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Abstract:
This paper investigates Qur’ānic euphemisms and sets out to answer the question: How euphemistic is the Qur’ān when mentioning sex-related and genitalia issues? It probes the techniques used for sex-related Qur’ānic euphemisms in an attempt to design a model for the Qur’ānic euphemism formation. Data have been collected from chapters 19 to 76 and have been contextually and linguistically analysed based on classical sources of exegesis and Arabic dictionaries in order to eliminate the factor of semantic change of words through the years. Having made an attempt to universalize the English euphemism innovation model presented by Warren (1992) by applying it on the Qur’ānic euphemisms, the analysis shows that the formal innovation is not applicable on the Qur’ān; and the semantic innovation is found to be used instead. Two new sub-categories are found in the Qur’ānic discourse and are suggested to complement the semantic innovation in the Warren's model.
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Introduction

This paper presents a stylistically-based investigation of Qur’ānic discourse to verify how the Qur’ān avoids mentioning sensitive sex-related expressions by means of employing euphemism. Potentially offensive sex-related Qur’ānic words are to be investigated to explore the rhetorical features of decorum in Qur’ānic discourse. The data will be collected from chapters 19 onward as the chapters 1-18 were already covered in another study (Al-Barakati 2013). The data are limited only to sex-related Qur’ānic expressions for the reason that sex-based themes are more common among languages and cultures and are more likely to offer an in-depth view towards comparative studies.

The references consulted will include classical exegesis books, traditional Arabic dictionaries, and books of Arabic rhetoric written as early as the 2nd/8th century as they offer priceless data for Qur’ānic words. As some Qur’ānic words have acquired new denotations and connotations over time (i.e. semantic change) or have acquired new senses (i.e. semantic extension), these two factors of semantic extension and semantic change will be eliminated in the diagnosis of meaning within the same period of revelation to avoid later word interpretations. In other words, later senses of the words are not going to be considered in the analysis. Moreover, exegesis books are consulted diachronically in order to potentially spot where the shift in meaning - if there is any- could have occurred.

Another criterion used in this research is the connotative meaning of the word; it is analyzed in comparison with other choices having a similar literal meaning. Because the euphemistic effect is contingent on word choice and context, it is claimed here that since -by definition- the more polite the word is -compared to other choices in the same semantic range, the more euphemistic it is and vice versa; and if the word used in the verse is the most euphemistic in the semantic range, then the whole structure is euphemistic.
**What is euphemism?**

The term euphemism is well-established in English pragmatics, rhetoric and stylistics. Etymologically, it comes from a Greek origin with /eu/ meaning good and /pheme/ related to speaking (Rawson 1983; Farghal 1995). According to Fowler (1994: 152) it is “the use of a mild or vague or periphrastic expression as a substitute for blunt precision or disagreeable truth”. However, Neaman and Silver (1983: 4) point to an element of “indirectness in the service of pleasantness” while Noble (1982: 5) links it to some social motives such as loss of face affirming that it is an evasion through linguistic means of some unpleasant aspects (ibid: 13).

Willis and Klammer (1981: 192–193), define euphemism as "a mild or roundabout word or expression used instead of a more direct word or expression to make one's language delicate and inoffensive even to a squeamish person". From a stylistic point of view, Wales (2014: 146) defines euphemism as "the substitution of an inoffensive or pleasant expression for a more unpleasant one". She rightly posits that offensive topics may change from time to time and can be different from a society to another.

Whether it is seen as a word or as a technique in which speakers tend to use to express sensitive ideas, euphemism seems to be collectively defined as an expression that is used to substitute another which could be offensive to the reader or listener. This involves using evasive expressions or avoidance language (Allan and Burridge 1991: 3). A more recent definition of euphemism; however, is provided by Gomez (2009: 736):

"the cognitive process of conceptualization of a forbidden reality, which, manifested in discourse through the use of linguistic mechanisms including lexical substitution, phonetic alteration, morphological modification, composition or inversion, syntagmatic grouping or combination, verbal or paralinguistic modulation or textual description, enables the speaker, in a certain "context" or in a specific pragmatic situation, to attenuate a certain forbidden concept or reality."
Traditionally, euphemism in Arabic has been studied under rhetoric. Among the names that are used for 'euphemism' are: kināyah (i.e. metonymy), taʿrīḍ (i.e. innuendo), taḥsīn al-Lafẓ (i.e. beautifying the word), talṭīf al-lafẓ (i.e. mitigating the senses of the word), tawriyah (i.e. equivocation). Fraghal (1995), however, claims that Arabic employs four major devices for euphemism formation: figurative expressions, circumlocutions, remodelings, and antonyms. While the first two devices are more commonly used, the last two devices are not.

**Euphemism, language and culture**

Euphemisms, according to Brown and Levinson (1987: 216) "are a universal feature of language usage". Many cultures euphemize for themes such as sex, death, mentioning God's epithets. However, cultures differ in the way or degree to which a theme is considered a taboo. For example, while mentioning God is a taboo in Western cultures leading speakers to replace God's name with words like 'Adonai' (Frankel and Teutsch 1992: 119) and 'gee' for Jesus (Sanga and Ortalli 2003: 113), it is the opposite in Islam where mentioning the name of God is considered a worship. Nonetheless, the theme of sex seems to be universally tabooed and thus universally euphemized; yet with variation in degree.

The interweaving of languages and cultures seems to lie behind the different motivations of euphemism. Depending on languages and cultures, motivations behind euphemizing range and vary. English for example has more than 800 euphemisms for 'copulation' (Allan and Burridge 1991: 91), and over 350 words for 'drunk' in American slang (Rawson 1983: 6). These numbers clearly show that these two themes are strong taboo themes providing that the abundance and frequency of use of euphemisms reflect the degree of taboo strength in a culture (ibid). Arabic, on the other hand, does not have such numbers for these themes which could be attributed to the fact that borrowing is a major technique on which English depends to enrich its vocabulary (Lawrence 1973) while Arabic uses inflection.
As mentioned above, Arabic and English are rich in euphemistic expressions covering a wide array of themes such as the body parts, mentioning disease, drug addiction and sex. Linguistically however, an interesting analysis depicting English euphemism from a pure linguistic approach was presented by Warren (1992). She claims that process of assigning new meanings to words is constant; a process she termed as 'euphemism innovation' in which existing words catch up new contextual meanings (ibid: 130). The denotative meaning is termed in her model as 'conventional referent' while 'contextual referent' describes the emerging meanings i.e. the new euphemistic usage. According to Warren (1992), two main innovations are there for creating euphemisms: formal and semantic. Three techniques are used for the formal innovation:

1. Word formation devices such as compounding, blending, derivation, onomatopoeia and acronyms.

2. Phonemic modifications such as letter reversal as in ('enob' = bone); rhyming slang; and abbreviation as in ('eff' = fuck).

3. Using loan words from other languages (mainly French, Greek and Latin in the case of English).

Semantic innovation involves eight techniques:

1. Particularization where a general term is used as a euphemism such as 'intercourse' and 'satisfaction'. These words can lose their euphemistic senses over time and usage; a phenomenon called euphemism treadmill.

2. Implication where there is a concurrent relationship between the euphemized referent and the conventionally common referent as in 'to sleep with someone' as a euphemism for having sex.

3. Metonymy where there is co-occurrence between the euphemized and the conventional referents such as cause-effect as in 'to go to bed with' for 'to have sex'.

4. Metaphor where there is at least one shared link between the conventional and euphemistic referents such as shape as in 'balls' = 'testicles'.

5. Reversal where the conventional referent is assigned an opposite meaning for a euphemistic purpose as in 'crazy' to mean 'creative'.

6. Understatement takes place when the new contextual referent has a neutral element that can help downplay the connotations of the conventional referent as in 'to sleep' meaning 'to die' as both have the element of unconsciousness in common.

7. The opposite of understatement is overstatement where the new referent gives the conventional one an exaggerated tone as in 'housekeeper' for 'servant'.

8. Paraphrasing where more general structures are used such as definition, explanation, or a restating the meaning using other words.

While formal innovation refers to euphemizing through change in the word form, semantic innovation refers to euphemizing through change in word meanings.

**Euphemism in Arabic**

Traditionally and historically speaking, the concept of euphemism has been studied as an element of rhetoric in Arabic; being studied under two rhetorical devices known as: *kināyah* (i.e. metonymy) and *taʾrīḍ* (i.e. innuendo) which deal with similar euphemistic functions. Recently, however, it has been given labels such as, *taḥsīn al-Lafẓ* (i.e. beautifying the word), *talṭīf al-lafẓ* (i.e. mitigating [the negative senses] of the word), *tawriyah* (i.e. equivocation) (El-Zeiny 2009: 173).

Derived from the verb *kanā* i.e. to cover or to hide, the word *kināyah* denotes the opposite meaning of *al-taṣrīḥ* i.e. clarification. It carries the meaning of insinuation without elaboration (Ibn Manẓūr 1980). A *kināyah* structure should carry both denotative and connotative meanings, with the second meaning being
al-Thaʿālibi uses the term *kināyah* to refer to an utterance that has two layers of meaning; one is being more common whilst the other is less commonly used. According to al-Thaʿālibi, one main purpose of *kināyah* is "to beautify the ugly" (al-Thaʿālibi 1998: 163).

*Kināyah* has also been investigated by other traditional Arabic linguists of the 3rd/9th century such as al-Mubarrad (d.898). Among three main *kināyah* functions he lists is: function of using *kināyah* as a euphemistic tool: “the replacements of an obscene vulgar word with a polite one which can still convey the meaning (my translation)” (al-Mubarrad 1997: 855). Moreover, another Arabic pioneer who has also sensed the relationship between *kināyah* and euphemism is Ibn Fāris. Among the categories of *kināyah* he lists is one which provides less coarse-sounding words (Ibn-Fāris 1998: 200-2). Among many examples he lists is the verse “wagālū li julūdihim lima shahīdtum ʿalaynā” (Q 41:21) (literally: and they said to their skins why did you testify on us?). The word *julūd* (literally skins), according to Ibn-Fāris, refers to sexual organs. This opinion is also found in some exegesis books which follow a linguistic approach to interpret the Qurʾānic text such as (al-Razi 1981, Al-Mawardi 1993, al-Zamakhshari 1998, Ibn-Atiyyah 2002).

The word *taʿrīḍ*, on the other hand, is a noun derived from of the verb *ʿarraḍa* which literally means 'to widen'. In the Qurʾān, it is used to mean the opposite of declaration as in the verse (Q 2:235) which allows men to indirectly propose to women who are still in their ʿiddah (i.e. Period of waiting a woman must observe after the death of her husband or divorce). It uses evasive ways to hide the undesired meanings by way of selection of words. However, unlike *kināyah* which tends to use brevity and metaphor, the principle of brevity is not emphasized in *taʿrīḍ*. They both share indirectness; yet *taʿrīḍ* is more semantically broad, i.e. paraphrased. While both *kināyah* and *taʿrīḍ* do not rely on the literal expression of the meaning, the former tends to be more idiomatic while the latter hides the meaning in periphrastic forms; called by some researchers allusion (Taheri 2015).
Recently however, Farghal (1995) finds that Arabic employs four major devices for euphemism formation: figurative expressions, circumlocutions, re-modeling, and antonyms. The first two devices are similar in nature to *kināyah* and *taʿrīḍ* in standard Arabic and are more commonly used than the last two which occur more often in vernacular Arabic. There are other strategies found in some Arabic vernaculars; Rabab’ah and Al-Qarni (2012: 736) finds that euphemizing in Saudi Arabian vernacular employs ‘part-for-whole’, ‘overstatement’, ‘understatement’, ‘deletion’, ‘metaphor’, ‘general-for-specific’, and ‘learned words and jargons’. Moreover, from an Egyptian vernacular sample, Thawabteh (2012) puts forth four techniques he examined in his study: figurative expressions, re-modeling, omissions, and circumlocutions. The sample of this research, however, is from the Qurʾān which is likely to be different from other Arabic texts as we shall see in the following section.

**Analysis:**

- **Example 1 (Q 19:20):**

  - *Qālat ṣanā yakūnu lī ghulāmīn walam yamsanī basharūn walam ṣaku baghiyya*

**Contextual analysis:**

The verse deals with the story of Mary who, according to the Qurʾān, is a pious virgin woman who received the heavenly angel Gabriel. He appeared before her in a form of a man and conveyed a heavenly message to her that she would conceive a son. Affirming her chastity, she replied: “how would I have a son when no man ever touched me nor have I been unchaste”. Exegetes consensually explicate that the part “touched me” refers to marriage (Ibn-'Ashour 1969, al-Baghawi 1989, al-Tabari 1997, al-Baidhawi 1999, Al-Qurtubi 2003) They add that if the intended meaning was adultery here, other words of choice could have been used such as *fajara biha* and *khabatha biha* which are rather dysphemistic.
The second part *baghiyyā* means one who would have a relation outside the wedlock. al-Qurṭubī (2003) claims that this part bears emphasis that she has never been touched by a man neither through marriage nor through other means.

**Textual analysis:**
The potential euphemisms found in this verse relate to two parts:

- *yamsasni* literally (literally touch me) which is a famous Qurʾānic euphemism used in (Q 2: 237, Q 3: 43) for the same meaning i.e. sexual relationships. It applies a part-for-whole technique to euphemize the sexual activity. The part, per se, is the touching action while the whole is the whole sexual relation itself. Therefore, the touching part in the verse denotes the sexual intercourse as a whole. This makes it a typical example of using metonymy for euphemism formation or innovation in Warren's words.

