role of cooperating with the author in the construction of the meaning of the text. A literal translation of the phrase would suggest promiscuousness while the original author is trying to portray female sexual freedom positively and to describe it as an inherent nature of women; therefore, the translator attempts to make the idea less shocking to the Arab reader.

Using ancient civilisations' mythology to support her argument that women were sexually free, Miles (2001) narrates a tale about Ishtar in which the goddess threatens to cause chaos and destruction because she was "thwarted in her unbridled sensuality" (p. 40). Ṣādiq translates this phrase as "وقد أخفقت في محاولاتها الغرامية" which means that her love attempts had failed (Miles, 2001/2021, p. 64). The translator's intervention is influenced by her ideology as she seems to attempt to make the text about a female's uncontrolled sexual behaviour less shocking to the Arabic speaking readers of her translation who belong to predominantly conservative societies.

In spite of the attempts to convey the Western feminist ideas in a way that may seem less shocking or a way that may attempt to normalise them, the readers of the translation may still find these ideas outrageous or at least inconvenient. The translator gives wings to some radically feminist ideas expressed in the source text regardless of the nature of the societies which receive the translation. Her translation of a feminist text can be seen as an attempt at making change by introducing new ideas that may make people in the predominantly conservative Arab societies rethink some of the issues of women. However, some parts of the original book present ideas which may be shocking to readers in Arab societies because they clash with deeply rooted traditions and religious beliefs. Although the translation can be thought-provoking and a catalyst for change, it can also be regarded as a tool of Western cultural imperialism because the translator prioritises conveying the ideas of a Western global feminist over the suitability of some of these ideas to the more conservative societies which receive this translation.

Conclusion

The present study focuses on analysing an Arabic translation of Rosalind Miles's (2021) feminist book *Who Cooked the Last Supper? The Women's History of the World*. The translation which was produced by Rasha Ṣādiq reflects her feminist sympathies which affect

her work (Miles, 2001/2021). The study develops a method of analysis that is based on Irshad and Yasmin's (2002) categorisation of the ways in which the feminist translation theory is applied in studies about translated novels. The method of analysis is employed in exploring the translator's feminist approach towards rendering the feminist text into Arabic.

The study concludes that the translator produces a feminist translation which reflects her stance on women's issues and which can serve as an ideological tool as it gives wings to feminist ideas through translation. The translation is made feminist through taking translation decisions which change the phrasing or meaning of translation units and seem to be done in accordance with the translator's gender consciousness and ideology. The translator's intervention in the text as a feminist is also evident in flaunting her presence through footnoting and the creative use of typology and in using gendered language. Although the translator's choice of a feminist text and her feminist approach to the translation may help in making change by encouraging readers to rethink some of women's issues, the translation may simultaneously be shocking to readers who belong to predominantly conservative societies. It may also be considered as a tool of global feminism and cultural imperialism because it gives wings to radical Western feminist ideas in spite of the fact that the Arab societies which receive the translation are conservative and that the needs of Arab feminists can be different from those of their Western counterparts.

The study contributes to the field of translation studies by producing an analysis of a feminist Arabic translation; thus, it attempts to meet the interest in feminist writings and studies which have a growing popularity in academia. It also furthers the understanding of Arab feminist translation praxis and sheds light on the pros and cons of translating a Western feminist text into Arabic while taking into consideration the nature of the receiving societies and the needs of the target audience. For future research, the study encourages the investigation of the ways in which other translators handle the translation of Western feminist texts in the Arab World and other non-Western societies.

References

Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Cambridge English Dictionary. (n.d). Reinvent. In *Cambridge English dictionary*. Retrieved January 12, 2024, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/reinvent

Castro, O. (2009). (Re)examinando horizontes en los estudios feministas de traducción: ¿hacia una tercera ola? [(Re-)examining horizons in feminist translation studies: Towards a third wave. *MonTI. Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, *1*, 59-68. https://doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2009.1.3

Chamberlain, L. (1992). Gender and the metaphorics of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology* (pp. 57- 74). Routledge.

