

# Stereotyping and vilifying the other behind the mask of humour – *when a chicken smells of fear*

**Rashid Yahiaoui**

Hamad Bin Khalifa University, Qatar  
[ryahiaoui@hbku.edu.qa](mailto:ryahiaoui@hbku.edu.qa)

## Abstract

*Audiovisual texts are social semiotic constructions that arbitrate reality according to a set of discursive patterns and established beliefs. Therefore, it is natural for translators to re-create and manipulate audiovisual texts to overcome challenges pertaining to religion, culture, and politics, which are the three intrinsic determinants of positioning in any translation project. Leaning on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a methodological approach, this paper aims to investigate how stereotypes and disparagement humour about Arabs and Muslims are dealt with in translating a segment from Family Guy into Arabic. The focus of the paper is on examining ideology-related shifts, and how and to what degree the students manipulated or mitigated religio-cultural barriers, as well as on assessing the role of visuals in the decision-making process. The students' translations denote the inextricable intertwining of their authoritative voices and the act of translation, that is, some students consciously attempted to expose the writers' intentions, while others subverted the text as a protective and resistive measure against the anti-Islamic, racist, sexual humour of the show.*

*Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), dubbing, Family Guy, humour, ideology, culture.*

## 1. Introduction: seeing through a hazy glass

It is axiomatic that the American cinema industry has perpetually represented Arabs and Muslims through a distorted lens that ritualised orientalist tropes, especially after the events of 9/11. Television shows, being potent vehicles of expression, and also of ideology, are one of the main culprits that promote and influence this prejudiced rhetoric via portrayals that fit the stereotypical mould, and with it, the “academic and imaginative demonology of the mysterious Orient” (Said 1978/2003: 26). More often than not, male Muslim characters are portrayed as bearded terrorists threatening U.S. national security, democracy, and freedom, whereas their female counterparts are portrayed to be the veiled victims of an oppressing religion (Alsultany 2012). Despite the West’s pontification, Said (1997: 1) stipulates that the term *Islam* “is part fiction, part ideological label, part minimal designation of a religion called Islam, [and in] no really significant way is there a direct correspondence between the ‘Islam’ in common Western

usage and the enormously varied life that goes on within the world of Islam.” In view of this, ‘Islam’ is a fabricated concept that operates in the West for the West.

Some shows working within this racial milieu, such as Seth MacFarlane’s *Family Guy*, caricature these images for political comedy, or what Hughey & Muradi (2009: 210) have termed the “economy of hyper-irony and manic-satire” – that is to say, the show both promotes and obfuscates racial stereotypes via “a blurring of the line between ‘authentic’ and ‘satirical’ racism/nationalism.” Similarly, Feltmate (2017) uses the concept of “ignorant familiarity” to describe the superficial and erroneous knowledge the show disseminates via satirical framing. He argues that because ignorant familiarity is swathed in political and moral thought, it facilitates “institutional resonance [which] enables people to make quick decisions on bad information” (Feltmate 2017: 215). Accordingly, the targeted group is “institutionally consonant” when positively presented, and “institutionally dissonant” when negatively presented (Feltmate 2017: 70). By deploying a postmodern lens to evaluate the ilinx-like narrative structure, Sienkiewicz & Marx (2014: 112, 105) propose that *Family Guy* produces “small, attention-demanding vignettes divorced from broader critiques” and “invokes the aesthetic appeal of multi-screen media consumption at the expense of a deeper engagement more amenable to productive satire.” ‘Productive’ is a key term here, and one which nuances the show’s focus on the entertainment and economic aspects of satire which “interpellate its desired viewers as media literate consumers with quick, striking, low commitment bursts of content” that is often built around racial incendiary humour (Sienkiewicz & Marx 2014: 113). Previous to this, DeRochi (2008: 36) had also pointed out that although the adult-themed cartoon is acerbically comedic, it never reaches “the level of authentic social critique that intends to affect social change [...and] should never be mistaken for true satire.” These are telling observations that aim to illuminate and question the ‘hermeneutics’ of *Family Guy*’s satire in relation to plot and narrative.

For a show that contains 84% of overt references to religion (Feltmate 2017), it is inevitable that the stigmatisation of Islam is strategically interpellated. As far as translation is concerned, transadapting *Family Guy*’s satirical, yet offensive humour into Arabic would result in a deliberate reassessment of verbal humour vis-à-vis the iconographic constructions to gain acceptability in the Arab culture. Differences, therefore, do not make translation a “transparent filter through which a text could and should pass without adulteration,” simply because language is sutured in a culture, and culture is the infrastructure of knowledge (Bassnett 1996: 22).

## 2. “Invention labours less, but judgement more”

Pérez-González (2014) and Chaume (2018b) postulate that audiovisual translation (AVT) relies more on intervention and the creation of a text tailored to the target culture norms than on representation and equivalence. Leonardi (2008) also acknowledges the fact that AVT can increase or decrease the sense of otherness because it is “mainly characterised by the use of language which, far from being neutral, can be used in many different ways in order to manipulate meanings and exert a strong influence on society as a whole” (p. 158). Hence, it is appropriate to say that the faculty which operates in this multimodal space is none other than judgement since translators are social agents pressured by singularity as well as moral and cultural norms (Magazzù, 2020). According to Hatim & Mason (1990: 223), the volatility of mediation requires “not only a bilingual ability but also a bi-cultural vision [...] to overcome those incompatibilities which stand in the way of transfer of meaning.” As is the case with subtitling, dubbing in the Arab world has become synonymous with protectionism and censorship due to the impact of religion, and in reality, the complete invisibility of the original patently guarantees that all inappropriate content is either euphemised, expunged, or visually

edited (Alkadi 2010; Di Giovanni 2016; Yahiaoui et al. 2019; Yahiaoui & Fattah 2020; Magazzù 2020). In this regard, Ascheid (1997: 33), asserts that dubbing equates to recontextualization because in the dubbed production “characters are uttering a translated, which always also means interpreted, appropriated, and recreated new text, thus undergoing fundamental shifts in the construction of their national and cultural identity and context.”

The domesticating nature of dubbing should not be thought of negatively but “as a means to dilute the degree of racism which can be noticed in some audio-visual materials” (Leonardi 2008: 163). Such negotiative interaction, which is hinged on cultural sensitivity, aptly indicates that “translation is *parti pris* and that translators are engaged, actively involved, and affiliated with cultural movements” (Tymoczko 2003: 200). In other words, the protean platform of translation empowers translators to re-write the past and resist the petrification of images and cultural misconceptions, and it is for this reason that notions such as fidelity and equivalence are becoming less and less relevant. As aptly put by Gentzler & Tymoczko (2002: xv-xxi), translators are pivotal in “establishing, maintaining, and resisting power structures” given the fact they equally “participate in the powerful acts that create knowledge and shape culture.”

### **3. Humour: when man laughs in scorn**

The normative approach to dubbing has much in common with humour theory for they both draw on the primacy of impressionistic evaluations. As Krikmann (2006: 27) explains, one branch of humour theory is associated with theories of superiority that accentuate aggression and hostility of laughter elements which are “pointed against some person or group, typically on political, ethnic or gender grounds.” Nonetheless, proponents of psychoanalytic theories such as Freud (1963) and Koestler (1964) consider humour a mitigative release mechanism to convert aggressive impulses into something more acceptable, albeit acceptability is in the eye of the beholder. Building on Freud’s theory from a postcolonial perspective, Richter (2005: 63) describes jokes as subversive “manifestations of a symbolic victory over an enemy,” wherein the listener, or in the present case spectator, is the authoritative source whose confirmation of the joke announces “the triumph of the teller, and, consequently, the establishment of a hierarchical power structure.”

Vandaele (2002, 2010) also emphasises the variegated and (anti)social effects of humour which can foster feelings of inferiority, confirm inclusion or exclusion, create hierarchies, and perpetuate stereotyping and cueing. This goes to show that much of what propels humour is the force of judgement disguised as playful entertainment, and the issue thus lies in the perception of humour. In other words, tendentious jokes transform into transgressive “neuralgic points” by paradoxically turning the comic into “the appropriate site for the inappropriate, the proper place for indecorum, the field in which the unlikely is likely to occur” (Neale & Krutnik 1990: 92). When it comes to the unfeasibility of translating humour, most scholars point at issues pertaining to the divergence of cultural paradigms in terms of social patterns, political dominance, as well as values and ideology (Tymoczko 1999; Zabalbeascoa 2005; Díaz Cintas 2012). However, Chiaro (2005: 135) optimistically remarks that “humorous discourse, which is naturally impeded by linguistic and social barriers, actually succeeds in crossing geographical frontiers.”