- *baghiyyā* is an indefinite noun in the accusative case. It literally means one who wants or seeks i.e. seeker, as it derives from the verb *baghā* i.e. to want or seek something. According to classical Arabic dictionaries, the word *baghiy* generally refers to bondswomen who are likely to be easygoing when it comes to having unlawful affairs (Ibn-Manzur 1980, Al-Jawhari 1990). However, it can also be used for free women who practice prostitution. These connotative differences indicate that when a word is found to have various connotation i.e. euphemistic and direct senses, it is highly likely that the word has gone through semantic change over time. Dictionaries provide meaning at a certain stage; hence the variations. The word *baghiy* entails immorality, whoredom, and any other promiscuous sexual activity when it refers to bondswomen. Yet, according to the traditional dictionaries, it is merely descriptive and connotes no negative senses in itself. In other words, this word bears no face threatening unlike a word such as *mūmis* which could have been used in that context but it lucidly bears negative connotations. A word such as *baghiy* can be used to describe a manner followed by some women; no prescriptive meaning is intended.
here. Similarly, the words zāni and zāniyah which have been used in the Qurʾān to refer to those who commit adultery while being married. If another function was intended, more strongly negative words could have been used such as fājirah. This is indeed an example of using metonymy to euphemize for sex seekers.

- **Example 2 (Q 21:91), Example 3 (Q 33:35) Example 4 (Q 66:12) and Example 5 (Q 70:29)**
  - Wālātī ṣaḥsanat farjahā fanafaḵnā fīhā min rūḥinā
  - Walḥāfīḏīna furūjahum walḥāfīḏāt
  - Wa maryama abnata ʿimrāna allatī ṣaḥsanat farjahā fanafaḵnā fīhī min rūḥinā
  - Wālādīhīna hum lifurūjihim ḥāfīḏān

**Contextual analysis**

Examples 2 and 4 talk about Mary and speak highly of her that she had guarded her chastity. It is quite interesting to find that most exegetes tend to use euphemistic styles in their commentaries on these verses. Some have provided an interpretation that further exonerates Mary from the conviction of committing adultery. Commenting on this verse in example 4 for example, the word jayb (i.e. her garment opening) is said to account for the masculine pronoun feeḥī mentioned in the verse (al-Baghawi 1989, Al-Mawardi 1993, al-Tabari 1997, Ibn-Kathir 1999, Al-Qurtubi 2003). In other words, the breathing of the angel into Mary's body was said to be via her garment opening. Consequently, Marys' pregnancy was not due to a normal sexual intercourse.

Example 2 lists ten traits that if Muslim men and women keep, God will forgive them for their sins and give them a great reward for their acts of obedience. It has been reported that one of the Prophet's wives i.e. ʿUmm Salamah asked the Prophet why women are not mentioned in the Qurʾān: "You [men] were mentioned and we were not. Had there been any good in us, we would have been
mentioned!" And so Allah, exalted is He, revealed (Lo! men who surrender unto Allah, and women who surrender)” (al-Wahidi 1994).

Example 4 is preceded by a verse in which the Qurʾān gives examples of female believers in contrast of the two disbeliever women mentioned earlier i.e. Noah's and Lot's wives. The Wife of Pharoah was mentioned in (Q 66: 11) and Mary is mentioned in this verse (Q 66: 12). She is being spoken about very highly in this verse and in the Qurʾān in general as we have already discussed in example 2. In this verse in particular, the Qurʾān says that she had guarded her chastity, then Allah breathed through Gabriel into her clothes so that she would get pregnant with Jesus (al-Nasafi 1980, Ibn-Kathir 1999, al-Alusi n.d, al-Biqa'i n.d). This verse is a counter argument to the claim that Mary had committed adultery.

Example 5 comes in a context where an outline of the features of believers is provided. Among many features is the feature that believers protect their private parts. Those who enjoy these features will be eventually admitted to paradise.

**Textual analysis:**

The words under examination are *farjaha* in examples 2 and 4 and *furūjihim* in examples 3 and 5. They are all derived from the tri-literal root *fāʾ rāʾ jīm* which occurs nine times in the Qurʾān, in two derivation forms: a verb once and eight times a noun. According to classical Arabic dictionaries the word *farj* means opening in general (Ibn-Faris 1969, Ibn-Manzur 1980). One's garment has four openings: the head opening, the feet opening and the two sleeves (Al-Qurtubi 2003). The meaning of opening is also employed in the verse "*wa mā lahā mín furūj*" (Q 50:06).

Later, the meaning was further developed to euphemize for the female pudendum. It is used pervasively in the religious discourse for this purpose. Contemporarily, the word *farj* has become specific for this meaning to the extent which one can hardly find this word to refer to anything but this particular meaning; the literal meaning has almost died out. al-Qurtubi (2003) states that it meant an opening in
the garments, and that all openings are called *furūj* i.e. plural of *farj* as in the verse (Q 50: 06). It has also acquired new meanings such as mouth and genitals. Based on the contextual and co-textual clues, the word *furūjihim* in example 4 could only mean the euphemistic meaning. We can conclude that it was a euphemism which employed metaphor – based on the Warren's model adopted in this study- where the opening shape is the common feature between the conventional meaning (opening) and the euphemistic one (genital organs). The reason why this word has acquired such a novel meaning is similarity as there is a shared link between the original and the novel meaning: both have a hole shape (Ibn-Manzur 1980).

- **Example 6:** (Q 23:13), **Example 7:** (Q 76:02) and **Example 8:** (Q 80:19)
  - *Thumma jaʿalnāhu nutfatan fī qarārin makān*
  - *ʿinnā khalaqnā alʿinsāna min nutfatin ʿamshāj*
  - *Min nutfatin khalaqahu faqaddarah*

**Contextual analysis:**

The verse which is preceding example 6 (Q 23:12) introduces the process of creation of mankind stating that humankind was first created from clay. Then, human (generic) was made a drop in a safe place i.e. the womb. Example 7 is a verse occurs in a Qurʾān chapter titled as al-insan i.e. the human. It starts with a reminder that man was at a certain stage of life unremembered (Q 76:01). Then, the verse at hand advocates that humans were created from a tiny mixed fluid (*i.e. nutfah ʿamshāj*) from both man and woman (al-Baghawi 1989, al-Wahidi 1994, al-Tabari 1997, al-Zamakhshari 1998). They were made capable of hearing and seeing so that they would be tried. Example 8, however, states that man was created from a drop of semen (*i.e. nutfah*) and then fate and age were determined.

**Textual analysis:**
The word *nutfah* is found to have some neutral general senses. Traditional Arabic dictionaries give more than ten different meanings for the word; yet all evolve around water. Al-Saghani (1981) quotes a prophetic ḥadīth and some traditional Arabic poetry lines in which the word *nutfah* was used to mean “clear water”. It is also used for both large and little amounts of water but the plural determines which meaning is intended (*nutaf* and *niṭaf* respectively) (al-Firuzabadi 1884, Al-Jawhari 1990). This usage is found as well as in some prophetic ḥadīths which proves that it was an established euphemism during the prophet's era. In these verses the word *nutfah* is used as a euphemism for sperm and the technique employed is metaphor as there is a mutual similarity between water and semen.

- **Example 9 (Q 24:2-3)**

  *Azzāniyatu wazzānī fajlidū kulla wāḥidin minhumā miāʻata jaldatin*

**Contextual analysis:**

This verse deals with the penalty of fornication in Islam: a hundred lashes. However, it is generally admitted by a majority of renowned scholars that this punishment is only for unmarried offenders. A married perpetrator should be stoned to death as the *sunnah* (i.e. sayings and teachings of Prophet Muhammed) further explained.

**Textual analysis:**

The potential euphemistic words here are *al-zānī* and *al-zāniyah*; the second one is the female variant of the first. They are derived from the verb *zanā* which originally meant to tighten something (al-Firuzabadi 1884, Ibn-Manzur 1980). Interestingly though, information on this meaning is very scarce which makes us believe that this meaning was particularized for this act long before the time of compiling the traditional Arabic dictionaries. The most pervasive meaning found in dictionaries is 'having an illegal sexual relation'. What is meant by illegal here is lovemaking with someone who is not one's husband or wife.
During the pre-Islamic era, they used to differentiate between bighāʾ and zinā. The first is concerned with paid illegal lovemaking while the latter concerns illegal relations out of love in general (i.e. love affairs) which makes bighāʾ a hyponym of zinā (Ibn-'Ashour 1969). There are many traditional Arabic words that are used to express the same meaning though: waṭʾ, which literally means stepping with one's feet on something, sifāḥ (i.e. literally: shedding liquid), and fujūr (literally: lewdness). These semantic variations reflect different euphemistic patterns. For example, waṭʾ assigns a new meaning to a word that bears no negative connotations while the second and third are more dysphemistic. The word zanā stands in the middle among these three choices having no dysphemistic senses.

To recapitulate, this word is found to be used as a euphemism for it is void from dysphemistic senses, and for it has acquired a new novel sense (the euphemistic one) different from that which it had once meant (i.e. to tighten something). Currently though, it is used as a jurisprudence term for 'adultery' and is being seen a descriptive term void from euphemistic and dysphemistic senses. This example, then, uses particularization for euphemism innovation.

- **Example 10 (Q 24:58)**

  Yā 'ayyuhā alladhīna ʾāmanū liyastaʾdhinkumu alladhīna malakat 'āymānukum wālładhīna lam yabluġū alḥuluma minkum

**Contextual analysis:**

This verse accounts for how closely related people should seek permission to gain entry into house. Believers are commanded here to ensure that their servants and their children who have not yet reached the age of puberty should seek permission at three times: before the dawn prayer, when garments are put off at noon, and after the night prayer (al-Suyuti and al-Mahalli 1987, Ibn-Kathir 1999). After reaching the age of puberty (i.e. hulum), they are considered as adults and should always ask for permission to enter (al-Tabari 1997, al-Zamakhshari 1998).

**Textual analysis:**
The potential euphemistic word here is *hulum*. This word is identical in spelling to two words which should not be mixed with them: (*helm* i.e. patience, *hulm* i.e. dream). The meaning *hulum* is reaching a state of wisdom i.e. becoming mature. However, it is argued here that this word has been metonymically used to euphemize for the meaning of reaching the age of puberty which is a typical sensitive sex-related issue. Such an issue involves having natural desire for the opposite gender, and developing some physiological changes such as the ability for males to ejaculate sperms and having menstrual period for females. These developments are concurrent relationships between *hulum* and the sex theme. It is then a euphemistic word which employed implication to convey the euphemistic function.

- **Example 11 (Q 24:60)**
  - *Walqawāʿidu mina annisāʾ i allātī lā yarjūna nikāḥan*

**Contextual analysis:**

This verse was preceded by some verses which discussed how closely-related people should ask for permission before entering upon one another. This verse, however, advocates that elderly women may put off some clothes of theirs such as a robe, a cloak or a head veil (al-Suyuti and al-Mahalli 1987, al-Tabari 1997).

**Textual analysis:**

The word *qawāʿid* is the plural of *qāʿidah* which normally and commonly means “a sitting woman”. According to al-Mawardī (1993), they were called *qawāʿid* because women would sit more often as they get older. While the verse itself provides a definition of the word: "those who have no hope of marriage"; a Qur’ānic feature which is called “interpreting Qur’ān by Qur’ān”, the word *qāʿidah* according to classical Arabic dictionaries refers to elderly women who have reached menopause age and hence cannot conceive (Ibn-Manzur 1980, Al-Jawhari 1990). Moreover, al-Rāzi (1981) adds that it is not only that they have menopause for they may still be sexually active, they rather should be old enough or even ugly enough not to be approached by men for marriage (Al-Qurtubi 2003).
This word then is used here as a euphemism for elderly women who do not excite the passions of men (Ibn-Kathir 1999). This is a typical euphemism which employed implication to express the euphemistic function.

- **Example 12 (Q 25:07)**

- *Waqālū māli hādhā arrasūlu yaʾkulu aṭṭaʿāma wayamshi fī alʾaswāqi*

**Contextual analysis:**

This verse talks about a situation which took place between some Qurashī disbelievers who had refuted the prophet's message with the claim that he was an ordinary person (i.e. he had no special traits). According to the verse, they argued that since he would eat food, go the markets and walk there as they did, he should have an angel to support him in his message. According to Ibn Kathīr (1999), this shows their stubborn position and their rejection of Muhammad's prophethood. Although, they made a previous claim that he had been bewitched by some Jinn (Q 26:27), their claim that he had been acting like an ordinary person contradicts what they had claimed before.

**Textual analysis:**

The expression *yaʾkulu aṭṭaʿāma* has been used in many occasions throughout the Qur’ānic text. As a metonymic expression, two possible meanings can be intended: literal and figurative. The literal meaning of the expression simply denotes that the prophet ate food whereas the figurative meaning could allude to one of the aftermaths of eating (i.e. defecation). Context can help readers to figure out whether the intended meaning of the expression is literal or figurative. Unlike (Q 5:75) which applied this kind of metonymy to proof the non-divine status of Jesus and Mary in a euphemistic way, (Q 25:07) does not have enough contextual links nor textual hints to convince the reader that the intended meaning is the figurative.
On the contrary, the above expression was supported by another expression i.e. *wayamshī fi alʾaswāqi* which further proves that it is the literal meaning intended here. In other words, the first expression denotes that the prophet was an ordinary person and the second expression denotes that he was not a king who could have his own servants do daily chores (shopping for instance) on his behalf; the two expression are interrelated and complete one another. We can conclude then that the expression *ya ʿkulu ʿattāʾāma* in this verse is not euphemistic and rather denotes the actual eating and going to markets.

- **Example 13 (Q 26:165) and 14 (Q 27:55)**
  - ʿataʾtūn adhuakrāna min alʿālmīn
  - ʿaʾinnakum lataʾtūn arrijāla shahwatan min dūn alannisa`

**Contextual analysis:**

These two verses deal with the story of the people of Sodom who used to practice some lustful acts. According to the Qurʾān, the Prophet Lot was sent to the people of Sodom to preach them to monotheism and that they should stop their deviant sexual acts. His message was ignored by them so they were subsequently destroyed. Their story is mentioned in chapters 7, 11, 15 and 26.