Chen, Z, & Zhang, X. (2016). Translator's subjectivity in feminist translations—A case study of Eileen Chang's translation practice. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *85*, 602-606. 10.2991/msetasse-16.2016.132

Davis, K. (2002). Feminist body/politics as world traveller: Translating our bodies, ourselves. *The European Journal of Women's Studies, 9*(3), 223-247. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506802009003373

Di Sabato, B. & Perri, A. (2020). Grammatical gender and translation: A cross-linguistic overview. In L. von Flotow & H. Kamal (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation, feminism, and gender* (pp. 363-373). Routledge.

Ergün, E. (2013). Feminist translation and feminist sociolinguistics in dialogue: A multi-layered analysis of linguistic gender constructions in and across English and Turkish. *Gender and Language, 7*(1), 13-33. https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.v7i1.13

Espasa, E. (2008). A gendered voice in translation: Translating like a feminist. *Transfer*, *3*(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1344/transfer.2008.3.1-8

Florio, J. (1603). Preface. Lord de Montaigne, M. *Montaigne's essays.* *https://www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/montaigne/#p1*

Frye, M. (2000). Feminism. In L. Code, *Encyclopaedia of feminist theories*, (pp.195-197). Routledge.

Godard, B. (1989). Theorizing feminist discourse/translation. *Tessero*, *6*, 42-53. https://doi.org/10.25071/1923-9408.23583

Goodman, L. (1996). *Literature and gender*. Routledge.

Irshad, I. & Yasmin, M. (2022). Feminism and literary translation: A systematic review. *Heliyon, 8*(3), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09082

Kamal. H. (2016a). A century of Egyptian women's demands: The four waves of the Egyptian feminist movement. *Gender and Race Matter: Global Perspectives on Being a Woman, 21*, 3-22. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1529-212620160000021017

Kamal, H. (2016b). Translating feminist literary theory into Arabic. *Studia Filologiczne*, *2*(29), 57-73. https://www.academia.edu/34427130/Translating_Feminist_Literary_Theory_into_Ar abic

Kamal, H. (2018). Travelling concepts in translation: Feminism and gender in the Egyptian context. *Synergy*, *14*(1), 131-145. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352005684_Travelling_Concepts_in_Transl ation_Feminism_and_Gender_in_the_Egyptian_Context

Lerner, G. (1993). *The creation of feminist consciousness: From the Middle Ages to eighteen-seventy*. Oxford University Press.

Miles, R. (2001). *Who cooked the last supper? The women's history of the world.* Three Rivers Press.

Miles, R. (2021). *Man ṭabakhat al-ʿashā' al-akhīr? Tarīkh al-ʿalam kama tarwīh al-nesā'* [Who cooked the last supper? History of the world as narrated by women] (R. Ṣādiq, Trans.). Al-mada for Media, Culture and Arts. (Original work published 2001)

Millán, M. (2016). The traveling of 'gender' and its accompanying baggage: Thoughts on the translation of feminism(s), the globalization of discourses, and representational divides. *European Journal of Women's Studies, 23*(1), 6-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506814565632

Mohanty, C. T. (1984). Under western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Boundary 2, 12*(3), 333-358. https://doi.org/10.2307/302821

Sami, H. G. (2020). Bridging the cultural gap: the translation of Simone de Beauvoir into Arabic. In L. von Flotow & H. Kamal (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation, feminism, and gender* (pp. 205-217). Routledge.

Simon, S. (1996). *Gender in translation: Cultural identity and the politics of transmission.* Routledge.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1990). Linguistic transcoding or cultural transfer? A critique of translation theory in Germany. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Translation, history, and culture* (pp.79-86). Printer Publishers.

Spivak, G. C. (1993). *Outside in the teaching machine*. Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation.* Routledge.

von Flotow, L. (1991). Feminist translation: Contexts, practices and theories. *TTR Traduction Terminologie Redaction, 4*(2), 69-84. https://doi.org/10.7202/037094ar

von Flotow, L. (1997). *Translation and gender: Translating in the 'era of feminism'*. St. Jerome Publishing.

von Flotow, L. (2018). Feminism, gender, and translation. In L. D'hulst & Y. Gambier (Eds.), *History of modern translation knowledge. Sources, concepts, effects* (pp. 347-351). John Benjamins.

Wallmach, K. (1998). Translation and gender: Interconnections. *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa*, *29*(1), 5-25.
http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1080/ 10228199808566130