#### **3.1. “Mindlessly adopted and casually adapted”**

Existing literature abounds with discussions of televisual representations that incite the fear of what has been labelled “the green menace.” Perhaps one of the most ambitious ventures is Shaheen’s (2009: 1) extensive study of more than 900 feature films that prove “cinema’s

systematic, pervasive, and unapologetic degradation and dehumanisation of a people.” Shaheen outlines a number of reasons for this persisting practice: the Arab-Israeli conflict, lack of Arab presence in the industry, lack of accurate portrayals, the absence of vibrant film criticism, peer pressure, public silence, and greed. The image repertoire has become monotonous, overflowing with normalised prejudices that paint Islam as the incarnation of evil; jihad as a synonym of terrorism and violence; men as regressive, power-crazed, oversexed fanatics; and women as submissive wives, or harems trapped inside of a patriarchal system (Saloom 2006; Starck 2009; Amz 2014; Al-Ghamdi & Safrah 2020). All these framing devices lead to myopic constructions that fuel xenophobia, a blurring of the vision that could last a lifetime. As Lester (2020: 109) points out, “[b]ecause pictures affect a viewer emotionally more than words alone do, pictorial stereotypes often become misinformed perceptions that have the weight of established facts.”

Apropos of *Family Guy*, Juckel et al. (2016) and Zsila et al. (2021) suggest that the animated sitcom draws its distinctive power from absurdities, offensive parodies, in addition to malicious humour techniques, all of which generally involve debating morality, politics, and social standards. The denigration this type of humour originates can either be easily shrugged off as boisterous play and not receive the criticism it should because it is made under the cloak of a cartoon (Belamghari 2015; Ford 2015) or neglected because it is dark and ostensibly difficult to access (Billig 2005). However, by focusing on post 9/11 narratives, the contributions in Gournelos & Greene’s volume (2011) illustrate the ways in which dark comedy reinforces or destabilises the status quo of political narratives, proving in the process that humour is often inundated with ambiguity and violence. Seen from this prism, translators are caught in a whirlwind of continuous constraints and catalysts that make the question of humour translation more cumbersome, but it is possible that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) holds a satisfactory answer.

#### **4. CDA: Casting a critical eye on *Family Guy***

Chaume (2018a) indicates that CDA has proved an illuminating tool in translation studies, particularly in regards to unveiling societal power relations and language use and how discourse can propagate or oppose inequalities and domination. “Because it is through translation that a vast amount of information is made available, or censored,” he goes on to say, “[t]ranslation can either legitimise or battle current political interpretations of violent conflicts, gender inequalities, power relations, and so on” (Chaume 2018a: 52). As an approach based on sociology and communicative theory, discourse analysis is said to have three qualities: it focuses on authentic language, discusses whole texts rather than isolated short stretches of text, and considers the extralinguistic context in which the discourse takes place (Kim 2020). Therefore, adopting CDA brings to the fore the question of choice concerning “which information to include or to exclude, what to make explicit or leave implicit, what to foreground or background, what to thematise or unthematise, which categories to draw upon to represent events” (Schäffner & Bassnett 2010: 8). For example, Hatim & Mason (1997: 147) highlight the translators’ embeddedness in the process in the way they are “feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into their processing of a text,” a view echoed by Munday (2007) whose study demonstrates how knowledge and value systems are shaped by the ideology of the individual translator. Ideology is an important term here because it is the foundational block for discourse analysis and the interface between cognition and social functioning (Van Dijk 1995). Wodak (2011) too explains that because discourse is the concrete realisation of ideology, it is CDA’s aim to produce “enlightenment and emancipation” not by mere description, but by rooting out delusions (Wodak 2011: 52). In the context of multimodal discourse analysis, Bezerra (2020: 6), argues that dynamic images present “a greater ideational meaning potential” due to the temporal

unfolding of events, which in turn could affect emotionality. It follows that the theory attempts to question imbalances “as an attempt to start de-naturalising beliefs that sustain unequal relations of power in society” (Bezerra 2020: 4). The ideas put forward by Machin & Mayr (2012) should be also mentioned here, as they locate and investigate how semiotic choices implicitly constitute the social world in the way “some participants are individualised or collectivised, made specific or generic, personalised or impersonalised, objectivated, anonymised, aggregated and suppressed” (Machin & Mayr 2012: 12). According to the authors, the whole thrust of MCDA lies in being critical of linguistic and visual choices “to reveal the kinds of ideas, absences and taken-for-granted assumptions in texts” including the underlying power interests (Machin & Mayr 2012: 5).

Even though the majority of CDA-inspired research examined media and political discourse, the framework lends itself particularly well to the examination of disparagement humour, its complexity and multifunctionality (Schnurr & Plester 2017). The present study leans on CDA as a methodological approach that demonstrates how an object of research is constructed; to produce what Fairclough (1995/2013: 8) describes as “interpretations and explanations of areas of social life which both identify the causes of social wrongs and produce knowledge which could (in the right conditions) contribute to righting or mitigating them.” The object of research here is *Family Guy*'s episode “Turban Cowboy” from the eleventh season, which aired in early 2013. The episode features Peter Griffin converting to Islam after meeting Mahmoud who, unsurprisingly, turns out to be a member of a terrorist group planning to blow up the Quahog bridge; however, the episode was removed afterwards, not because of the offensive depiction, but because of the scene in which the Boston Marathon is depicted (Feltmate 2017). According to Garrido & Morales (2018), the scenario and representations camouflage Islamophobia by blandishing national and patriotic discourse, whereas the mise-en-scène invigorates feelings of rejection and marginalisation of Muslims. This is all clear for the educated viewer, from the way the characters are dressed to their manner of speech and background, all of which invite otherness and schism. Incendiary portrayals of Muslims and Arabs pervade the series; however, it is in “Turban Cowboy” that the spectrum of stereotypes is displayed in full, thus reflecting a shift from *Family Guy*'s traditional disruptive cutaway gags to having a unified narrative driven by identity-based humour. As a result, the episode serves as an exemplary overture to navigate the relation between humour and identity construction.

It is important to note that the series belongs to Fox, which is also the home of *The Simpsons* and *American Dad*, both of which received equal criticism for their offensive portrayals and jokes. In fact, the religio-cultural mosaic of the series and the translational challenges arising therefrom are the main reasons behind selecting this particular episode. Regarding the data, this study is built on the analysis of 8 Arabic translations made by a group of Master's level students in audiovisual translation, in addition to their retrospective views as a triangulating tool to have insight into the cognitive process. Thus, the aim is first to examine ideology-related shifts, and how and to what degree the students manipulated or mitigated religio-cultural barriers, to then assess the role the visuals played in the decision-making process (see Yahiaoui 2021 and Yahiaoui et al. 2021 for a discussion on how religio-cultural dissonances in visual and linguistic codes leads to corrective negotiations in translation). The students were instructed to transadapt the dialogue for an Arab television channel for Arabic-speaking audiences in the MENA region using the medium of dubbing and were given freedom in their approach in terms of ideological positioning (subvert the text or translate literally) and language choice (using vernacular or Modern Standard Arabic). This latitude is important for investigating how ideological and cultural constraints are dealt with in dubbing and what this says about the translator's agentive and social role.

## 5. (Un)covering Islam in dubbing

Although it would have been preferable to discuss a larger segment of the episode, the focus is exclusively limited to three sequential scenes, starting with the one where Peter meets Mahmoud at The Chaste Camel. Perhaps it looks like I am entering the text in *medias res*, but in reality, these scenes are able to contour the primordial ideologies that imbue the episode as a whole. First, The Chaste Camel serves as an expository device to introduce and locate Mahmoud within the orientalist imagination that is keen on exoticizing Islam and degrading the Arab. Second, Peter's conversion illustrates how misconceptions are easily instilled in American society.