**Textual analysis:**

The potential euphemistic expression in this verse is ʿataʾtūn which literally translates as 'do you come [to]'. It is an inflection of the verb *yaʾtī* which means to come to a place. Earlier exegetes have acknowledged such a novel use of the verb; yet it is contextually supported. Some exegetes such as (al-Baghawi 1989, al-Wahidi 1994, al-Tabari 1997, al-Zamakhshari 1998, Al-Qurtubi 2003) among others have clearly interpreted it with the word *nikāḥ* (i.e. marriage) or *jimāʾ* (i.e. sexual intercourse) which are the most commonly used euphemisms for having sex. Moreover, al-ʿAlusī (n.d) and Ibn ʿĀshūr (1969) indicated that such a use of
the verb was a *kināyah* (i.e. euphemism) for having sex. Nonetheless, some exegetes have bluntly commented on the verse using words such as *'adbār* i.e. arse (Ibn-al-Jawzi 1984, al-Tabari 1997).

One more tool that can be used to support our findings is the words used by exegetes to comment on these verses. That is, when exegetes comment on a sensitive issue, some use evasive ways so that they do not violate the politeness principle established in the Islamic culture. In this example in particular, some exegetes have used some expressions such as *ghishyān* i.e. covering with the body (Ibn-Kathir 1999), *ʿtyān al-maʿṣiyah*, literally coming to the sin (al-Biqaʾi n.d) to explain the meaning. This further confirms that it is a euphemism at least at the time of exegesis. Based on the discussion above, we can argue that the lexical item (*yaʾtī*) was a euphemism that employed metonymy to achieve this rhetorical function.

**Example 15 (Q 29:28)**

- *Walūṭan ʿidh qāla liqawmihi ʾinnakum lataʾtūna lafāḥishata mā sabaqakum bihā min ʿaḥadin mina al-ʿālamīn*

**Contextual analysis:**

This verse deals with the story of the people of Lot as well. It affirms that this act has never been practiced before the people of Lot (al-Tabari 1997, al-Zamakhshari 1998, Ibn-Kathir 1999).

**Textual analysis:**

The word *fāḥishah* is derived from the verb *faḥash*. It refers to any extremely obscene act (al-Zamakhshari 1998, al-Baidhawi 1999). While al-Qurṭubī (2003) affirms that the word *fāḥishah* is commonly used for adultery, al-Rāzi (1981) claims that it can refer to both committing adultery and committing sodomy. The latter is considered more obscene because the only drive to committing it is lust;
and because it would never result in reproduction of mankind. However, it was used in this context to show how similar adultery and sodomy are. The second part of the verse clearly affirms the abominable sin of such a sexual misconduct that it never been practiced before the people of Lot. Drawing upon verses which deal with sensitive issues such as sex, the Qur’ān has in this instance used a dysphemism rather than a euphemism. This seems to have been done to show strong condemnation of the act besides directing the reader's attention towards focusing on the denotative meaning rather than the sensitive connotative one.

- Example 16 (Q 30:21)

- Wamin ʾāyātihi ʾan khalaqa lakum min ʾanfusikum ʿazwājan litaskunū ʿilayhā wajaʿala baynakum mawaddatan waraḥmah

Contextual analysis:

This verse comes amid a series of verses in which God signs are enumerated to indicate His omnipotence. The signs mentioned before this verse are: creating the plant from the seed, and the seed from the plant; bringing out the living from the dead and the dead from the living; giving life again to the earth after it is dead; and creating man from dust. The sign mentioned in this verse is creating one's mate from his or her own kind.

Textual analysis:

The potential euphemism in this verse is the word mawaddah. Literally, it carries the meanings of friendship, love, affection; amicability; amity and cordiality. In this verse, however, it conceals some other meanings. It is interpreted by some traditional scholars of exegesis as affection, love of the wife for her husband or vice versa (Al-Mawardi 1993, Ibn-Atiyyah 2002). Nonetheless, the majority have interpreted it as sexual intercourse (al-Razi 1981, al-Wahidi 1994, al-Zamakhshari 1998, al-Baidhawi 1999, Al-Qurtubi 2003). This word which adds an aesthetic value is used to account for a sensitive issue (i.e. sexual intercourse). It is an
example of semantic innovation where a hypernym is particularly used instead of a hyponym. There is a part for whole relationship between the word *mawaddah* and the whole marital relationship. Sexual intercourse which is a component of the marriage affair is not worded and no lexical links are present in the text. This makes it a euphemism which used generalization to communicate the euphemistic meaning.

- **Example 17 (Q 32:8) and Example 18 (Q 77:20)**

  - *Thumma ja'ala naslahu min sulālatin min māʾ in mahīn*

  - `alam nakluqkkum min māʾ in mahīn

**Contextual analysis:**

This verse comes along a number of verses that deal with the theme of God's creation and His eternal omnipotence. It starts with stating that Allah has perfected all creations and that He started the creation of mankind (i.e. Adam and Eve) from clay and then made Adam's offspring from semen of despised water.

**Textual analysis:**

The potential euphemistic expression in these two verses is the word *māʾ in mahīn* which literally translates as despised or mean water. The word *māʾ* could generally refer to water and also to fluids in general as in *māʾ ward*: rose water, and *māʾ al-'ayn*: tears. However, more than twenty five exegesis books have been consulted and there seems to be consensus among the scholars that it refers to the semen. They explain that *mahīn* means weak and delicate (al-Baghawi 1989, al-Tabari 1997, Al-Qurtubi 2003) or worthless or insignificant (al-Baidhawi 1999, al-Biqa'i n.d). This technique employed here is generalization by using a hypernym (i.e. water) to convey a meaning of a hyponym (i.e. sperm); climbing up the ladder of abstraction. The word *mahīn* further adds a dysphemistic effect to the structure.
- **Example 19: (Q 33:37)**

- *Falammā qada zaydun minhā waṭaran zawwajnākahā*

**Contextual analysis:**

The verse and the preceding verses deal with the story of Zayd b. Ḥāritha who had been a prisoner of war before the coming of Islam. He was purchased by Prophet Muhammed before his call to prophethood. He then freed and adopted him as his son. Zayd married Zaynab b. Jaḥsh and after sometime he decided to divorce her. The prophet advised him not to do so: retain your wife; but Zayd eventually divorced her and she married the prophet afterwards. The Qur’ān states that it was the commandment of Allah for the prophet to marry Zaynab (al-Suyuti and al-Mahalli 1987, Al-Mawardi 1993, al-Tabari 1997).

**Textual analysis:**

The potential euphemism in this verse is the word *waṭar* which literally means aim; desire ;end ;purpose, and wish (al-Firuzabadi 1884, Al-Jawhari 1990). The intended meaning in the Qur’ānic text in this verse is marital needs and desires (al-Shawkani 1994, al-Wahidi 1994, Ibn-Atiyyah 2002, Al-Qurtubi 2003) or divorce (Ibn-Kathir 1999, Al-Suyuti 2003, al-Biqa‘i n.d) which is a hyponym expressed using a hypernym (*i.e. waṭar*). Generalization by means of using the hypernym 'waṭar ' is used to euphemize for the sexual affair involved in the marriage. Furthermore, using 'waṭar ' in the indefinite form further lessens the effects of the undesired senses.

- **Example 20: (Q 54:37)**

- *Walaqad rāwadūhu ʿan ḍayfihi faṭamasnāʾaʿyunahum*

**Contextual analysis:**

This verse deals with the story of Prophet Lot when the angels came to punish his people who used to practice sodomy with strangers (Al-Mawardi 1993, Al-Qurtubi 2003) When his people heard that Lot had visitors, they came and
approached them perversely, but Gabriel effaced their eyes (al-Razi 1981, al-Baghawi 1989).

**Linguistic analysis:**

The potential euphemism here is the word *rāwada* which is derived from the generic root *rawd* meaning 'to want something' (Ibn-Manzur 1980). The morphological inflection *mufāʿalah* also denotes asking for something persistently (al-Andalusi 1993). The word *rāwad* has also been found in other sources to mean 'to do something intermittingly' as in the ḥadīth when the Prophet used to call his uncle Abu Talib for Islam persistently, and in the Ḥādīth ḥadīth (the night journey of Muhammed to heaven) when Moses was reported to say to Muhammed "By Allah, I had tried with the people of Israel persistently to do less than this but they disobeyed" (Ibn-Manzur 1980). The word had originally had general senses (i.e. conventional referent) but then acquired a new (i.e. novel) sense i.e. the euphemistic one. Based on the context and the exegetical opinions, the euphemistic meaning is the intended meaning here and the technique used is generalization.

- **Example 21: (Q 55:56)**
  
  - *Fīhinna qāširātu aṭṭarfi lam yatmith-hunna ‘insun qablahum walā jānn*

**Contextual analysis:**

Surat al-Raḥmān starts with displaying God's omnipotence and signs, and then shifts towards describing the judgment day and the punishment awaiting the sinners. Verses 46-78, however, expound upon the blessings and delights awaiting the pious in paradise. This verse in particular talks about the women of paradise telling that their eyes are restricted to their husbands, and that they are virgins that have never been deflowered by a human or a jinn (al-Tabari 1997, Ibn-Kathir 1999).

**Linguistic analysis:**
The potential euphemism here is *yaṭmith-hunna* which is the present verb of *ṭamatha*. The most common meaning of *ṭamath* in modern standard Arabic nowadays is 'menstrual period' and is used as a noun. However, it is used as a verb in the verse to mean 'to touch' according to traditional Arabic dictionaries (al-Firuzabadi 1884, Ibn-Faris 1969, Ibn-Manzur 1980, Al-Jawhari 1990). It is then a euphemism that employs the technique of metonymy to express the euphemistic meaning.

- **Example 22: (Q 70:39)**
  - *Kallā 'innā khalaqānāhum mimmā yaʿlamūn*

**Contextual analysis:**

Examples 22 deals with the theme of disbelievers and that they used to mock the Prophet's preaching and reciting of the Qurʾān. They denied the fact of resurrection day and therefore this verse comes to show them that 'He who started them from a sperm drop could bring them back from death (al-Razi 1981, al-Zamakhshari 1998, al-Alusi n.d).

**Linguistic analysis:**

The potential euphemism in example 18 is the phrase which translates as 'what they already know'. Exegetes have consensually agreed that the intended meaning of the phrase is that they were created from an insignificant sperm drop (al-Nasafi 1980, al-Baghawi 1989, al-Baidhawi 1999, Ibn-Atiyyah 2002, Al-Qurtubi 2003, al-Alusi n.d). In this example, the Qurʾān employs insinuation to avoid mentioning the word 'sperm' which would evoke embarrassment. For one to understand the intended meaning of this euphemistic expression, the whole process of creation needs to be mentally represented. In other words, one needs to consider the components of creation process starting from sexual intercourse with other sub-components such as insemination of the ovum by the sperm.
Conclusion:

In the analysis sections above, 22 Qurʾānic sex-related examples are analyzed both contextually and linguistically. The contextual analysis is based on traditional exegesis, while the linguistic analysis is mainly drawn from traditional Arabic dictionaries and the euphemism innovation model proposed by Warren (1992). The analysis proves that the Qurʾān uses semantic innovation for euphemism formation and not the formal innovation techniques as proposed by Warren (1992). It can be concluded, however, that the Qurʾān uses semantic innovations throughout Qurʾānic discourse to carry out the function of decorum in Qurʾānic discourse (Abdul-Raof 2001). We can add then two more stylistic sub-categories into the semantic innovation category: insinuation where the euphemistic expression may only be understood through the contextual clues; and dysphemism where a word with dysphemistic senses is used to cover the taboo or the sensitive senses i.e. euphemistic purpose.

It has also been found that Muslim exegetes follow similar euphemistic styles in their commentaries on sex-related themes in their Qurʾān exegesis. They use evasive ways and broader terms to avoid direct mention of sex-related words. This should be taken into consideration by researchers in this sensitive area as some exegetical commentaries may not be as expressive.
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Translation and the Quest for Meaning: Adūnīs and Yūsuf al-Khāl’s Translation of T. S. Eliot’s The Waste Land

Imed Nsiri

Introduction

It is common knowledge to state the centrality of translation in the modernist project be it in English or Arabic. The translation act itself, especially when performed by a poet, is an instance of the poet’s liminality as he puts himself in betwixt and between. The English poet T.S. Eliot’s The Waste Land is itself a liminal and the energy engendered by that liminality is a central aspect of the power of the text. The end-product is a liminal text that shares so much of the original text. It is revealing that the first task that the reader of The Waste Land must come to terms with is a multi-tongued European text: the epigraph, in Latin; the dedication, “for Ezra Pound,” in English; and the allusion, il miglior fabbro, in Italian. With the publication of Facsimile (Eliot 1971c) it became clear how Ezra Pound’s “Cesarean operation,” had changed the poem.

This article examines some Arabic translations of T.S. Eliot’s The Waste Land with special reference to Adūnīs (Alī Aḥmad Saʿīd) and Yūsuf al-Khāl’s al-ʻArḍ al-ḥarāb (1958). Translation requires a close reading of an original text; however, in the case of Adūnīs’s and al-Khāl’s (1958) al-ʻArḍ al-ḥarāb, I found that the translation is the offspring not of one original text, but of an original and a translation, which are Eliot’s The Waste Land (1922) and its earliest French translation by Pierre Leyris (1983/1947). The reason for Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) inclusion of and reliance on the French version may be attributed to the fact that, at the time of the translation, Adūnīs’ English was limited—it was, at most, at the intermediate level. The article shall discuss this multiplicity in the recreation of the text viz-a-viz the decisions that Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) made
to agree or disagree with Leyris’ (1983) choices. I shall also use other translations of *The Waste Land*, such as those by ‘Awaḍ (1968), Lu’lu’ah (1980), and Saqqāl (1996) in order: i) to show the other possibilities that Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) had in rendering the text into Arabic and, ii) to underscore the point that the choices that they made shed light not only on their activity as translators, but also on the nature of their artistry as poets.

Drawing on translation theories and the poetics of translation, the article will have a twofold focus: to trace Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) understanding of a key poem in the development of modern Arabic poetry and their aesthetic principles as they emerge in their decisions, to use Venuti’s (1994) terms, to “domesticate” or “foreignize” their translation (p. 20). I will demonstrate how, despite the mistakes that the two poets made, their translation is sound and holds an important place in the history of Arabic literature inasmuch as, on the poetic level, it communicates the essence of the original poem. I conclude that there is ample room for many more translations.

**Influence of Eliot and *The Wasteland* on English and Arabic Literatures**

Before delving into the issue of the translated texts, I would to note here the influence of the English poet and essayist T. S. Eliot and his *The Waste Land*. *The Waste Land* is considered by most critics as one of Eliot’s masterpieces, if not the masterpiece on which Eliot’s fame rests (Brooker & Bentley, 1990, p. 3). Eliot and his poem under consideration were also celebrated by Arab writers and critics of the twentieth century. For instance, noting the centrality of Eliot and *The Wasteland* to modern Arabic poetry, Jabrā (1971) writes: “T.S. Eliot influenced many Arab authors [...] But most important of all was *The Wasteland* which, regardless of how it was understood, seemed to provide the key to the new movement in Arabic poetry” (pp. 82-83). According to Moreh (1976), Eliot’s influence on Arabic poetry “almost cut it entirely from
its roots. Eliot’s work changed the form and technique of Arabic poetry—as well as its content—to an extent that has no precedent in the whole history of Arabic poetry” (p. 216).

**Arabic Critiques and Translations of *The Waste Land***

If *The Waste Land* has exerted such an influence in English and Arabic it is because it is what I call a ‘liminal text’ that touches the heart of modernist sensitivity and anxiety. As such, it warrants a multiplicity of readings; for the poem has generated a large number of interpretations. *The Waste Land* is said to reflect both the impersonal and the personal aspects of Eliot’s poetry (Canary, 1982, pp. 1-11). No matter, for example, how sound is the personal/autobiographical treatment of the poem, the appeal of the disintegrated reality and the now “traditional” interpretation still retains its validity. My point is that any interpretation of *The Waste Land* is not to be discarded but rather can help in further understanding the poem. Though I read the poem as the treatment of poetic creation, I do not discredit any other interpretation for I see the poem as a celebration of multiplicity and disclosure.

Below are examples of the translations of the poem which I will be discussing.

Eliot’s original text:

```
I sat upon the shore
Fishing, with the arid plain behind me
Shall I at least set my lands in order?
London Bridge is falling down falling down falling down
Poi s'ascose nel foco che gli affina
Quando fiam uti chelidon—O swallow swallow
Le Prince d'Aquitaine à la tour abolie
These fragments I have shored against my ruins
```
Why then Ile fit you. Hieronymo's mad again.

Shantith shantith shantith

Lerys’s translation:

Je pêchais sur la rive
Et derriere moi se déroulait la plaine aride
Mettrais-je au moins de l’ordre dans mes terres?
London Bridge is falling down falling down falling down
Poi s'ascose nel foco che gli affina
Quando fiam uti chelidon… Aronde Aronde
Le Prince d'Aquitaine à la tour abolie
Je veux de ces fragments étayer mes ruines
Why then Ile fit you. Hieronymo's mad again.

Shantith shantith shantith

Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation:

جلست على الشاطئ
اصطاد ، والسهل الفاحل ورأتي
ترى ، أضبط على الفاحل يدي ؟
حصر لندن ينهار ينهار ينهار
poi s’ accose nel faco che gli affina
أه إبلع إبلع Quando fiam uti chelidon
Le Prince d’ Aquitaine à la tour abolie

هذه الشذرات أقامتها سداً في وجه القاضي
لماذا ، اذن ، لا تتناسب معك . هيرونيمو غاضب أ
داتا . دياد همام . ديميتا .
شانتيه شانتيه شانتيه

'Awad’s translation:

على الشاطئ جلست
أسطاد السمك ، من ورائي السهل الفقير
أرتب أعمالك على الأقل ، قبل الرحيل ؟
جسر لندن يهوي ، جسر لندن يهوي
ثم توارى في النار التي طهرتم .
باعصفور الجنة ، يا عصفور الجنة ؟
امير الكوتين في البرج المحطم
هذه الكسر جمعتها إنا حطامي
إذن انت وأنا صنوان .
ها قد عاد ((( هيرونيمو )) إلى الجنوب ،
أعطت (أعطت) : سيطر
سلام . سلام . سلام

Lu’lu’ah’s (1980) translation:

جلست على الساحل
أصطاد ، والسهل الفاحل خلفي
أما يتوجب علي في الأقل ترتيب شؤوني ؟
( جسر لندن ) يتهاوى يتهاوى يتهاوى
According to Lu’lu’ah (1980), four translations were produced before his own and that what made him decide to translate the poem again was his dissatisfaction with the previous translations (p. 5). Saqqāl (1996), too, expresses his discontent with the previous translations, though he finds very few problems with Lu’lu’ah’s (1980), except his use of standard (fuṣḥā) versus dialectical Arabic (a topic I will discuss later). As a matter of fact, Saqqāl (1996, pp. 105-112) virtually paraphrases Lu’lu’ah’s (1980) criticism of the previous translations. They both discuss how Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation of The Waste Land is teeming with misunderstandings of the source text.

I posit that the belated translator does not necessarily have to be dissatisfied with previous translations or seek to belittle them in order to justify his own attempt. This is in aligning myself with other critics such as J. Barth (1982) when he notes “that literature can never be exhausted, if only because no single literary text can ever be exhausted” (p. 38). Any translation, like any reading, no matter how good it is, can never capture all aspects of a literary text; hence, the necessity for a multiplicity of translations/readings.

The first point of criticism leveled at Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation by Lu’lu’ah (1980) is the omission of Eliot’s preface which, he rightly argues, is important for the poem and hence should have been included (Lu’lu’ah, 1980, p. 66).
Eliot’s original text:

Nam Sibyllam quidem Cumis ego ipse oculis meis vidi in ampulla pendere, et cum illi puerci dicerent:
Σίβυλλα τί θέλεις; respondebat illa: ἀποθανεῖν θέλω.

Yes, and I myself with my own eyes even saw the Sibyl hanging in a cage; and when the boys cried at her: “Sibyl, Sibyl, What do you want?”
“’I would that I were dead,’ she caused to answer (Southam, 1994, p. 133).

Leyris’s (1983) translation:

Nam Sibyllam quidem Cumis ego ipse oculis meis vidi in ampulla pendere, et cum illi puerci dicerent:
Σίβυλλα τί θέλεις; respondebat illa: ἀποθανεῖν θέλω.

The above example shows different understandings in the importance of the preface. While Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) as well as 'Awaḍ chose to omit the preface, Lu’lu’ah (1980) translated it into Arabic and Leyris (1983) kept it as is in the original text. Leyris (1983) and Lu’lu’ah (1980) seem to have understood the role the preface and the dedication play in shaping the meaning of the poem. Kenner (1959), among many other critics, believes that the preface is central to the understanding of The Waste Land; thus, its exclusion is a major deficiency of Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation. Another shortcoming in their translation that Lu’lu’ah (1980) points out relates to the notes (Lu’lu’ah, 1980, pp. 66-67). Both the notes and the preface are an integral part of the text and have always been published with the poem. Eliot himself jokes about the fact that the notes
have almost become more popular than the poem itself (Eliot, 1975, p. 117). His notes on the poem became a bibliographical list of what an educated person after 1922 should know: from Frazer’s The Golden Bough to Weston’s From Ritual to Romance. “English courses,” writes Pettingell (2000), “became guidebooks to the writers quoted in The Waste Land” (p. 45). On the Arabic side, Jabra thinks, for instance, that the notes are so important that he translated into Arabic the three parts of The Golden Bough that Eliot said were crucial for understanding the poem (83). Other translation problems that Lu’lu’ah (1980) mentions are the translation of lines 99-100:

Eliot’s original text:

The change of Philomel, by the barbarous king
   So rudely forced; yet there the nightingale
   Filled all the desert with inviolable voice

Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation:

تحول فيلوميل المفروض بفسوء
من الملك البربري ؛ مع ذلك فهناك العندليب
ماّ الصحراء بصوت محرم

This is an important image of the poem: the metamorphosis of Philomel. The barbarous king Tereu rapes her and cuts out her tongue to prevent her from telling on him to her sister and his wife. She turns into a nightingale to sing her story with inviolable voice. This image of rape, violation, and suffering that is transformed into art is a key concept in the poem. Although I agree with Lu’lu’ah
(1980) that as poets themselves Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) did not reproduce some aspects of the scene, the overall image of the transformation of Philomel is still there.

Also, the same aspect of transformation can be seen in the resurrection of Christ, as mentioned in Part V of the poem, which links the archetypal image of suffering and death to rebirth and the transformation of the land and the people. Another version of it is the scene of the typist and the clerk.

“The time is now propitious, as he guesses, / […] Flushed and decided, he assaults at once.” So, there is not much loss there.

Nevertheless, Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) made a serious mistake in reading the reference to Philomel at the end of Part V of the poem, line 429:

Eliot: quando fiam uti chellidon – O swallow swallow


In the above line, “swallow” does not refer to the verb “to swallow”, as shown Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) rendering, but rather to the bird. Although some differences in translations can be attributed to differences in taste and interpretation, there are also clear-cut cases of mistaken interpretation of the text, and the above example is clearly a case of a misreading of the original text. This misreading could also give us an idea about the collaboration between Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958). It is well known that at the time of the translation Adūnīs did not know English or at least not enough to translate The Waste Land. Rather than translate from the original text, Adūnīs, I believe, relied on Leyris’ (1983) translation as his source text. It seems to me that Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958)
divided the task of the translation, with Adūnīs taking the first part and al-Khāl
the latter, for the French text leaves no room for any misunderstanding as is
obvious in the above quote. Thus, while Adūnīs used the French text for his
translation of the first part of the poem, al-Khāl used the original English text for
his translation of the second part of the poem.
Another example “of serious misunderstanding of the source text,”
according to Lu’lu’ah (1980), is turning the frustrated woman in line 132 of
“A Game of Chess” into a man (Lu’lu’ah, 1980, p. 67).
‘What shall I do now? What shall I do?
‘I shall rush out as I am, and walk the street
‘With my hair down, so. What shall we do tomorrow?
‘What shall we ever do?

Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958):

"ماذا سأفعل الآن ؟ ماذا سأفعل ؟
سأندفع خارجاً كما انا ، واسير في الشارع
مسدل الشعر ، هكذا . ماذا سنفعل غداً ؟
ماذا سنفعل ابداً ؟"

Although the third line in this excerpt makes it probable that the speaker is
a woman, reading the line as said by a man is not totally out of line with
some interpretations of *The Waste Land*.
As a matter of fact, around the time of Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958)
translation, there were many speculations about the possible
autobiographical element in the poem, especially with reference to Eliot’s
sexuality. A letter to Aiken in 1916 (Eliot, 1988, p. 125) shows that Eliot
considered the death of his friend Verdenal and his wife Vivienne’s health
and financial problems among the reasons why he could not produce much. This letter has given some power to the Verdenal hypothesis, which Peter (1990) developed in his essay, “A New Interpretation of The Waste Land,” which interprets the poem as some sort of elegy for Eliot’s friend Verdenal who died during WWI and to whom Eliot dedicated Prufrock and Other Observations and Poems 1920 (as cited in Moody, 1979, p. 330).

There is another significant aspect of The Waste Land in which Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation differs from those of Lu’lu’ah (1980), Saqqāl (1996), and ‘Awaḍ. The poem is brimming with excerpts in many different languages: Latin, Greek, German, French, Italian, and even Sanskrit. While Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) decided to keep those excerpts in their original languages, Lu’lu’ah (1980), Saqqāl (1996), and ‘Awaḍ translated them all into Arabic. Lu’lu’ah (1980) sees it as a deficiency on the part of Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) not to have translated those excerpts (Lu’lu’ah, 1980, p. 66). However, I believe that Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) decision, consciously or unconsciously, is exemplary of the way they treated an important aspect of the poem that goes to the core of what the source language text seeks to communicate. This aspect has to do with the voices in the poem. There are many levels of understanding in a work of art; and, especially in poetry, the literal level does not necessarily have a better claim to being represented than the myriad of the other levels especially in a liminal text like The Waste Land.

In this regard, we should note that “The Waste Land” as a title was an afterthought, as the original title of the poem was “He Do the Police in Different Voices” (Bedient, 1986, p. 1). Rather than look for one sole protagonist or a center to the poem, Eliot was investigating the multiplicity of voices in the work. One of the mistakes committed by most critics, as Davidson (1985) argues, is to look for or supply a protagonist or a center to a centerless poem. For her, the absence of one center is the main theme of The Waste Land (2-3) just as it is an important technique of the poem.
As *The Waste Land* is a celebration of voices, it is hard to give eminence to one voice over another. From Marie, the Son of man, Stetson, the quester, Sosostris, the Hyacinth couple and Tristan and Isolde, to name but a few voices from the first part, none of them can claim to be “a center around which the other details can be organized” (H. J. Miller, 1982, p. 59). Furthermore, Brooker and Bentley (1990) study this aspect of the multiplicity of voices and they convincingly argue for it, especially for what they call “the contingency of language” as a theme in the poem (p. 6). This notion of multiple voices and multiple interpretations is clear, for example, in the reference to the wisdom of the thunder god and the multiple meaning to one single utterance: “Da.”