The Chaste Camel is straight out of the standard textbook dictating how Arabs ought to be misrepresented. Peter is fascinated by the Arabian music, middle-eastern interior with all the Moroccan lanterns, Persian curtains, floor cushions, and the fact that men are casually lounging with women while smoking hookahs. He exclaims: "Wow! This place is really cool, Mahmoud! It's like ear-bloodening sounds had sex with nose-bloodening smells and this is their baby." Peter's sexualisation suggests that Arabs are unhygienic and are a disturbance to domestic seamliness and modernity. Moreover, when judged against the place's name, one can immediately conclude that such a remark is part of a larger insulting joke where Arabs are first given the epithet 'chaste' to be later shown as having false modesty. The translations are as follows:

Table 1. Chastity and sexual innuendos

Source text	
Peter: Wow! This place is really cool, Mahmoud! It's like ear-bloodening sounds had sex with nose-bloodening smells and this is their baby.	
Target texts	Back translation
1. هذا المكان رائع! وكأن الأصوات المزعجة عاشرت الروائح المقرفة، وهذا الناتج.	This place is cool! It's like disturbing noises befriended disgusting smells and this is the result.
2. يا نهار أبيض! إيه الحته الجميلة دي يا محمود! ده كأنه إزعاج الدنيا كلو وريحته المعفنة اتلموا في المحل ده.	Good grief! What a beautiful place, Mahmoud! It's like the whole world's noise and its musty smell have gathered in this space.
3. واو! هذا المكان رائع يا محمود! وكأن الأصوات الدافئة والروائح الشهية امتزجت لتنتج هذا المكان الجميل.	Wow! This place is very cool, Mahmoud! It's like warm voices and delicious aromas blended to create this beautiful place.
4 and 5. يا إلهي، هذا المكان رائع جداً محمود، يبدو وكأنه تفلّ نتج من زواج صوت حمار ورائحة فأر ميت.	Oh my God! This place is very cool, Mahmoud! It's like a spittle created from the marriage of a donkey's braying and the smell of a dead mouse.
6, 7, 8. عجباً، هذا المكان رائع حقاً يا محمود! كما لو أن هذا المكان مزيج من حفلة موسيقية مزعجة ورائحة ظربان.	How wonderful! This place is very cool, Mahmoud! As if this place is a blend of a loud concert and a skunk's smell.

Student 1 opted for preserving the joke in translation by using the less face-threatening term 'عاشرت' and substituting 'baby' with 'الناتج'. She maintains that flagrant language is part of Peter's character, and by omitting the joke Peter will lose the obnoxious immaturity he is known for. The euphemism widens the semantic spectrum of the taboo to make it more digestible for the Arab viewer while keeping the sexual insinuations intact. As Al-Adwan (2015: 8) concludes, "speakers use euphemistic expressions deliberately in a particular context to disguise sensitive

aspects of the message without projecting their reluctance to engage in the interaction.” However, the sexual reference is completely altered in all subsequent translations.

Student 2 is conscious of the fact that translating the original message would nurture propaganda, especially in young viewers who are more susceptible to the cultivation of misguided beliefs. Accordingly, the student suggests inserting a disclaimer at the beginning of the episode that reads “Attention: this episode has offensive and propagandistic scenes to Islam” to alert viewers. Translating between Arabic and English commonly assumes a myriad of religious and political issues. In a postcolonial situation such as this, where different cultures are in contact with each other, the disclaimer represents a postpositivist strategy that empowers the translators’ agency. Such preface calls for cultural awareness, yet it is guaranteed to receive criticism for the visible ‘violence’ it substantiates. Venuti (2008: 14) defines violence as the inevitable and inherent process by which values, representations, and beliefs are reconstituted in the translation language, allowing differences to be “imprinted by the receiving culture, assimilated to its positions of intelligibility, its canons and taboos, its codes and ideologies.” Translation-wise, the phrase ‘ده كانه إزعاج الدنيا كلو وريحته المعفنة اتموا في المحل ده’ (‘it’s like the whole world’s noise and its musty smell have gathered in this space’) retains the sensuous quality of the metaphor but removes all sensual implications. Nonetheless, it could be argued that resorting to the Egyptian vernacular compensates for the apparent loss in which the expression ‘يا نهار’ (good grief) is humorously contrasted with ‘ايه الحنة الجميلة دي’ (what a beautiful place). Still, the student made it clear that shifting the original message will deceive the audience into thinking that Arabs are represented fairly.

The interventionist approach of Student 3 is more visible, that is she domesticated the text to achieve an appropriate rendering that does not disclose America’s faulty views of Islam. Using ‘الأصوات الدافئة’ (warm voices) and ‘الروائح الشهية’ (delicious aromas) not only beautifies the imagery, it also reverses the oriental tenor, or rather sacrifices the meaning in favour of appropriateness. Moreover, she claims that iconographic and musical codes will help viewers detect the intended meaning despite linguistic changes. Students 4 and 5 settled on the translation ‘يبدو وكأنه نفلٌ نتج من زواج صوت حمار ورائحة فأر ميت’ (it’s like spittle created from the marriage of a donkey’s braying and the smell of a dead mouse), which, as they point out, is a watered-down version of Peter’s original mockery. ‘زواج’ (marriage) masks the blunt expression, while ‘صوت حمار’ (donkey’s braying) is culturally tailored to fulfil the original function. In fact, donkeys are proverbial for censure in the Arab culture and their braying is detested in Islam for its association with the devil. In addition, they overturned the accent stereotype to counter the compartmentalisation of Arabs. Mahmoud’s thick accent accentuates his inferiority by making him an identifiable subject, or more accurately a subject of suspicion. Therefore, the student’s choice of giving Peter a broken Arabic accent – marked by incorrect pronunciations – mimics the linguistic ridicule and racial prejudice of the original. Similarly, Students 6, 7, and 8 chose the less sensitive expressions ‘حفلة موسيقية مزعجة’ (loud concert) and ‘رائحة ظربان’ (skunk’s smell) to gain social acceptance.

After the insult is casually dismissed, Mahmoud – with a smile on his face – urges Peter to try a dish of ‘fooshnoosh’ which he describes as “a chicken that has been yelled at for two hours and then run over by a Mercedes.” Uttered by an Arab character, the statement poses several implications. It is a self-incriminating confession that weaves a web of deceptions about Arabs; that they are belligerent, brutal, uncivilised wealthy sheikhs keen on terrorising even animals. After giving it a taste, Peter assumes the role of gourmet and replies “Oh! You can really taste the fear in the chicken.” It is important to note that the name ‘fooshnoosh’ – which has nothing to do with Arabic – is also part of the absurd clichés that mock the Arabic language.

Table 2. Terrorising a chicken to death

<b>Source text</b>	
<p>Mahmoud: Would you like some of my meat fooshnoosh? It's a chicken that has been yelled at for two hours and then run over by a Mercedes.</p> <p>Peter: Mmm! Mmm! Oh! You can really taste the fear in the chicken</p>	
<b>Target texts</b>	<b>Back translation</b>
<p>1. محمود: جرب الفوشنوش. إنه مصنوع من دجاجة صُرخ عليها ثم دُهست بمرسيدس. بيتر: اممم، أوه! يمكنك حقاً تذوق خوف الدجاجة.</p>	<p>Mahmoud: Try the fooshnoosh, it's made out of a chicken that has been yelled at and then run over by a Mercedes. Peter: Mmm! Oh! You can really taste the fear in the chicken.</p>
<p>2. محمود: مش عاوز حنة من الفوشنوش بتاعي؟ ده دجاج مزعقين عليه ساعتين وبعدها عفصتو عربية. بيتر: بجد! ده أنا قادر أذوق طعم الخوف فيه.</p>	<p>Mahmoud: Don't you want a piece of my fooshnoosh? It's chicken yelled at for two hours and then run over by a car. Peter: Really! I can taste the fear in it.</p>
<p>3. محمود: هل ترغب في تذوق طبق فوشنوش خاصتي؟ إنه طبق دجاج عربي. بيتر: ممم! ممم! إنه لذيذ للغاية!</p>	<p>Mahmoud: Would you like a taste of my fooshnoosh? It's an Arab chicken dish. Peter: Mmm! Mmm! It's so delicious!</p>
<p>4 and 5. محمود: بتحب تجرب لحم الفوشنوش؟ ده معمول من فرخة صرخوا عليها ساعتين، وبعدين خبطوها بسيارة مرسيدس. بيتر: اممم، اممم، أوه! بالفعل حقاً، أستطيع أن أذوق طعم الخوف.</p>	<p>Mahmoud: Would you like to try fooshnoosh meat? It's made out of a chicken yelled at and then run over by a Mercedes. Peter: Mmm! Mmm! Oh! Really, I can taste the fear.</p>
<p>6 and 7. محمود: هل تريد بعضاً من الدجاج؟ إنها دجاجة صُرخ عليها لساعتين، ثم دهستها سيارة مرسيدس. بيتر: مم! مم! يُمكنك حقاً تذوق طعم الخوف في الدجاجة.</p>	<p>Mahmoud: Would you like some chicken? It's a chicken that has been yelled at for two hours and then run over by a Mercedes. Peter: Mmm! Mmm! You can really taste the fear in the chicken.</p>
<p>8. محمود: هل تريد بعضاً من لحم الفوشنوش؟ إنها دجاجة صُرخ عليها لساعتين، ثم دهستها سيارة مرسيدس. بيتر: ممم! ممم! يُمكنك حقاً تذوق طعم الخوف في الدجاجة.</p>	<p>Mahmoud: Would you like some fooshnoosh meat? It's a chicken that has been yelled at for two hours and then run over by a Mercedes. Peter: Mmm! Mmm! You can really taste the fear in the chicken.</p>