Another example of this multiplicity is the reference to Sibyl’s way of giving her wisdom: she would send her divination to the seekers of her wisdom in scattered leaves and the meaning would depend on how they would assemble the leaves and interpret the message. Kenner (1959) believes that in this respect Eliot is the Sibyl of the twentieth century, for *The Waste Land* seems to reiterate such a practice. This goes hand in hand with Eliot addressing the reader as a partner in the making of the meaning of the poem, “mon semblable, mon frère” (Kenner, 1959, p. 159). The emphasis here is on the multiplicity of voices and the quest, and the excerpts in their original languages are an integral part of that aspect. This can easily be illustrated with a quote from the very end of the poem (lines 425-30):

> Shall I at least set my lands in order?
> London Bridge is falling down falling down falling down
> Poi s’ascose nel foco che gli affina
> Quandp fiam uti chelidon- O swallow swallow
> Le Prince d’ Aquitaine à la tour abolie
> These fragments I have shored against my ruins
When the non-English excerpts are translated into Arabic, as in Lu’lu’ah’s (1980) translation, the text is more understandable, but the effect of multiplicity is lost. The sense of loss or being lost that the original reader experiences is lost. The search for meaning that the English reader goes through is denied the Arab reader. It is not the task of the translator to deny their reader an active participation in the above-declared partnership (“mon semblable, mon frère”) between the author and the reader.

It is in this light that I argue in support of the decision of Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) not to translate those quotes but rather to leave them in their original language. The only power of the writer, R. Barthes (1994) contends, “is to mix writings” (p. 224). This is the same idea Eliot (1953) advances in “Tradition and the Individual Talent.” This aspect of the poet as a bricoleur, “amalgamating disparate experience” (Eliot, 1975, p. 117), is what comes through those excerpts in their original language. It is also an important aspect of the historical sense and of Eliot’s belief in the European mind as an important component of his notion of tradition. The historical sense, says Eliot (1953), “compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe [...] has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order” (p. 23). This notion of a European literature is so woven in “the pattern in the carpet,” Schneider’s (1975) title-phrase, that without this European color the whole piece would have looked pale.

Admittedly, the first task that the reader of The Waste Land must come to terms with is a multi-tongued European text: the epigraph, in Latin; the dedication, “for Ezra Pound,” in English; and the allusion, il miglior fabbro, in Italian. In “The Burial of the Dead,” Marie does not want to be considered Russian and prefers to speak German to confirm her origin. The hyacinth-garden scene is set between the first and the final acts of Wagner’s opera Tristan und Isolde. The hyacinth couple and Tristan and Isolde are then fused and the German sub-text, the entire
story behind the opera, is thus vividly incorporated into the poem, enhancing the feeling of loss and desolation in different voices and different worlds:

_Frisch weht der Wind_
_Der Heimat zu.
_Mein Irisch Kind,
_Wo weilest du?_

'You gave me hyacinths first a year ago;
'They called me the hyacinth girl.'
—Yet when we came back, late, from the Hyacinth garden,
Your arms full, and your hair wet, I could not
Speak, and my eyes failed, I was neither
Living nor dead, and I knew nothing,
Looking into the heart of light, the silence.
_Od' und leer das Meer._

Likewise, the _Inferno_ of Dante is projected onto and it as well parallels the London scene, giving it the hell-like mood needed for the understanding of _The Waste Land_ (Bedient, 1986, p. 64). Blended with Baudelaire’s “unreal city” and the allusion to “Fourmillante cité, cité pleine de rêves / Où le spectre en plein jour raccroche le passant” (Eliot, 1971b, p. 51), the whole passage gains much in meaning and significance through the simple technique of amalgamating different voices. Thus, the dilemma sweeps out of its locality towards a much more universal implication that yokes together Dante’s, Baudelaire’s, and Eliot’s time. This multiplicity of tongues goes hand in hand with the multiplicity of the unreal cities. Towards the end of the poem, reference to Hieronymo (from Kyd’s _Spanish Tragedy_) points to his way of creation to emphasize that of Eliot (lines 431-32).
These fragments I have shored against my ruins
Why then Ile fit you. Hieronymo's mad againe.

The last line here is a self-reflexive cue to Eliot’s technique. Hieronymo was not mad, but was fusing a muddle of languages for his own purpose (revenge), a practice Eliot repeats.

The historical sense that Eliot tries so hard to express is achieved through this juxtaposition of past and present experiences, which serves to highlight the differences and similarities, not to refer to a clear-cut good and bad, but to fuse and confuse perspectives so as to allow as many points of view as possible. The juxtaposition of different languages, numerous voices, and disparate experiences is an aspect of Eliot’s “raid on the inarticulate” (Eliot, 1971b, p. 128).

By subjugating all those voices into a mono-tone voice, both Saqqāl (1996) and Lu’lu’ah (1980) failed to communicate that multiplicity of voices and experiences and limited the universality of the dilemma of the protagonists of The Waste Land. By doing so, they both have deprived the poem of what makes it a modernist text, which represents the quest for meaning and the feeling of loss in this modern, chaotic world that Eliot calls “the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history,” (Eliot, 1975, p. 177). Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958), however, like Leyris (1983/1947), produced a translated version of The Waste Land that poetically communicates an almost equivalent effect in the target language and this is partly due to their effort not to “domesticate,” but rather to “foreignize” their translation (Venuti, 1994, p. 20).

Lu’lu’ah (1980) admits that “Eliot himself had put [the excerpts] in this form, and that they became a part of the poem. But the average English reader raised this very issue in their first rejections of the poem when it was published in 1922” (Lu’lu’ah, 1980, p. 66, emphasis mine). Lu’lu’ah (1980) is right when he says “first rejection,” but Eliot refused to change the poem. Time has proven that Eliot was right, and the poem and the foreign excerpts are no longer rejected. Adūnīs
and al-Khāl’s (1958) decision to keep some of the foreign words is supported by the fact that Eliot approved of Leyris’ (1983) retaining the original languages of the excerpts; “such approval, with its implication of shared aesthetic values, suggests that Eliot himself saw his poem as aesthetically realized in French” (Hooker, 1983, p. 11). E. G. Miller (1996) notes that the hindrance to “accomplishing an excellent translation, i.e., the recreation of the multiple facets of any text, may either be regarded by the translator as unimportant, or he/she simply may not possess the scholarly knowledge or the prerequisite creative skills for a translation to approach the original text in its complexity” (p. 10). While Lu’lu’ah (1980) possesses the scholarly skills, he has deemed the inclusion of the foreign excerpts in the poem unimportant not crucial for his audience. But some translation studies scholars would disagree. For instance, Shakir and Farghal (1994) observe that:

For the translator, the consideration of the TL [target language] audience emanates from his awareness that the TL reader/recipient is not a passive target. Viewing the TL recipient as a passive target is, in fact, an oversimplification of both the translating and the reading process[es]. (p. 78)

Nevertheless, Lu’lu’ah’s (1980) decision, like Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958), is grounded in its own time and addressed to its own audience. While Lu’lu’ah’s (1980) translation was produced in 1980, arguably for students and scholars of Arabic literature, Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation was published in Majallat shiʿr, an avant-gardist magazine that was seeking to change the aesthetics of Arabic poetry. When I asked Adūnīs—in an interview conducted with him in December 1999—about the circumstances under which they undertook the translation, he replied:
It was within the translation movement to learn about the Western experiments, especially the English language ones. For there was little knowledge about it in Lebanon [...] It was a type of discovering and uncovering; letting the Arab poets know about the great [Western] poetics, especially uncovering a poetics that is in a way, far from the duality of the Arabic poetics (translation mine).

There is, thus, a difference in the purpose of the translations, and Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958), despite its mistakes, was meant for a specific audience. I believe that it successfully accomplished what it set out to do when one studies the influence of the translation/original on the Arab poets of the time. When I asked Adūnīs about the influence of translating the poem, he said:

It is a poem that has a history. And it was crucial in the poetic language of that time and it is not possible for it not to influence whoever translates it. But how? We do not know. It is hard to determine that. However, it influenced the Arabic poetic experience.

Shaheen (1990), however, more affirmatively acknowledges the influence of Eliot and The Waste Land on modern Arabic poetry:

demonstrated from the poetry published in [the Spring issue of] *Shi’r* (poetry), a journal devoted to the new movement in Arabic poetry. (p. 154)

Moreover, Zeidan (1979) states that, starting from his collection of 1961, “[Adūnīs’] poetry became a mixture of mysticism and surrealism. His voice became less direct by adopting the masks and personae of historical figures’ (p. 85). The mixture of voices/masks that are not direct is an important development in Arabic poetry, and it is interesting that this comes in 1961.

The proliferation of masks, personas, and mixing of voices and the indirect way of the poetic language is an important aspect of fragmentation both as a technique and as a reality. This fragmentation is central to both English and Arab modernist poetics and poses a stark contrast to traditional Arabic poetry. “Until the 1950’s,” says Jabrā (1971) “nothing could be more unlike Arabic poetry than *The Waste Land*: the endless juxtapositions, the sudden jumps, the parodies, the quotations […] the use of different languages […] all previously unknown in Arabic poetry” (p. 84). It is, specifically, this aspect that Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation communicates, that is, the insistence on fighting the urge to domesticate the English text that kept the inspirational power and the obstinacy of the original poem. The chaos and the disjointedness that their translation expresses and that Saqqāl (1996) and Lu’lu’ah (1980) call confusion is, according to Eliot himself, at the “heart of the light” of the poem, and those foreign excerpts with the English allusions are objective correlative to the central line in the poem, as he declares: “These fragments I have shored against my ruins,” which makes him to ask: “shall I at least set my land in order.”

It is interesting that the original text of *The Waste Land* is the end product of collaboration between Eliot and Pound; what is even more fascinating is that some of the translations—the aesthetically successful ones from the point of view of this article—are the result of the collaboration between more than one individual or voice. For his French translation, Leyris (1983) worked with John Hayward (and to a certain extent with Eliot) and for the Arabic one, Adūnīs and al-Khāl
(1958) acted as a team (with the French translation supplying an additional voice). Furthermore, Eliot was under the influence of the French symbolist movement; as a matter of fact, “Death by Water,” the part V of *The Waste Land*, was originally “Dans le Restaurant,” a poem Eliot wrote in French and then reworked it to become the basis for an important part of *The Waste Land*. It is equally telling that at the time of the translation, Adūnīs himself admits—during my interview with him—that he was “more inclined towards the French style of poetics and it is possible, also, that [he] included, inadvertently, the language of the French poetics in the translation. [He] was engulfed to a great extent by the sensitivity of the French poetics.” All these coincidences, I believe, have contributed to a better aesthetical understanding, translation, and reproduction of the poem.

If Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) were influenced by the translation of Leyris (1983), they also made different decisions when they saw fit. Whereas Leyris (1983) kept all of the non-English excerpts in their original tongues, Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) decided against keeping some of the intertextual allusions in their original English language. We see this, for example, in line number 125: “These are pearls that were his eyes,” which Leyris (1983) kept as is in the original English, while Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) chose to translate it.

Another important difference between Leyris’s translation and that of Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) is the pub scene. While Leyris (1983) was true to Eliot’s technique of juxtaposing the difference of the speeches and voices of Lil and her friend with those of the aristocratic lady of the previous scene to universalize the dilemma of their similar fate, Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) chose to deprive the former of their common (Cockney) speech and blend them with the latter. Whereas Leyris (1983) chose to preserve the contrast in class-based linguistic registers (Cockney vs. aristocratic), in Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation the two passages exhibit a shared *fuṣḥā* Arabic. In this aspect, Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958) are like ‘Awāḍ, Lu’lu’ah (1980), and Saqqāl (1996), in failing to reproduce Eliot’s technique.
Lu’lu’ah (1980) and Saqqāl (1996) seem to agree and somehow not to agree on the use of the ʿāmmiyya, the dialectical Arabic instead of the fuṣḥā, Standard Arabic. Lu’lu’ah (1980) criticizes Lūwīs’ Awaḍ (1968) at length for using “a lot of words from the Egyptian dialect” (Lu’lu’ah, 1980); nevertheless, Awaḍ did not use the Egyptian dialect for the pub scene. Yet, the only major fault—unconvincing, though, as I argue below—that Saqqāl (1996) finds with Lu’lu’ah’s (1980) translation is that the latter uses ʿāmmiyya “in his attempt at translating the common speech that Eliot made on behalf of Lil and her friend in the bar” (Saqqāl, 1996, p. 112).

Eliot’s original text:

When Lil's husband got demobbed, I said -
I didn't mince my words, I said to her myself,
HURRY UP PLEASE IT'S TIME
Now Albert's coming back, make yourself a bit smart.
He'll want to know what you done with that money he gave you
To get herself some teeth. He did, I was there.
You have them all out, Lil, and get a nice set,
He said, I swear, I can't bear to look at you.
And no more can't I, I said, and think of poor Albert,
He's been in the army for four years, he wants a good time,
And if you don't give it him, there's others will, I said.
Oh is there, she said. Something o' that, I said.
Then I'll know who to thank, she said, and give me a straight look.
HURRY UP PLEASE IT'S TIME
If you don't like it you can get on with it, I said.
Others can pick and choose if you can't.
But if Albert makes off, it won't be for a lack of telling.
You ought to be ashamed, I said, to look so antique
(And her only thirty-one.)

I can't help it, she said, pulling a long face,
It's them pills I took, to bring it off, she said.
(She's had five already, and nearly died of young George.)
The chemist said it would be all right, but I've never been the same.
You are a proper fool, I said.

Well, if Albert won't leave you alone, there it is, I said,
What you get married for if you don't want children?

HURRY UP PLEASE IT'S TIME

Well, that Sunday Albert was home, they had a hot gammon,
And they asked me in to dinner, to get the beauty of it hot -

HURRY UP PLEASE IT'S TIME

Ta ta. Goonight. Goonight.

Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation:

حين أدرك زوج ليل الجمهور، قلت
لم أُغمِّغِ كلماتي، قلت لها بثوقني
أسرعوا أرجوكم حان الوقت

الآن ألبرت راجع، خليك فطنة قليلا.
يريدان يعرف ماذا فعلت بالمال الذي أعطاك إياه
لتشتري لك أسنانًا. أعطاك، كنت هناك.
انزعها كلها، بالليل، واستبدوها بأخرى جميلة،
قال، اقسم، لا أطقي النظر عليك.
ولا أنا، قلت، وفكري بالمسلتين ألبرت.
بقي في الجيش أربع سنوات، يريد وقتًا طيبًا،
واد لم تمنحه اياه، فهنالك آخريات يفعلن، قلت
إذن سأعرف من اشكر، قالت، وتطبع بي جيدًا؟

أسرعوا أرجوكم حان الوقت

إذا لم تعحبك لا ضير عليك، قلت.

آخرون يقدردون ان يختاروا، ان كنت لا تقدرين.
ولكن إذا ما تقرب ألبرت، فليس عن جهل بالأمر
يجب أن تتخلي، قلت، من ظهورك هكذا هرمه
(ومعمرها فقط إحدى وثلاثون)

ماذا يحكم أن افعل، قالت، وعلى وجهها أمارة الغضب
إذا الغافقين التي استعملتها، لأوقف ما بي، قالت.
(عندها خمسة وكادت تموت بجورج، آخرهم)
الصيدلي قال لا بأس، لكنني لم أعد كما كنت.
با لكي من معهودة، قلت،
حسناً إذا ما تركك ألبرت وشانك
فما تفعلين، قلت؟
ام تزوجت ان كنت ما تريدين أطفالًا؟

أسرعوا أرجوكم حان الوقت

هذا الأحد كان ألبرت في البيت وكان يلعبون الورق
أسرعوا أرجوكم حان الوقت
أسرعوا ارجوكم حان الوقت

تصبح علي خير يا بابا، تصبح علي خير يا بابا.

تصبحون علي خير يا بابا. تصبحون علي خير.

ثانيا. تصبحون علي خير. تصبحون علي خير.

 حين سرح زوج ((ليل)) من الجنود، قلت،

ومأخفف كلماتي، قلت لها نفسها:

هيا عجلني فالوقت أزف،

أما الآن ((ويلبرت)) عائدة، فأنا في فلسط.

فسيحب أن يعرف ماذا فعلت بما أعطاك من مال

لتشتري به طقم أسنان. نعم أعطاك، فقد كنت معكما.

قال: اخلعها كلها يا ((ليل)) واشترى طقمًا جميلًا،

فلست أطيق النظر اليك يا ((ليل))، هكذا قال.

وقلت: وأنا أيضا لا أطيق، فكلك في ((ويلبرت)) المستثنى،

إنها قضى في الجيش أربع سنوات، وهو ينتظر وقتًا طيبًا،

فان لم تعطيه يا، فهناك غيرك يعطيه، هكذا قلت.

قالت: أهناك غيري حقًا؟ قلت: تقريباً.

قالت: إذن سأعرف من صاحبة الفضل ونظرت إليه شدراً.

هيا عجلني فالوقت أزف.

قلت أن لم يرق لك الأمر ففي استطاعتك احتماله.

‘Awaḍ’s translation:
إن كنت لا تعنين الانتقاء، فغيرك يعرف.
ولكن إذا هجرت آلت، فإن يكون ذلك لقلة الوضاءة.
قلت: ينبغي أن تخللي من منظرك العتيق
(وهي في الثلاثية والثلاثين لا أكثر)
قالت، وهي تطم وجهها: لا حيلة لي في هذا;
اما الحبوب التي أخذتها لا أحبها، هكذا قالت.
(هي أنجبت قبلها خمسا، وكانت تموت يوم جورج الصغير)
الصيدلي قال إن كل شيء سيكون على ما يرام،
ولكني لم أعد بعدها كما كنت ابدا.
قلت: أنت حمقاء مائعة في المائة.
قلت: إذا لم تتركك (آلت)، وشأنا، لم يبق إلا أن ترضحي،
ثم كيف تزوجت إذا كنت لا تزيدين الأطفال؟
هيا عجل، فالوقت أزم.
هيا عجل، فالوقت أزم.
طابت ليلتك يا (بيل)، طابت ليلتك يا (لو)، طابت ليلتك يا (ماي).
طابت ليلتك.
شكرا. شكرًا. طابت لينكن، طابت لينكن.

Lu’lu’ah’s (1980) translation:
لما سرحوا زوج (ليل) قلت لها-
وما اختلفت كلماتي، قلت لها بنفسي
أسرعوا رجاء انتهى الوقت

لآن (ألبرت) راجع، حسني حالك حبي.
حتى يريد أن يعرف الذي عملتيه بالفلوس التي أعطاك اياها
حتى تعمل ليك بما أناスペ. أعطاك، كنت حاضرة.
أفلعهم كلمهم يا (ليل) واعملي ضفة طفيفة،
قال اقسمي أنني لا تحمل النظر البار.
ولا أنا اتحمل، قلت، وذكرت (ألبرت) المسكن
كان في الجيش أربع سنين، ويبرد أن نتسلي
وإذا أنت لا تتسلي، هناك غيرك على استعداد، قلت
صحيح؟ قالت. يعني، قلت.
إذن سأعرف من أشكر، قالت، وحملت بوجهي.
أسرعو رجاء انتهى الوقت

إذا ما أعجبك الحال استمري على هذا المنوال قلت
غيرك يقدر أن ينسخ ويختار إذا أنت لا تقدر.
ولكن إذا أفلت منك (ألبرت) لن يكون السبب من قلة التعلي.
يجب أن تظهر، قلت، من هذا المنظر البار.
(وهي ما عبرت الواحدة والثلاثين)
ما بيدى حيلة، قالت، ومطت وجهها.
هذي الحبوب التي اخذتها، حتى انزله، قالت.
صار عندها خمسة، وكادت تموت مع الأصغر (حورج)
The difference between Saqqāl (1996) and Lu’lu’ah (1980) is that, while Saqqāl (1996) categorically refuses any use of the dialect, Lu’lu’ah is more lenient towards its use in the dialogue. Lu’lu’ah (1980) believes that the technique of using the common speech in the pub is an important aspect of the poem that should be reflected in the translation. His solution, however, was to devise an artificial language that is somewhere between the fuṣḥā and the ʿāmmiyā. He writes, “I use standard Arabic, not the dialect. I found difficulty in the pub passage in the speech of the common people [...] Here I tried to concoct a spoken Arabic language permissive a little in the grammatical rules” (72, translation mine).

It is surprising to find Saqqāl (1996) criticizing Lu’lu’ah (1980) for this technique because one can hardly notice the deviation from Standard Arabic where the latter intended to do so. The pub scene is basically a collage from drama, something akin to what Stetkevych (1975) calls the “two levels of speech”: 

الصيدلي قال كل شيء سيمضي على خير، لكنني ما عدت مثل قبل.

أما صحيح مجنونة، قلت

هه، إذا ما تركك (ألبرت) لحالك، سترين، قلت

لأي شيء تتزوجون إذا ما تريدون أطفال؟

أسرعوا رحاء اتهمي الوقت

أي، ذاك الأحد وصل (ألبرت) وعملوا فخذة مشوية،

ودعوني للعشاء، للاستماع بما حارة

أسرعوا رحاء اتهمي الوقت

أسرعوا رحاء اتهمي الوقت


شكرًا، شكرًا. للسعدة. للسعدة.
the difference between the literary, which is to say the written word, and the spoken or conversationally used word is less immediately one of grammar properties, of correctness or incorrectness, as it is one of level of meaning and of style in the broadest sense of mode, manner, and level of being. In other words, a person who uses one language or another, means and becomes what that language imposes on him. The existence of these two levels of speech in Arabic thus still chains Arabic literature to some extent [...] to that antiquated mentality of a division of styles into higher and lower. (p. 155)

**Conclusion**

This article has found that most of the Arabic translations of *The Waste Land* are “complementary versions, with each version approaching the original from a different perspective” (Trahan, 1988, p. 4; emphasis in the original). A common problem in most of the translations is that the translators, unfortunately, missed the opportunity to correct the literary disdain of dialectical Arabic which, as has been noted earlier, has to do with the act of viewing the target language recipient as a passive reader. Admittedly, when it comes to accuracy, Lu’lu’ah (1980) and Saqqāl (1996) have a far better grasp of some aspects of the literal level of the poem than Adūnīs and al-Khāl (1958). However, one has to remember that Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation was the first and that, at the time of its publication in the 1950s, there were no much of the criticism of the poem in Arabic. The purpose of Adūnīs and al-Khāl’s (1958) translation was accuracy but rather opening new direction for Arabic poetry and make it new. Nevertheless, the translation bears witness to some of their sound decisions as well as their higher aesthetic understanding—being professional poets in their own rights—of the source text in communicating its artistic essence. This is in line with Eliot’s declaration that one does not necessarily need to grasp the literal meaning of a
poem to be able to understand its deeper level of communication (Eliot, 1975, p. 117).
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© Antarah
Ibrahim Mumayiz
Antarah, described by Nicholson as ‘The Arabian Achilles’ was born c. 530 C.E and died c.614. Known as ‘Antarah bin Shaddad’, some accounts say, after his grandfather not his father. Other sources say Shaddad was his uncle with whom Antarah grew up. He was called “Split-lipped”, for a lip deformity. The homelands of his tribe, the āABS, lay between west central Arabia (Najd) and the eastern Hijaz. āAntarah’s mother, Zabiba, was an African slave of Abyssinian origin from whom āAntarah inherited an inferior social status. The son of a slave mother was regarded as a slave unless acknowledged by his father to be free. This acknowledgment was given in haste when ‘ABS’s camels were driven away by raiders. The āABSites charged the raiders but āAntarah refrained saying ‘a slave does not know how to fight. He only knows how to milk camels and bind their udders’. His distraught father cried out to him in despair “Charge! Thou art free!”

Aside from his unmatched fiery courage in battle, āAntarah is famous for his love for his cousin āAbla. Although he was acknowledged by his father as a free man, and as her cousin, he had first right to āAbla’s hand, his suit failed repeatedly. āAbla’s father, Malik, āAntarah’s other uncle, had expectations of his daughter marrying into the best bloodlines of Arabia, and did not to waste her on a nobody like her cousin āAntarah. Indeed āAbla was not short of eligible suitors; one was from the prestigious and distinguished Beni Shayban tribe who were lampooned by āAntarah in a poem of his entitled “How dare they come and ask for āAbla’s hand”. āAbla was indeed a quite attractive young woman, with a clear fresh complexion. In his verse āAntarah likens her to “an ivory doll studded with pearl”. She had gleaming dark hair that recalled a succession of clear starlit nights. His uncle saw his nephew as harassing his daughter and pestering her with unwanted attentions. But āAntarah’s poetry shows that āAbla was well disposed to him; describing an occasion when she drew closer to him in a scene of intimacy, but honor prevented him from taking advantage of her. Finally, his uncle relented and agreed to the match but demanded such an exorbitant bride-price that āAntarah could not possibly afford: A thousand rare, milk white pedigree āAsafiriyah
(sparrow-like) camels known to exist only in Iraq. Malik was certain that ʿAntarah would fail to deliver the valuable livestock, hoping he would also perish in the attempt; since the carefully guarded animals belonged to the King of Hira.

On his way to Hira, ʿAntarah, from his poetry, appears to have spotted and rounded up the prize herd. Captured and led to Hira, he languished in the King’s dungeons, calling down curses on his uncle who drove him to this fate. He was brought before the king who he described as ‘exalted eminence and sublime glory’. At the monarch’s feet sat ‘an ugly lion with a face that makes eyes burn with horror’ whom the king had intended to let loose on the captive, but decided on a contest between man and beast. Still in chains, ʿAntarah was given a sword with which he sliced off the lion’s head. He then stood before the king in audience, hoping for a gesture of regal munificence. Impressed, and learning of the worthy cause for which this Arabian champion rustled his heard, gave him the thousand camels as wedding gift. However Malik continued to procrastinate until a rival tribe, the Beni Saleh, fired with greed by the influx of so much wealth, raided the ʿAbsites and took Malik and his son hostage to be held for ransom. Antarah promptly charged the raiders and freed the two captives. Malik, greatly relieved, consented to the marriage. ʿAbla’s hand was finally won.

ʿAntarah also fought in the ‘Dahis and Ghabraa’ war and in the great battle of “Dhi Qar” in 610 against the Persians which the Prophet lauded as ‘the first the Arabs truly won over the Persians’. ʿAntarah died while raiding the Beni Nabhan clan of Tayy tribe. Unhorsed the eighty year old ʿAntarah was unable to remount and had to take refuge in a nearby thicket where a lurking Nabhan archer released an arrow at him. The veteran octogenarian warrior managed to make it back to the ʿAbs tents where he died of his wounds.

His poetry, brimming with epic heroism, with its graphic descriptions of bravery in the battlefield coupled with an evocative tenderness of romance, and the grandiose Jahiliya terminology, made ʿAntarah perhaps the most popular of
pre-Islamic poets. But his poetry is also just as rich in two other aspects: First, there is a definite strain of honor and morality in his verse which we do not find elsewhere in the M‘uallaqat poets. His unmistakably deep love for ʿAbla is virtuous and free from lewdness. He is held back from any improper close rendezvous with her, always citing honor as the deterrent to voluptuous passion. Secondly, and more importantly, the metaphysical finds its way into his poetry. Classical Arabic critics have identified two verses in his M‘uallaqa which no other poets, before or since, they say, have composed poetry in that strain; one which we would identify today as metaphysical:

“Flies buzz round her in glee, as singer airs his tunes

Tipsy and joyful and loud his soulful songs he croons”

“Joyful, flies rub their wings together in their glee

like one rubbing fire-stick, its flamelet for to see.”