As the above translations demonstrate, almost all students agreed that it is their responsibility to render the joke as it is to expose the true visage of the show, which in itself is an act of political correctness. Slight modifications can be discerned nonetheless, such as Student 1 omitting 'for two hours,' Student 2 substituting 'Mercedes' for 'car,' and Students 6 and 7 passing over 'fooshnoosh.' On the contrary, Student 3 neutralised the joke, changed the meaning, and presented a new ideology to prevent the spreading of false images. Hence 'إنه طبق دجاج عربي' (it's an Arab dish) reveals the translator's ideological positioning and agency over the text. As Tymoczko (2014: 191) asserts, by looking at the notion of agency within the larger cross-cultural context and beyond the western tradition, translators can redefine their role, "thus potentially allowing themselves to undertake new types of projects, to risk using new translation

strategies, to create new types of translated texts, and to engage in new fields of activism and ethical engagement.” The student’s project in this case is the creation of a repaired text that morally undermines racial prejudice.

The show relies on derogatory speech to deliver humour, which in one way or another “allows for a social structure where unequal treatment of individuals is permissible” (Ricke 2012: 121). Much of this permissibility is inherent within the animated characters, particularly Mahmoud. For instance, after Peter tasted the chicken’s fear, Mahmoud responds with the problematic “you know, Peter, a lot of people are not as accepting of Muslim culture as you are.” Here, the image of Islam is deliberately distorted not only by attributing these images and stereotypes to Muslim culture, but also by corroborating their assumed validity by a quasi-Arab character. The effects of this pigeonholing are incarnated in Peter and his myopic thinking. He answers: “Well, I think everything about it is the best! Like this hookah. I mean, who doesn’t want to sit around a table with a bunch of guys and suck on the same thing? Mmm, it’s like smoking my grandfather’s jacket.” In terms of translation, all students translated Mahmoud’s remark literally, except for Student 1 who changed “Muslim culture” to ‘ثقافتنا’ (our culture). Peter’s remark on the other hand was modified in translation.

Table 3. Shisha time for idle Arabs

Source text	
Peter: Well, I think everything about it is the best! Like this hookah. I mean, who doesn’t want to sit around a table with a bunch of guys and suck on the same thing? Mmm, it’s like smoking my grandfather’s jacket.	
Target texts	Back translation
1. أنا أعتقد أنه رائع. الشيشة مثلاً، تجلس مع مجموعة شباب تدخن من نفس الأنبوبة. ممم، مثل معطف جدي!	I think it’s great! The shisha, for example, you sit with a bunch of guys smoking from the same tube. Mmm, like my grandfather’s jacket!
2. أعتقد إن كل حاجة فيها هي أحسن حاجة. زي الهوكة دي مثلاً. يعني مين منا مش عاوز يقعد مع جماعة ويشرب في نفس الهوكة دي؟ دي زي كأنها ريحة سويتر جدوا!	I think everything about it is the best! Like this hookah. I mean, who doesn’t want to sit with a group and smoke from the same hookah? It’s like my grandfather’s sweater!
3. أوه، أعتقد أن كل شيء متعلق بها هو الأفضل! فمن لا يريد أن يحظى بوقت جيد مع الأصحاب المحبوبين والشيشة.	Oh, I think everything about it is the best! Who doesn’t want to have a good time with lovely friends and shisha?
4 and 5. وكيف لي أن لا اتقبلها وكل شيء فيها رائع؟ من الذي لا يرغب أن يجلس هنا كل ليلة ويدخن النارجيلة. ممم، وكأني في العصر الحجري!	How can I not accept it and everything about it is great? Who doesn’t want to sit here every night and smoke nargileh? Mmm, It’s like I’m in the stone age!
6 and 7. أعتقد بأنها مُميّزة، كهذه النارجيلة. أعني، من قد يرفض فكرة الجلوس حول طاولة مع شخص ما والتدخين من نفس النارجيلة؟ ممم! وكأني أدخن سترة جدي.	I think it’s special, like this nargileh! I mean, who would refuse the idea of sitting around a table with someone and smoke from the same nargileh? Mmm, it’s like smoking my grandfather’s jacket.
8. أعتقد بأن كل شيء عنها رائع، كهذه النارجيلة. أعني، من قد يرفض فكرة الجلوس حول طاولة مع مجموعة أشخاص والتدخين من نفس النارجيلة؟ ممم! وكأني أدخن سترة جدي.	I think everything about it is great, like this nargileh! I mean, who would refuse the idea of sitting around a table with someone and smoke from the same nargileh? Mmm, it’s like smoking my grandfather’s jacket.

The translation of Student 1 implicitly diverts the message imposed by the source text by focusing on visual codes. She negotiated the cultural tensions and chose the lesser of two evils: ‘أنا أعتقد أنه رائع’ (I think it’s great). This is an example of how visuals contribute to the re-framing of ideologies; she previously omitted “Muslim” to turn the reference on the place itself rather than Muslim culture as a whole. Furthermore, ‘suck’ is substituted with ‘تدخن’ (smoke) to eradicate the negative connotations and sexual innuendos attached to the expression. In a similar fashion, Student 3 opted for eliminating the joke and replace it with ‘فمن لا يريد أن يحظى بوقت جيد مع الأصحاب المحبوبين والشيشة’ (who doesn’t want to have a good time with lovely friends and shisha), to make positive connections to The Chaste Camel’s exotic atmosphere. Students 4 and 5 retained the joke but used cultural equivalence to translate “it’s like smoking my grandfather’s jacket.” The students believe that a literal translation of the metaphor would result in a flawed phraseology, or what is known as “dubbese.” Therefore, the expression ‘وكانني في العصر الحجري’ (it’s like I’m in the stone age) aims to override cultural differences and make the exchange more natural-sounding.

Students 2, 6, 7, and 8 translated the utterance literally into Arabic to show how Arabs are truly portrayed in the show and in that manner be faithful to the target audience. Similar to previous translations, the expression ‘suck’ is eliminated in all instances by adapting it to ‘تدخين/يدخن’ and ‘يشرب’ (smoking). It must be noted that the uncensored DVD version contains additional stereotypical dialogue about Arabs’ unhygienic lifestyle (<https://comb.io/TYYeH3>). After smoking the *hookah*, the first time, Peter asks: “how often does this get cleaned?,” to which Mahmoud replies, “never.” He then asks: “and how old is it?” and Mahmoud replies, “eighty years.” The joke is then concluded with Peter’s sardonic “perfect!” This is almost like saying that the dirtier the Arab is, the better the stereotype and enmity. Whatever the reason is for censoring this small exchange, it has not mitigated the disparagement already displayed.

Following this, Peter excuses himself because he has “to pick up the dry cleaning before it closes,” yet Mahmoud retorts, “nonsense! I’ll have my wife pick it up for you” and with an air of patriarchal authority orders her to run the errand. The wife acquiesces and replies, “of course, anything for you husband.” Needless to say, Peter is astonished by the woman’s subservient attitude, but Mahmoud clarifies that “in Muslim culture, wives are much more obedient.” This scene imparts a strong sense of misogyny, sexism, and oppression in the way the wife is objectified. Much of this is never explicitly mentioned, but it is signalled clearly enough in the visuals – Mahmoud’s finger snap, his dismissive look, and the wife’s bow.

Table 4. Women as objects at the service of men

Source text
Peter: Man, I wish I could stay here all night, Mahmoud, but I’m supposed to pick up the dry cleaning before it closes. I killed a mouse with my tie.
Mahmoud: Nonsense. I’ll have my wife pick it up for you.
Peter: What? She’d do that?
Mahmoud: Oh, absolutely. [snaps his fingers] I need you to run an errand for my friend Peter.
Wife: Of course. Anything for you, husband.
Peter: That was amazing. She just listened to everything you said.

<p>Mahmoud: Of course, she listened. In Muslim culture, wives are much more obedient.</p> <p>Peter: No way! That's awesome!</p>	
Target texts	Back translation
<p>1. بيتر: ليتني أستطيع أن أبقى هنا محمود، لكن عليّ أن أستلم الغسيل. لقد خنقت فأراً بربطتي.</p> <p>محمود: لا عليك، ستجلبه زوجتي لك.</p> <p>بيتر: حقاً؟ لن تُمانع؟</p> <p>محمود: بالتأكيد، اذهبي وأحضري ملابس صديقي من المغسلة.</p> <p>الزوجة: حاضر، سمعاً وطاعة.</p> <p>بيتر: رائع جداً، ستفعل لك ذلك!</p> <p>محمود: بالتأكيد، الزوجات مُطيعاتٌ في مجتمعنا.</p>	<p>Peter: I wish I could stay here, Mahmoud. But I have to pick up the dry cleaning. I strangled a mouse with my tie.</p> <p>Mahmoud: Don't you worry, my wife will get it for you.</p> <p>Peter: Really? She wouldn't mind?</p> <p>Mahmoud: Absolutely. Go and get my friend's clothes from the dry cleaning.</p> <p>Wife: At your service. I hear and obey.</p> <p>Peter: Very cool, she'll do that for you!</p> <p>Mahmoud: Of course, wives are obedient in our society.</p>
<p>2. بيتر: يا راجل كان نفسي والله أقضي السهرة دي معاك يا محمود بس مفروض أمر آخذ هدومي من المغسلة قبل ما تقفل.</p> <p>محمود: ياود ده كلام فارغ أنا حكلم مراتي تجيهاالك.</p> <p>بيتر: بجدا! هي ليه ممكن تعمل كده؟</p> <p>محمود: آه، بجدا! عاوزك تقضي غرض لصاحبي بيتر.</p> <p>الزوجة: حاضر، أوامرك.</p> <p>بيتر: مش مصدق! ده شيء هايل!</p>	<p>Peter: By God, I wish I could spend this evening with you, Mahmoud. But I'm supposed to pick up my clothes from the dry cleaning before it closes.</p> <p>Mahmoud: Boy, this is foolish talk! I'll talk to my wife to get them for you.</p> <p>Peter: Really! Why would she do that?</p> <p>Mahmoud: Yes, really! I need you to run an errand for my friend Peter.</p> <p>Wife: At your service, as you order.</p> <p>Peter: I can't believe it! This is great!</p>
<p>3. بيتر: أتمنى لو أستطيع البقاء هنا طوال الليل يا محمود، ولكن عليّ أن أمر على المغسلة لأجلب الملابس. لقد قتلت فأراً باستخدام ربطة عنقي.</p> <p>محمود: هراء! سأجعل موظفتي تقوم بذلك.</p> <p>بيتر: ماذا؟ هل ستقوم بذلك حقاً؟</p> <p>محمود: أوه، بالطبع. أحتاجك من أجل أن تقضي حاجة لصديقي بيتر.</p> <p>(الموظفة): أمرك يا سيدي.</p>	<p>Peter: I wish I could stay here all night, Mahmoud. But I have to pick up the dry cleaning to get the clothes. I killed a mouse with my tie.</p> <p>Mahmoud: Nonsense! I'll make my employee do that.</p> <p>Peter: What? She'll really do that?</p> <p>Mahmoud: Oh, of course. I need you to run an errand for my friend Peter.</p> <p>(Employee): Yes, sir.</p>

<p>بيتر: رائع! لقد وافقت بالفعل. محمود: بالطبع، إنه عملها.</p>	<p>Peter: Cool! She agreed! Mahmoud: Of course, it's her job.</p>
<p>4 and 5. بيتر: أتمنى لو أستطيعُ البقاء هنا طوال الليل يا محمود، لكن عليّ أن أذهب لأخذ ملابس من المغسلة. محمود: إيه الكلام ده، مراتي هتروح تجيبهم. بيتر: هل ستقوم بذلك حقاً؟ محمود: آه طبعاً، عايزك تروحي مشوار عشان بيتر صاحبي. الزوجة: ولا يهمك، تحت أمرك. بيتر: هذا مدهش. كيف جعلتها تطيعك؟ محمود: أيوا طبعاً، الزوجات كلهم بيطيعوا أجوازهم في ثقافتنا الإسلامية / الزوجات لازم يطيعوا أجوازهم في ثقافتنا الإسلامية.</p>	<p>Peter: I wish I could stay here all night, Mahmoud. But I have to pick up my clothes from the dry cleaning. Mahmoud: What illogical talk! My wife will go get them. Peter: She'll really do that? Mahmoud: Yes, of course! I need you to run an errand for my friend Peter. Wife: Don't you worry. At your disposal. Peter: This is amazing! How did you make her obey you? Mahmoud: Yes, of course! All wives obey their husbands in our Islamic culture\ Yes, of course! Wives must obey their husbands in our Islamic culture.</p>
<p>6, 7, and 8. بيتر: أتمنى لو أستطيع البقاء هنا أكثر يا محمود، ولكن يجب عليّ الذهاب إلى المغسلة قبل أن تغلق. لقد قتلْتُ فأراً بربطة عُنقي. محمود: على جثتي! ستجلبها لك زوجتي. بيتر: ماذا؟ هل ستفعل حقاً؟ محمود: بالطبع يا رجل. أريدك أن تقومي بمهمة لصديقي بيتر. الزوجة: حاضر. طلباتك أوامر يا زوجي. بيتر: هذا مذهل حقاً! لقد أطاعتك دون اعتراض. محمود: بالطبع ستفعل. ففي ثقافتنا الإسلامية، الزوجات مُطيعات/ أكثر طاعة.</p>	<p>Peter: I wish I could stay here longer, Mahmoud. But I have to go to the dry cleaning before it closes. I killed a mouse with my tie. Mahmoud: Over my dead body! My wife will get it for you. Peter: What? She'll really do that? Mahmoud: Of course, man. I need you to run an errand for my friend Peter. Wife: At your service. Your wish is my command my husband. Peter: This is really amazing! She obeyed you without objection! Mahmoud: Of course, she will. In our Islamic culture wives are obedient/ more obedient.</p>

The rendering of these excerpts into Arabic indicates that half of the students opted for siding with the Arab/Muslim audience. As previously mentioned, Student 1 follows the source language as close as possible to emulate the show's ideology; however, two changes are made. First, the student softened the imperative tone of Mahmoud's command by rendering "I need you to run an errand" as 'أذهبي وأحضري' (go and get). This might not be easily detected but the

immediacy of “I need” gives the wife no option but to comply with her husband’s command, whereas the translation insinuates that the errand can be done at a later time. Another dimension pertaining to the orchestration of negative images has to do with the fact that Mahmoud could have summoned a servant or worker, instead, the writers selected the wife to contrast her with the ‘democratic’ and ‘liberal’ women of the west. Second, “in Muslim culture, wives are much more obedient” has been rendered as ‘الزوجات مطيعات في مجتمعنا’ (wives are obedient in our society) to refrain from incriminating Islam as a whole.

Despite her close imitation of the source text, Student 2 omitted Peter’s joke about killing a mouse with a tie and censored Mahmoud’s last remark. It is unclear why the student decided to delete the latter audio-track given the fact she previously maintained the reference to Islamic culture, but it could be delegated to ulterior motives or technical constraints. The conservative approach of Student 3 made her subvert the stereotypical parlance and manifest assertions by turning the wife into an employee. In translation, the wife answers with ‘أمرك يا سيدي’ (yes, sir), and to justify her obedience, Mahmoud says ‘بالطبع، إنه عملها’ (of course, it’s her job). This creative interpretation counter-narrates and hacks into the deep-seated association between Islam and the oppression of women. The covering of Islam here is not employed in the sense put forward by Said (1997), rather the student’s covering strategy simply falls under protectionism.