The “Flies” here are just as metaphysical as The “Flea” in the seventeenth century poem, and as closely associated with romantic love.
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The Muallaqa of Antarah

1- هل غادر الشعراء من متردمن هم هل عرفت السّداد بعد توهّم

Have poets left aught that had not before been told?
Do you now know the house you did not know of old.

1- يا دار عبّلّائي بالجوء تكلمي وعمي صبّاحا دار عبّلّائي واسلمي

O Abla’s “Jiwa’s” home, of beloved ones, do tell (1)

2-
Good morn, 'Abla’s home! May you e’er fare safe and well

3. By it I stopped my she-camel, so grand and fair (2)

   Palace-like she was. I, my love pangs had to air.

4. “Jiwa’” ‘Abla has chosen as a place to stay

   “Hazn”, “Samman” and “Mutathallim” were our folks’ way (3)

---


(2) It: refers to ‘Abla’s home.

(3) “Hazn”, “Samman”, “Al-Mutathallim” various high-ground locations surrounded by lowlands.

5. Greetings! Your remains of old now stand all alone (4)
Des’late you are after “Umm al-Haytham” had gone (5)

6. She stayed in lands of roaring foes (6). And now you are
   So hard to reach, O Makhram’s daughter, (7) and so far

7. By chance her love struck me, and went against my will
   I, intent on her love, whilst I her people kill? (8)

8. I have for you honor’d love, none else should you assume
   To doubt otherwise, never should you e’er presume.

---

(4) He is addressing the ruins of =: Abla’s former encampment.


(6) He is worried about Abla staying in hostile territory, -:‘lands of roaring foes’

(7) =: Abla is Makhram’s daughter.

(8) He would like to kill =: Abla’s father for refusing to give her to him in marriage.
While our folk in “Ghaylam” spring pastures they have found? (9)

10. If you’re bent on breaking with me, and will take flight

Your baggage packed, fleeing away in darkest night.

11. By her laden camels, I was by fright quite dazed

Watching them as they, on noxious, black-seed weeds, grazed (10)

12. Forty-two milch camels did her baggage train bring

Jet-black they were as pinions of a raven’s wing.

(9) “Unayzatayn” is the place ĪAbla’s folk chose as their spring pastures. “Ghaylam” is ĪAntara’s spring pastures. The two were very far apart. It would have been unseemly, and improper, he implies, for him to come that long way to visit ĪAbla.

(10) Spring grazing was over and the pastures were dry except for the noxious black-seed weeds. He was afraid that ĪAbla’s laden camels would come to grief after cropping that harmful herbage. His love for ĪAbla extended to being concerned for the well-being of her camels.
13. Her pure, pearl-toothed mouth so enraptures you with bliss
so sweetly tastes and scented, and so cool to kiss.

14. Like merchants’ lidless musk-jar, her scent you’d ne’er miss
Wafting from her mouth that’s there for a scented kiss

15. Like a verdant oasis, well-watr’d by blessed rain
Beyond beaten tracks, no droppings its fresh air stain. (11)

16. To it clouds were gen’rous with rain, copious and cool
Drenching orchards, dirham-like was a water-pool (12)

17. Ev’ry evening the rains in pouring torrents fall
Their unbroken rain-lines were ceaseless, straight and tall.

(11) ‘Abla’s scent is fresh, like the air of a well-watered oasis thick with vegetation, lying well beyond camel tracks. Its clean fresh air is thus free from the pungent odor of animal droppings.

(12) The heavy rains filled the orchards with water, forming pools as well-rounded as a dirham, an Arabian coin.
18. All through this oasis flies swarmed, whose din and drone
    Were like drunken singer whose drunken song will moan.

19. Flies rubbing wings and legs together in their glee.
    Like handless man rubs firestick its flame for to see. (13)

20. On well-padded bed she sleeps nights, and wakes at day.
    Whilst I on a black charger night and day must stay.

21. My bedroll is saddle of a stout-legged charger
    Whose spurring sides are large, and strap-belly larger.

22. On swift Yem’nite she-camel to her home I’d fly
    A she-camel so cursed her udders had gone dry. (14)

---

(13) He compares the ecstatic arm-waving singer to a one-handed man working a firestick to eagerly see its flame. Flies in the lovely oasis is a metaphysical conceit, highlighting the sweetness of the oasis which attracts flies.

(14) A cursed, milkless camel would be tough, hardy and agitated, and thus more likely to reach its destination quickly.
23. Raising her tail, swagg’ring, throughout the night she pounds
   With her doughty pads at hardest and highest ground.

24. For a day and a night, breaking rough ground she raced
   Like an ostrich, small-eared, head high, and widely paced.

25. Young ostrich gather, unknowing, around this male
   Who’s like an alien herdsman who in speech would fail. (15)

26. The young ostrich follow his head, raised high and tall.
   A tent-like howdah it was, tow’ring o’er them all.

27. Small-headed, to “Al-‘Ashira” goes his eggs to save.
   Looking like an earless, fully fur-clad, black slave.

(15) Young ostrich try to win this male’s affection is as futile as Yemenite camels gather round a foreign herdsman whose speech, ways and conduct they cannot understand.
28. To the two “Duhrudh” pools willing, she came to drink
But from drinking at the “Daylam pools, she would shrink.(16)

29. Trotting at night, she inclines sharply to her right.
As if a cat scratches her left with all its might.

30. When she, in anger, turns to this cat, for to trounce
With bite and scratch the cat on her is quick to pounce.

31. By “Ridaa”’s sparse water, thickly o’ergrown with reeds
Under her weight hollow reeds did, with crackle, yield.

32. With thick, black pouring sweat her head and neck were soiled.
As if ’twas tar that in a wood-fired pot was boiled.(17)

(16) “Daylam” is referred to by ‘Antarah’s ‘Abs tribe as ‘the enemy’s water’. His intelligent she-camel knows this and in loyalty to her master and his tribe, refrains from watering there.
(17) It seems that his camel had fed on certain herbage that gave her a blackish sweat, or perhaps she was bilious. Blackish camel sweat usually turns yellow after it dries.

33. As she brays on, sweat first pours from behind her ears,
   Like a well-tried tough male, away she proudly tears

34. Should you, when seeing me, at once put on your veil
   Know that I’m good at slaying knights in coats of mail (18)

35. What you know of my good traits, you should others tell
   If I am not wronged, with others I fare quite well.

36. But if I’m wronged, in punishment I’ll be hard and free
   And as bitter as bitter-apple e’er could be (19)

37. At night I took drink after hot winds came to rest
   Drink bought with a coin whose condition was the best (20)

(18) He means that she need not conceal herself in her veil in fear of him. He is capable of felling armored knights, and thus could protect her from being carried away as a spoil of war.

(19) Bitter-apple – colocynth – Arabic handhal, a desert, lemon-shaped growth was proverbial in pre-Islamic and Arabic culture generally, for its unbearable bitterness.
The coin was in perfect, mint condition; well-struck, gleaming, its markings clearly embossed. It was the ‘dinar’, the Roman silver ‘denarius’. Pre-Islamic Arabs took pride in drinking and gambling as evidence of both manliness and generosity.

From yellow bottle of many a fluted line
And from a white cloth-stopp’d ever, I poured my wine.

If I drink ‘tis but my money that wears away.
But my honor, ‘spite drink, intact will ever stay.

My bounty ne’er falls short after I rise from wine
As you know, my moral traits are e’er so benign

A belle’s man-friend I slew, and there on ground he laid.
And there, like a fear-gripp’d chewing camel, he stayed

A swift preemptive stab from me left him deceased.
A shower of his “Andam”-red blood was released

(21) He is addressing ‘Abla, reassuring her that she need not fear his drinking, which will never adversely affect his honor or his virtues.

(22) The slain man, prior to his death was seized by gripping fear that made his pectorals quiver. The poet compares a camel’s masticating mouth to the dead man’s fear of the poet.
(23) *Andam: or baqam, a tall tree whose trunk is dark-red in color, and is used to prepare red dye.

43. Inquire, Malik’s daughter, from knights of high renown
    Whate’er of me, to you, as yet, is still unknown (24)

44. I’m still mounted on a large, fore-leg swimming steed,
    Knights have covered him with wounds that heavily bleed.

45. Sometimes on him, at slashing foes I headlong charge.
    Sometimes on him, I join a hardy host and large.

46. Who saw me in battle will tell I’m e’er prepared
    To charge but I hold back only when spoils are shared.

47. Well-armed am I, brave knights decline to challenge me
    Surrender I do not, nor far away I flee.
Well-known knights know his exploits in the battlefield. He asks 'Abla to inquire from them of how well he fights, in case she does not know.

48. A hard, direct and swift stab my arm to him gave
With a re-smithied, re-straightened, re-sharpened glaive.

49. I pierced his clothes with along and sharp-pointed spear
Those who with honor charge will not of spears stay clear

50. I left him for wild beasts to have as their fair share.
Between his head and wrist, they set upon to tear.

51. I strike to prize apart the plates that form a shield.
This marks the prowess that warriors should always wield.
(25) The shield ‘Antarah is describing is made of plates joined together. He strikes at the grooves between the plates, thus prizing them apart. This, he declares, is what hardy warriors should know and practice in battle.

(26) With dice his hands are deft when winter times are lean
And he who bought all wine, leaving vintners tents clean.

(27) When he saw me come, and that I would take his life.
He bared his back-teeth, but was not with laughter rife

(28) I speared him first, then, from up high, I ran him through
With sharpest Indian sword whose blade to kill was true.

---

(25) This is a continuation of the previous verse on the breaking up of shields. He is saying I broke up the shield of a man who was deft at gambling in the long winter months when there is little to do.

(26) This is a continuation of the previous verse on the breaking up of shields. He is saying I broke up the shield of a man who was deft at gambling in the long winter months when there is little to do.

(27) Wine-sellers hoist a flag over their tents to advertise their wares. This is also a continuation: He broke the shield and slew a man who had bought all the vintner’s wine that they had to lower their flags to show they were out of stock.

(28) “to bare his back-teeth”: To open one’s mouth so wide – with fear, anger, laughter, or hate – so that one’s molars show. Here, the man the poet describes opened his mouth wide with anger, hate and fear.
(29) “‘Idhlim”: A species of treelet whose leaves are used to make red dye.

56. A tall champion whose clothes could dress a giant tree.
Glorious; his footwear regal; twinless born was he (30)

57. Female quarry! Unclaimed by whom she is his lot
But to me is forbidd’n. I so wish she was not. (31)

58. I sent for my slave-woman, and said to her “Go
Spy on her, and of what you gather let me know.”

59. She said “I saw that lax carelessness there did dwell”.
“And the prey could be had by one who could aim well.” (32)

---

(30) Twinless: He was born an only child, having no twin brother to share his glorious presence.

(31) It is said that this line refers to ‘Antarah’s step-mother, his father’s young wife Sumayya, who incited his father against him for some amorous verses ‘Antarah recited about her. Here he says that he wished his father had not married her so that she could be his.

(32) His slave-woman is reporting that Sumayya is neglected and he could have her. It seems that he lusts for Sumayya, but deeply and honorably loves ‘Abla.
60. Her neck is like that of a side-long glancing deer.
   Young deer! A white speck on its lip shines bright and clear.\(^{(33)}\)

61. Umar, I’m told, for my favors, no grat’tude shows.
   Thanklessness deals the giver’s soul quite painful blows.

62. I kept what my uncle entrusted to my care
   During battles, when tightened lips one’s teeth laid bare.\(^{(34)}\)

63. From bloody fields of death, heroes ne’er back away.
   But of death’s horrors they mutter what they must say.

64. ‘Tween them, and foes spears, they place me in tightest spot.
   I cower not, but space to fight I have not got.

\(^{(33)}\) It is not clear whether he is referring to Sumayya, or ‘Abla
65. The self-urging host had advanced on us in force. (35)

I wheeled at them straight on, and blameless held my course

66. They call on Antarah, midst the thickest of spearfall

On “Al-Adham”; spears long as rope, down wells, falls tall. (36)

67. On my steed I charge, slash away, and at them tear,

Till my steed looks as if a shirt of blood does wear.

68. He reeled from the heavy fall – on his neck – of spear

and to me complained with a choked sob and a tear.

---

(34) This refers to the incident narrated by Nicholson: “cAntarah loved his cousin cAbla, and following the Arabian custom by which cousins have the first right to a girl’s hand, he asked for her in marriage. His suit was in vain; the son of a slave mother being regarded as a slave unless acknowledged by his father. On one occasion, when the cAbsites were hotly engaged with raiders who had driven off their camels cAntarah refused to join the melee saying ‘A slave does not how to fight. He only knows how to milk camels and bind their udders’. His father cried ‘Charge! Thou art free!’ (LHA, p.115). This verse refers to the tribe’s herds of camels entrusted to his care.

(35) Self-urging host: the enemy were loudly urging one another to fight.

(36) “al-Adham” (the Bay): cAntarah’s horse.
69. If dialogue he knew, complaining he would be
   If he could talk, conversing he would be with me.

70. My soul’s canker when knights to me called out
   “Curses, *Antar! Advance and put them to the rout!

71. Steeds, scowling with horror, tear through low, pot-holed ground
   Large, small, hirsute, smooth – all are to the battle bound.

72. Wherever I lead my camels, me they will e’er obey,
   My mind e’er leads me to the straight and righteous way

73. I’m loath to die while the battle is still not on
   With “Dhamdham’s” sons whose vengeful ire is too far gone.

(37) *Antarah had slain one “Dhamdham” whose two sons had insisted on killing *Antarah in revenge.
   *Antarah is afraid he would die before settling accounts with the two vengeful sons.
74. They my honor smear, though theirs I never smear
   Who dare when I’m gone, but cower when I appear.