With minor variations in linguistic choices, the remaining translations conform to the original ideologies. Students 4 and 5 deleted “I killed a mouse with my tie” for unknown reasons, and slightly changed “in Muslim culture, wives are much more obedient” to ‘الزوجات كلهم بيطيعوا’ (all wives obey their husbands in our Islamic culture) and ‘الزوجات لازم’ (wives must obey their husbands in our Islamic culture), respectively. Although both renditions insinuate the same view, the modal verb ‘لازم’ (must) conveys deontic authority that limits women’s freedom. Students 6, 7, and 8 rendered the interjection “nonsense” as ‘على جثتي’ (over my dead body) to – as they claim – emulate spontaneous conversation and show how Arabs express their generosity and kindness. Whilst it was the students’ good intention to imbue the character of Mahmoud with positive qualities, the visual design precludes a proper transfer of this generosity. The students also state that they preferred to mirror the distortions in translation to guide viewers’ attention to the cultural war that the west originally created. That is why references to Islam and female obedience are kept the same: ‘ففي ثقافتنا الإسلامية، الزوجات مطيعات’ (in our Islamic culture wives are obedient); ‘ففي ثقافتنا الإسلامية الزوجات أكثر طاعة’ (in our Islamic culture wives are more obedient).

It is at this point that Peter is sold and decides to convert to Islam, if by conversion one means turning into another archetypical example of how to deride Muslims. He blurts, “so wait, let me get this straight: sweet hat, obedient wife, and I get to shout Admiral Akbar when I do stuff? You, sir, have got yourself a Muslim.” It is obvious that Peter is oblivious to Islamic values and culture. On one hand, the *taqiyah* is a recommendable attire in Arab culture, but the generic “sweet hat” does not convey these associations. On the other hand, “Admiral Akbar” is a mispronunciation of the Islamic expression ‘الله أكبر’ (Allah is the greatest), which within the show’s context is linked to the larger discourse on ‘Arab terrorism.’

Table 5. Admiral Akbar and the epitome of ignorance

Source text	
Peter: so, wait, let me get this straight: sweet hat, obedient wife, and I get to shout Admiral Akbar when I do stuff? You, sir, have got yourself a Muslim.	
Target texts	Back translation
1. عجبك جداً، لديك قبعة جميلة، وزوجة مطيعة، و تصرخ: أدميرال أكبر دائماً؟ إذاً أنا مسلم أيضاً.	How wonderful! You have a beautiful hat, an obedient wife, and you always shout Admiral Akbar? Then I'm a Muslim too.
2. دقيقة خليني أفهم كده يعني ألبس طاقية حلوة كده ويكون عندي جوزة بتسمع كلامي وممكن كمان أقول "أدميرال أكبر" لما أعمل أي حاجة كده ولا كده؟ أيوا يا بني كده أنت بقيت نفسك كده مسلم.	Wait, let me get this straight: I wear a sweet hat, have a wife who listens to me, and can also say Admiral Akbar whenever I do this or that? Well, have got yourself a Muslim.
3. انتظر دعني أفهم، لديك قحفه جميلة وموظفون رائعون. أنت يا سيدي اقنعتني بأن أصبح مسلماً!	Wait, let me understand: you have a beautiful hat and cool employees, you sir convinced me to become a Muslim!
4 and 5. هذا رائع! أريد أن أصبح مسلماً الآن، سأرتدي قبعة جميلة، وسيكون لدي زوجة مطيعة، وأقول الله أكبر عند مواجهة العدو.	This is wonderful! I want to become a Muslim now. I'll wear a beautiful hat, will have an obedient wife, and will say Allah is the greatest when facing the enemy.
6 and 7. إذا في ثقافتكم، قُبعة جميلة، زوجات مُطيعات وبإمكاني الصُراخ بـ "الله أكبر" عندما أقوم بأي شيء؟ أنت يا سيدي حصلت على مسلم.	If there exists in your culture a beautiful hat, obedient wives, and I get to shout Allah is the greatest when I do anything; [then] you, sir, have got yourself a Muslim.
8. إذا دعني أستجمع ما قلتها: قُبعة جميلة، زوجات مُطيعات وبإمكاني الصُراخ بـ "أدميرال أكبر" عندما أقوم بأي شيء؟ أنت يا سيدي حصلت على مسلم.	so, let me get this straight: sweet hat, obedient wives, and I get to shout Admiral Akbar when I do stuff? You, sir, have got yourself a Muslim.

As the back translation of the above example shows, the students adopted three approaches: imitating the source text, heightening the ideological dimension of the message, and concealing the religious connotations. Students 1, 2, and 8 settled on literal translation to portend the warped intentions of the writers. Student 8, for instance, believes that correcting "Admiral Akbar" would be problematic because the scene draws its comedy from mocking Islam and Muslims. Students 4, 5, 6, and 7 explicitated the tacit tones. Students 4 and 5 rendered "you, sir, have got yourself a Muslim" as 'أريد أن أصبح مسلماً الآن' (I want to become a Muslim now), to reflect Peter's main desire to turn Lois into an obedient wife. They also rendered "shout Admiral Akbar when I do stuff" as 'وأقول الله أكبر عند مواجهة العدو' (say Allah is the greatest when facing the enemy) to accentuate the corresponding emotions which 'stuff' implicitly alludes to in American thought. It is possible that Students 6 and 7 pluralised "obedient wife" to express how the permissibility of polygamy is often misconstrued by westerners. Student 3 is the only one who opposed the hegemonic thinking – "obedient wife" is transformed into 'موظفون رائعون' and the whole religious reference is eliminated to, again, prevent the spreading of false images of and about Islam.

In the next scene, Peter is seen wearing a fez and a vest over a kurta as part of his religious dedication, and once Lois asks him about his attire, he replies, "I happen to be a Muslim now, which means I'll be spending a lot of my time in mostly-empty cafes, watching soccer on an eight-inch black-and-white TV." The cutaway gag switches to Peter in a café doing just exactly that, exclaiming "yes, the team I like is kicking it! Oh no, the team I don't like is kicking it! Yes, the team I like is kicking it again! I will celebrate with finger cymbals!" The scene is then

concluded with the abrupt joke “hey, is that for real, that-that ‘diarrhoea only’ sign on your bathroom?” This scene is a visual iteration loaded with orientalist baggage that needs unpacking. Identical to The Chaste Camel’s design, the café exhibits pictorial images that act as overlay symbols of Islam, such as the Turkish flag (evoking associations with the Ottoman empire), the minaret, and the woman wearing *hijab*. The television is also part of the constructed narrative since it implies that Arabs are outmoded and cannot keep abreast of America’s modern society, likewise, the comment about liking and disliking the teams tries to accommodate the idea that Arabs are idiots who fight over trivial matters. Peter’s dancing with finger cymbals casts Arab women as belly dancers and reduces them to sexual objects. Lastly, the ‘diarrhoea only’ sign joke is a dehumanising allusion to the supposedly unsanitary state of Arab lavatories.

Table 6. Muslims and their wasted life

<b>Source text</b>	
<p>Peter: I happen to be a Muslim now, which means I’ll be spending a lot of my time in mostly-empty cafes, watching soccer on an eight-inch black-and-white TV.</p> <p>[scene cuts to Peter sitting in a café]</p> <p>Yes, the team I like is kicking it! Oh no, the team I don’t like is kicking it! Yes, the team I like is kicking it again! I will celebrate with finger cymbals! Hey, is that for real, that-that ‘diarrhea only’ sign on your bathroom?</p>	
<b>Target texts</b>	<b>Back translation</b>
<p>1. لَقَدْ أَصْبَحْتُ مُسْلِمًا! وَسَأْمُضِي وَقْتِي فِي مَقَاهِي أَشَاهِدُ الْمُبَارِيَاتِ عَلَى شَاشَةِ تَلْفِيزِيُونِ قَدِيمَةٍ. (المشهد التالي) يس، فَرِيقِي سَيَفُوزُ! نُو، فَرِيقِي سَيَخْسِرُ! يس، فَرِيقِي سَيَفُوزُ، سَأَحْتَفِلُ بِقَرَعِ الصُّحُونِ. هَي، هَلْ حَقًّا الْحَمَامُ لِحَالَاتِ الإِسْهَالِ فَقَطْ؟</p>	<p>I became a Muslim! And I’ll spend my time in cafes watching soccer on an old TV. [next scene] Yes, my team will win! No, my team will lose! Yes, my team will win! I will celebrate with finger cymbals. Hey, is it for real that the bathroom is for diarrhoea cases only?</p>
<p>2. أَنَا يَا لُويسَ بَقِيتَ مُسْلِمٌ خِلاصَ، وَدِهْ مَعْنَاهُ أَنِّي حَقَقْتُ فِي الْمَقَاهِي الْفَاضِيَةِ الْوَقْتَ كُلُّهُ وَأَحْضَرْتُ مَاتَشَاتٍ فِي تَلْفِيزِيُونِ أَيْبِضٍ وَأَسْوَدٍ تَمَنِيَةً بَوَصَّةِ. (المشهد التالي) أَيُو! الْفَرِيقُ الِي بِشَجْعِهِ بِيَشُوتَهَا! أُوهُ لَاءُ! بِيَشُوتَهَا بِيَشُوتَهَا أَيُو! دِهْ بِيَشُوتَهَا مَرَّةً تَانِيَةً! أَنَا حَعْمَلُ زَيْطَةَ بِالصَّنِجِ. يَاضُ تَعَالَ هِنَا، هُو فِعْلًا الْحَمَامُ مَحْدَشٌ بِيَدْخِلُهُ غَيْرَ الْبَطْنِ بِتَوَجُّعِهِ؟</p>	<p>I, Lois, became a Muslim, which means I’ll be spending all my time in empty cafes, watching soccer on an eight-inch black-and-white TV. [next scene] Yes, the team I’m cheering for is kicking it! Oh no! Kicking it, yes! He’s kicking it again! I will have a blast with finger cymbals. Hey, come here, is it for real that no one enters the bathroom except for those whose stomachs hurt?</p>
<p>3. لُويسَ، أَنَا مُسْلِمٌ الْآنَ.</p>	<p>Lois, I’m Muslim now. (Scene deleted)</p>
<p>4 and 5. لَقَدْ أَصْبَحْتُ مُسْلِمًا الْآنَ يَا لُويسَ. وَهَذَا يَعْنِي أَنَّنِي سَأَقْضِي مَعْظَمَ وَقْتِي فِي الْمَقَاهِي، أَشَاهِدُ مُبَارِيَاتِ كُرَةِ الْقَدَمِ عَلَى شَاشَةِ صَغِيرَةٍ. (المشهد التالي) نَعَمْ الْفَرِيقُ الَّذِي أَحْبَبْتُهُ يَسْجَلُ الْفَرِيقَ الَّذِي أَكْرَهُهُ يَسْجَلُ. الْفَرِيقُ الَّذِي أَحْبَبْتُهُ يَسْجَلُ مَرَّةً أُخْرَى. سَوْفَ أَحْتَفِلُ عَلَى إِيقَاعِ الصَّنُوجِ. مَا هَذَا الَّذِي كَتَبْتَ فِي الْوَلُوحَةِ عَلَى بَابِ الْحَمَامِ؟ لِحَالَاتِ الإِسْهَالِ فَقَطْ؟</p>	<p>I became a Muslim now, Lois, which means I’ll be spending most of my time in cafes, watching soccer on a small screen. [next scene] Yes, the team I like is scoring! The team I hate is scoring! The team I like is scoring again! I will celebrate with finger cymbals! What’s written on the sign on the bathroom door, for diarrhoea cases only?</p>

<p>7 and 6. لقد أصبحت الآن مسلماً يا لويس، مما يعني بأنني سأقضي أغلب وقتي بمقاهٍ شبه خالية، وأشاهد كرة القدم على شاشة تلفزيون أبيض وأسود. (المشهد التالي) نعم! فريقتي حصل على الكرة! لا! ضربةٌ غير موفقة! أجل ضربةٌ موفقة! وقت رقصة الاحتفال. عفواً، هل صحيح أن لديكم لافتة «للمصابين بالإسهال فقط» في حمامكم؟</p>	<p>I became a Muslim now, Lois, which means I'll be spending most of my time in mostly-empty cafes, watching soccer on a black-and-white TV. [next scene] Yes, my team has the ball! No, no, unsuccessful shot! Yes, a successful shot! Time to party-dance! Excuse me, it is for real that you have a 'diarrhoea only' sign in your bathroom?</p>
<p>8. لقد أصبحت الآن مسلماً يا لويس، مما يعني بأنني سأقضي أغلب وقتي بمقاهٍ شبه خالية، أشاهد كرة القدم على شاشة تلفزيون أبيض وأسود. (المشهد التالي) نعم! فريقتي حصل على الكرة! أوه، لا! حصل الفريق الخصم على الكرة! أجل فريقتي حصل على الكرة مجدداً! سأحتفل برقصة صنع الأصابع. عفواً، هل صحيح أن لديكم لافتة «للمصابين بالإسهال فقط» في حمامكم؟</p>	<p>I became a Muslim now, Lois, which means I'll be spending most of my time in mostly-empty cafes, watching soccer on a black-and-white TV. [next scene] Yes, my team has the ball! Oh, no, the other team has the ball! Yes, my team has the ball! I will celebrate with finger cymbals! Excuse me, it is for real that you have a 'diarrhoea only' sign in your bathroom?</p>

Student 1 chose a literal approach; however, she removed “mostly-empty” and compressed “eight-inch black-and-white TV” into “شاشة تلفزيون قديمة” (old TV), to achieve isochrony, which was her main concern while translating. Student 2 replicated the text but changed “‘diarrhoea only’ sign on your bathroom?” to “هو فعلاً الحمام محدش بيدخله غير البطن بتوجهه؟” (is it for real that no one enters the bathroom except for those whose stomachs hurt?) for reasons she did not disclose, but one could hypothesise that she was attempting to mitigate the playful judgements the joke signals. Student 3, whose approach demonstrated the highest level of intervention, is even made more distinct with her curtailed translation “لويس، أنا مسلم الآن” (Lois, I’m a Muslim now) and deletion of the entire café cutaway gag. Student 3 sees translation “as an ethical, political, and ideological activity rather than as a mechanical linguistic exercise” (Tymoczko 2006); a political tool to resist oppression and dismantle American propaganda. Students 4 and 5 made little to no changes because the joke is less intrusive in their opinion, therefore, it allows for the humour to not be taken seriously, or at least not as serious as the other jokes. By the same token, Students 6, 7 and 8 remained loyal to the narrative as a means to uncover how Arabs and Muslims are being vilified under the mask of humour, yet, they were compelled to shorten the dubbed dialogue to achieve isochrony by relying on omission and substitution. The only difference is that Student 8 translated “I will celebrate with finger cymbals” literally, and not as “وقت رقصة الاحتفال” (time to party-dance). What has been changed in all three translations though is Peter’s manner of speech when asking about the ‘diarrhoea only’ sign. Inserting the polite ‘عفواً’ (excuse me) dilutes the condescending tone to make it more palatable for the Arab audience.

## 6. Conclusion: *Family Guy*, humorous or dangerous?

Dubbing is the itinerary through which language is reconstructed and meaning is recreated, thus heralding the translator’s cultural identity, moral attitude, political affiliations, and the many hues of ideology. In the Arab world, dubbing is the preferred approach for translating films and television shows that go against the grains of established norms, culture, or religion, as they are more than capable of influencing and conditioning people to think in prescribed ways. *Family Guy* is a stark example of how imperialist ideologies are disseminated under the name of humour and mere social satire. Adopting CDA in this study was critical in uncovering participants’ resistive and agentive stances *vis a vis* what could be perceived as an innocent and harmless

portrayal of the ‘Other.’ It was instrumental in deconstructing and analysing language use and function in social contexts beyond the façade of sentences and utterances, and more evidently in multimodal and audiovisual texts in which only the synthesis of various textual layers (visual, auditory and acoustic) makes the meaning whole and complete. The translations denote the inextricable intertwining of the students’ voices and the act of translation, that is, some students consciously attempted to expose the writers’ intentions, while others subverted the text as a protective and resistive measure against the anti-Islamic, racist, sexual humour of the show. If one conclusion could be drawn from the above discussion, it is that the translator’s voice cannot be extricated from the translational process, more so in audiovisual texts where images add another intricate layer of meaning. Even with the visual constraints, the students asserted their agentive role by finding creative solutions to manoeuvre the text linguistically.

## References

- Al-Adwan, A. (2015). ‘Towards a model of euphemisation in Arabic subtitling’. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* 4, pp. 6–21.
- Al-Ghamdi, N. & Safrah, R. (2020). ‘Islamophobia in the western media: a linguistic investigation of two counter arguments’. *Talent Development & Excellence* 12 (2), pp. 3061–3082.
- Alkadi, T. (2010). *Issues in the Subtitling and Dubbing of English-language Films into Arabic: Problems and Solutions* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Durham]. Durham e-Theses: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/326/>
- Alsultany, E. (2012). *Arabs and Muslims in the Media: Race and Representation after 9/11*. London and New York: New York University Press.
- Amz, T. (2014). ‘Dismantling the stereotypes of Islam, Arab, and Muslim women in the visual and print media of the western world’. *Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi* 2 (2), pp. 148–154.
- Ascheid, A. (1997). ‘Speaking tongues: voice dubbing in the cinema as cultural ventriloquism’. *The Velvet Light Trap* 40, pp. 32–41.
- Bassnett, S. (1996). ‘The meek or the mighty: reappraising the role of the translator’, in Álvarez, R. & Vidal, C. (eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion*, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, pp. 10–24.
- Belamghari, M. (2015). ‘Cartooning humor: how Arabs are laughably derided in animations’. *KOME—An International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry* 3 (2), pp. 64–74.
- Bezerra, F. (2020). ‘Multimodal critical discourse analysis of the cinematic representation of women as social actors’. *D.E.L.T.A.* 36 (4), pp. 1–28.
- Billig, M. (2005). *Laughter and Ridicule: Towards a Social Critique of Humour*. London: Sage Publications.
- Chaume, F. (2018a). ‘An overview of audiovisual translation: four methodological turns in a mature discipline’. *Journal of Audiovisual Translation* 1 (1), pp. 40–63.
- Chaume, F. (2018b). ‘Is audiovisual translation putting the concept of translation up against the ropes?’. *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 30, pp. 84–104.
- Chiaro, D. (2005). ‘Verbally expressed humor and translation: an overview of a neglected field’. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 18 (2), pp. 135–145.
- DeRochi, J. (2008). ‘What have you learned?: considering a new hermeneutic of satire in Family Guy’. *American Humor Studies Association* 3 (17), pp. 35–48.
- Díaz Cintas, J. (2012). ‘Clearing the smoke to see the screen: ideological manipulation in audiovisual translation’. *Meta* 57 (2), pp. 279–293.
- Di Giovanni, E. (2016). ‘New imperialism in (re)translation: Disney in the Arab world’. *Perspectives* 25 (1), 1–14.

- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1995).
- Feltmate, D. (2017). *Drawn to the Gods: Religion and Humor in The Simpsons, South Park, and Family Guy*. New York: New York University Press.
- Ford, T. (2015). 'The social consequences of disparagement humor: introduction and overview'. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 28 (2), pp. 163–169.
- Freud, S. (1963). *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Garrido, N., & Morales, Y. (2018). 'Islamophobia and adult animation: the tyranny of the visual'. *Comunicación y Medios* 37, pp. 119–130.
- Gournelos, T., & Greene, V. (eds.). (2011). *A Decade of Dark Humor: How Comedy, Irony, and Satire Shaped Post-9/11 America*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hughey, M. & Muradi, S. (2009). 'Laughing matters: Economies of hyper-irony and manic-satire in South Park & Family Guy'. *Humanity & Society* 33(3), pp. 206–237.
- Juckel, J., Bellman, S., & Varan, D. (2016). 'A humor typology to identify humor styles used in sitcoms'. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 29 (4). pp. 583–603.
- Kim, K. (2020). 'Critical discourse analysis'. In Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (3rd ed.), London and New York: Routledge, pp. 119–124.
- Koestler, A. (1964). *The Act of Creation*. London: Hutchinson.
- Krikmann, A. (2006). 'Contemporary linguistic theories of humour'. *Folklore: Electronic Journal of Folklore* 33, pp. 27–58.
- Leonardi, V. (2008). 'Increasing or decreasing the sense of 'otherness': the role of audiovisual translation in the process of social integration', in Taylor, C. (ed.), *Ecolingua: The Role of E-Corpora in Translation and Language Learning*, Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste, pp.158–172.
- Lester, P. (2020). *Visual Communication: Images with Messages* (8th ed.). Dallas: Lex Publishing.
- Machin, D. & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction*. California: Sage Publications.
- Magazzù, G. (2020). 'Dubbing between manipulation and censorship: the Italian version of The Happytime Murders', in Magazzù, G., Rossi, V. & Sileo, A. (eds.), *Reception Studies and Adaptation: A Focus on Italy*, Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 151–173.
- Munday, J. (2007). 'Translation and ideology: a textual approach'. *The Translator* 13 (2), pp. 195–217.
- Neale, S. & Krutnik, F. (1990). *Popular Film and Television Comedy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pérez-González, L. (2014). *Audiovisual Translation: Theories, Methods, and Issues*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Richter, V. (2005). 'Laughter and aggression: Desire and derision in a postcolonial context', in Reichl, S. & Stien, M. (eds.), *Cheeky Fictions: Laughter and the Postcolonial*, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, pp. 61–72.
- Ricke, L. (2012). 'Funny or harmful?: derogatory speech on Fox's Family Guy'. *Communication Studies* 63 (2), pp. 119–135.
- Said, E. (1997). *Covering Islam: How the Media and The Experts Determine How We See the Rest of The World*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1978).

- Saloom, R. (2006). 'Arab stereotyping: A multi-disciplinary perspective'. *The Modern American* 2 (3), pp. 24–29.
- Schäffner, C. & Bassnett, S. (2010). 'Politics, media and translation—exploring synergies', in Schäffner, C. & Bassnett, S. (eds.), *Political Discourse, Media and Translation*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 1–29.
- Schnurr, S. & Plester, P. (2017). 'Functionalist discourse analysis of humor', in Attardo, S. (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Humor*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 309–321.
- Shaheen, J. (2009). *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People*. Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press.
- Sienkiewicz, M. & Marx, N. (2014). 'Click culture: the perils and possibilities of Family Guy and convergence-era television'. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 11 (2), pp. 103–119.
- Starck, K. (2009). 'Perpetuating prejudice: media portrayal of Arabs and Arab Americans', in R. Geißler & H. Pöttker (eds.), *Media, Migration, Integration: European and North American Perspectives*, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, pp. 181–211.
- Tymoczko, M. (1999). *Translation in a Postcolonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tymoczko, M. (2006). 'Translation: ethics, ideology, action'. *The Massachusetts Review* 47 (3), pp. 442–461.
- Wodak, R. (2011). 'Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis', in Zienkowski, J., Östman, O., & Verschueren, J. (eds.), *Discursive Pragmatics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 50–70.
- Vandaele, J. (2002). 'Introduction: (re-)constructing humour: meanings and means'. *The Translator* 8 (2), pp. 149–172.
- Vandaele, J. (2010). 'Humor in translation', in Gambier, Y. & Van Doorslaer, L. (eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies: Volume 1*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 147–152.
- Van Dijk, T. (1995). 'Discourse analysis as ideology analysis', in Schäffner, C. & Wenden, A. (eds.), *Language and Peace*, Aldershot: Dartmouth, pp.17–33.
- Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Yahiaoui, R., Abu Alqumboz, B. & Fattah, A. (2019). 'Translating irony into Arabic – who is having the last laugh? Dubbing Monsters Inc.: Egyptian vernacular vs. modern standard Arabic'. *The European Journal of Humour Research* 7 (4), pp. 32-46.
- Yahiaoui, R. & Fattah, A. (2020). 'Shifts in transadapting western cultural references for dubbing into Arabic - The Simpsons vs. Al-Shamshoon'. *inTRAlinea Translation Journal*, 22.
- Yahiaoui, R. (2021). 'Transcreating humour for (re)dubbing into Arabic: creativity, register variations and meaning making between overt and covert dichotomies'. *The European Journal of Humour Research* 10 (3), pp. 151-167.
- Yahiaoui, R., Aldous, M., & Fattah, A. (2021). 'The impact of image on translation decision-making in dubbing into Arabic – premeditated manipulation par excellence: The Exodus Song as a case study'. *Open Cultural Studies* 5 (1), pp. 66–80.
- Zabalbeascoa, P. (2005). 'Humor and translation—an interdisciplinary'. *Humor: International Journal of Humour Research* 18 (2), pp. 185–207.
- Zsila, Á., Urbán, R., Orozs, G., & Demetrovics, Z. (2021). 'The association of animated sitcom viewing with humour styles and humour types'. *Humor: International Journal of Humour Research* 34, pp. 393–409.