75. What they say of me, I wonder not in the least
   for I left their slain sire to eagle and wild beast.
Diplomatic Terminology in the Arab World

Saleh Al Ayyaf

Introduction

The Arab world has always engaged in diplomatic activities, but these have increased dramatically since the past six decades. Much international attention is focused on the Arab world, due both to the dramatic events taking place there and to the regional interests of international powers. Thus, diplomacy plays a critical role in management of the situation in the Middle East. This situation also increases the responsibility of Arab linguists to pay attention to the language of diplomacy, especially diplomatic terminology, and to address the current dearth of studies on this subject in the literature. Arabic diplomatic terminology suffers from a number of problems resulting from the transfer of foreign diplomatic concepts into the Arabic language. This paper offers some insight into the nature of diplomacy in the Arab world and investigates problems with Arabic terminology itself in the context of translated diplomatic documents regarding diplomatic law of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

1. The Concept of Diplomacy

Historically, the use of diplomacy in an international context can be traced back to the late eighteenth century. Etymologically, of course, the English word diplomacy is ultimately derived from the ancient Greek verb diploun, meaning to double, and the Greek noun diploma, which referred to an official written document of double leaves (mostly parchment and papyrus), joined together and folded. These diplomas were handed to heralds to show their authority or status when delegated to other states (Constantinou, 1996). As the word came into English via French, the French word diplomate gained the connotation of a person authorized to enter into negotiation on behalf of the sending state (Encyclopedia
Britannica, 1998). The semantic development of the word diplomacy has imparted to it a kind of “soft power” in international relations (Melissen, 2005). The concept of diplomacy predates the countries and even the word itself, but real advances in the practice of diplomacy for the past two centuries or so have occurred primarily in the English language (Guzzini & Neumann, 2012; Cooper et al., 2013; Hare, 2015). Over time, diplomacy has taken different forms; however, “[t]here are two main types of diplomacy: traditional diplomacy and conference diplomacy” (Fahim, 2010, p. 8). Simply put, traditional diplomacy is inter-state interaction by way of permanent diplomats, ambassadors, and consuls as appointed members of the diplomatic corps, while conference diplomacy (or, alternatively, parliamentary diplomacy) encompasses all types of cooperation between parliamentarians or conferees. Originally, the latter type of diplomacy was linked to the work of the United Nations General Assembly, as well as multilateral diplomacy (Zhou, 2014). To differentiate between traditional and conference diplomacy, Zhou (2014) states:

What characterizes parliamentary diplomacy is that the objectives of a delegation to an international conference or meeting are attained through the use of the rules of procedure, which can be skillfully used in order to interrupt a debate, modify the voting procedure and, in some cases, create the necessary confusion in order to put off a vote likely to be contrary to the delegation. (p. 79).

Other sub-types include: integrative diplomacy, which captures some of the main characteristics of the diplomatic milieu essential to appreciating the challenges confronting policy makers and diplomatic practitioners in an era of markedly hectic agendas and increasingly dense types of communication; and cultural diplomacy, which is mainly concerned with bridging a cultural gap so as to create a better level of intercultural or interfaith dialogue and reach a better degree of acculturation.
Another sub-type is *official diplomacy*, which can be an instrument of foreign policy for establishing contacts between a government and other states through diplomatic intermediaries, or “an instrument of foreign policy for the establishment and development of contacts between the governments of different states through the use of intermediaries mutually recognized by the respective parties” (de Magalhães, 1988, p. 17). In the same spirit, *citizen diplomacy* complements official diplomacy, opening opportunities for stronger communication channels and better cross-cultural understanding while strengthening joint efforts to address the needs of the parties involved. It should be noted that citizen diplomacy also attempts to bridge the gap between government on the one hand and civil society on the other hand, and between different cultural views on how to control conflicts (Davies & Kaufman, 2003; Kurbalija & Katrandjiev, 2006).

Contemporary diplomacy now encompasses a broader concept, in that it is mainly a political science with in-depth communication skills (among others), but shrouded in shrewdness, caginess, vagueness, ambiguity, and evasiveness (Badie, 2011; Berridge, 2015). We should accept that diplomacy, in the contemporary sense of the word, has become more complex and diverse, and now includes more than it used to.

Diplomacy which encompasses *all* the sub-types can be defined as “the art and practice of conducting negotiations between nations,” and “skill in handling affairs without arousing hostility” (Merriam-Webster, 1997). This definition emphasizes that diplomacy is an interdisciplinary field which informs foreign policy with insights from science, education, history, technology, language(s), and culture(s). Diplomacy, as such, is not simply a game nor is it toying with international relations. Nicolson (1969) states that diplomacy is not the invention or the pastime of a particular political system, but is rather an important component of any valid relation between two entities. Simply put, “diplomacy is
the management of international relations by means of negotiations; the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys[;] the business or art of the diplomatist” (Nicolson, 1969, p. 5). By sifting the definitions of diplomacy, we can determine that diplomacy is a mechanism for promoting the national interest of the nation that it represents. It is done by means of negotiations and other kinds of relations with other nations. Diplomacy is always guided and conditioned by the foreign policy of the nation that it represents. Without the presence of diplomacy, many world affairs would be bungled and would break down completely. Chaos would prevail (Nye, 2008; Bjola & Kornprobst, 2013).

2. History of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is the most practical means devised by civilizations to prevent international relations from being governed by force and hegemony. The use of diplomacy in the history of humanity dates back to ancient civilizations. Archaeologists, anthropologists, and historiographers have revealed that diplomacy, as a communication catalyst, has prevented many potential misunderstandings, political blunders, or serious faux pas among nations. Before outlining the trajectory of diplomacy in history, let us focus on the definition of diplomacy. Linguistically, diplomacy is “the management of relationships between countries” or “skill in dealing with people without offending or upsetting them” (Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, 2010). Similarly, diplomacy is “the profession, activity, or skill of managing international relations, typically by a country’s representatives abroad” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, 2016). Diplomacy is “the work of maintaining good relations between the governments of different countries” or “skill in dealing with others without causing bad feelings” (Merriam-Webster, 2004). However, Liverani (2000) defines diplomacy as “the product of an international community of mutually independent polities, whose long-lasting and rather intensive contacts generated
precise norms regulating their interactions” (p. 26). Broadly speaking, diplomacy means peacefully dealing with human affairs by utilizing tactful and discreet techniques in negotiation and persuasion.

The etymology of the word *diplomacy* shows that, even at the time of its Greek origin, it meant something official. The earliest instance of the English word’s use dates back to around 1645, appearing in John Donne’s *Pseudo Martyr* (Roberts, 2009). Burke, in 1796, also speaks of diplomacy, by which he means skill and dexterity in the conduct of international intercourse and negotiations (Roberts, 2009). The pedigree of diplomacy can be traced back to the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East; the earliest documents of diplomacy date from around 2500 BCE (Badie et al., 2011; Cooper et al., 2013). The diplomatic systems of the Greek, Roman, and Chinese empires predate the modern diplomacy of Europe, but none of these three empires had the key characteristics of a full-fledged diplomatic system. The origin of modern diplomacy is often traced to the European system of states. In the wake of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which marked the end of the Thirty Years’ War, European diplomacy started to take shape and burgeoned through the member states and into other countries (Black, 2010). It should be underlined that “in the short term, the peace settlement of Westphalia(1648) was more significant in shaping diplomacy’s development” (Scott, 2015, p. 681). The communication channels between countries forged by this agreement helped diplomacy to become a virtual “international language.”

Some historiographies reveal that a rudimentary form of diplomacy was used by primitive people to regulate their treatment and reception by others. Roberts (2009) states that the origins of diplomacy may go back to “the Great Kings of the Ancient Near East in the second and possibly even as early as the late fourth millennium, the cuneiform civilizations of Mesopotamia” (p. 6). The earliest diplomatic document found dates to around 2500 BCE and was sent from the King of Ebla to the King of Amazi. It was discovered in the 1970s (Roberts, 2017).
Amarna letters, discovered in Egypt in 1887, include a large collection of diplomatic correspondence between various states of the Near East in the fourteenth century BCE. It is worth noting that by the time of the Greek city states of the fourth and fifth centuries BCE, a new and more advanced level of sophisticated diplomacy had developed (Jönsson & Hall, 2005). Perhaps the first evidence of a diplomatic conference is the Conference of Sparta, convened by the Spartans in 432 BCE, to decide whether to go to war with Athens.

In speaking of the European system of diplomacy, the historian Garrett Mattingly holds that Italian Renaissance diplomacy did not spring either from a Greek prototype or ready-made from Italian soil (Roberts, 2009). Mattingly’s interpretation is that the Western and Central European world adopted the triple concept of the Roman Empire, comprising Roman civil law, Roman customary law, and the Code of Canon Law of the Roman Catholic church. Renaissance diplomacy inherited two types of diplomacy, papal and imperial, in the examples of early diplomats Gregory the Great (papal diplomat in Constantinople, 540–604) and Nicodemo da Pontremoli (diplomat of the Regent of Milan, 1411–1481). The practice of diplomacy started to gain appeal during the Italian Wars (1494–1559). Then, after about 25 years, the first diplomatic law was written by Albertico Gentili in England (1580s) under the protection and rule of Queen Elizabeth I (Roberts, 2017). Diplomacy then descended into conspiracy, deceit, and espionage; diplomats found their reputations in tatters when diplomacy veered off under the impact of Machiavellianism. With faltering steps, the modern trend in diplomacy is a yearning for an international organization under the umbrella of the UN to settle all disputes and deter those seeking to impose their will by force. It seems now that the old practice of gunboat diplomacy and the new preference for shrewd diplomacy coexist. However, the norms of diplomacy have been refined to provide better immunity for diplomats, the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations being a case in point.
3. Diplomacy in the Arab World

Arabs have used diplomatic concepts from ancient times, as Arab civilization gradually developed political systems. The plurality of political systems in the old Arab world and their proximity to other civilizations had a considerable effect on the emergence of diplomatic relations and communications among these systems, promoting political and economic relations and making military alliances. Tribal customs emerged for organizing relations between people sent to solve disputes arising among these systems (Rahmanizadeh, 2015).

In view of the difficult task these people undertook during their tenure, tribal customs dictated that they be granted diplomatic immunity, to avoid any assault they might face during the discharge of the task with which they were entrusted (Berridge, 2010). The rule of granting a foreign messenger diplomatic immunity is a fixed rule for Arabs, and it is part of the original Arab morality. The messenger would be received with generosity and hospitality, and he would be lavished with presents. His dignity would remain intact, his person respected, he would be provided with all the supplies required for discharging his tasks, and he would be seen off with the same generosity and hospitality as when he arrived (Al-Fatlawi, 2002).

Arabs granted the messenger the diplomatic immunity that other contemporaneous societies and civilizations did not. Today’s so-called international community only adopted it at the beginning of this century and only in a limited manner, despite the development it witnessed in various fields. At the beginning of this century, practices appeared that necessitated granting the foreign messenger some diplomatic immunities; however, they varied from one state to another according to the political trends dominating the regimes and the nature of political relations between the two states. These states often transgressed the agreed-upon diplomatic immunity and messengers would undergo insult and assault. The protection of messengers emerges from Arab morality; it is a fixed
matter that is part of an Arab nation’s origin. Some writers have stated that the protection of messengers is “an Arab tribal law” (Brockelmann, 1973).

At the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first, Arab countries witnessed dramatic geopolitical changes. This has led to numerous diplomatic contacts at regional and international levels. The region became the focus of the world on account of its economic and geographic importance. Consequently, the region grew in stature and still plays a major role in international relations. Brown (2004) summarizes this in the introduction of his book when he states that “[t]he Middle East in modern times has been intensively caught up in greater power politics, and that experience has produced a distinctive pattern of relations among Middle Eastern states and outside states concerned with the Middle East”. He touches upon an important characteristic of diplomacy in the Middle East when he states that “[i]n the process, Middle Eastern political elites have become conditioned to a diplomacy that balances domestic, regional, and international alignments.”

4. Importance of Diplomatic Terminology

Diplomacy is considered the proper domain and central feature of the field of international politics. Diplomacy, like other human endeavors, has undergone development and progress over time, reflecting the various practices in the field at various times. Undoubtedly, the practice of diplomacy is positively influenced by developments in several fields, such as economics, technology, and international relations. This evolution of diplomacy is positively reflected in the language of diplomacy (Stempel, 1995).

The language used in diplomatic discourse is distinguished from the language used in other fields. It acquired this distinction based on the responsibility it shouldered as the mouthpiece of the state. Diplomatic discourse determines the state’s position about certain issues, declares its aspirations, and establishes the measures and procedures that can be undertaken with respect to certain causes. In
addition, the diplomat is the one speaker on behalf of the state whose discourse is reliable, committed, and an official point of reference; therefore, diplomatic discourse, including the terms used in such discourse, must be formulated carefully, more so than in other kinds of discourse. It must be accurate, direct, and clear, easy to analyze, and smoothly interpreted, so that it is not misinterpreted (Abu Jaber, 2001).

The nature of diplomatic discourse as an intellectual system is associated with certain concepts and terms that must be understood to ensure the discourse is comprehensible. The sensitivity of some diplomatic events requires brevity due to time limitations, so the use of accurate and well-expressed concepts is very important. Diplomatic terms, like other scientific terms, should be characterized by clarity and accuracy and convey a unique concept.

Arab diplomatic discourse has acquired a clear importance over the last five years as a result of the recent revolutions in the region, specifically in Iraq, Egypt, Yemen, Tunisia, Libya, and Syria, none of which have yet reached resolution. The discourse issuing from Arab countries is sought after to reveal what is happening in this region. Therefore, the details and the terminology of this discourse must be scrutinized in order to determine its purposes and meanings.

The time has come to study and analyze Arab diplomatic terminology in order to reach the sought-after goal of unification. A mechanism for generating that terminology, understanding its methods of construction, and accurately deciphering its connotations, as well as its flexibility and validity, has become a sine qua non, so that we can promote and develop it and rid it of terminological chaos.

Diplomatic terminology per se is a universal concept characterized by freedom from regionalism and validity for use by all states. Thus, agreement must be reached on unified translations at the level of individual languages, as well as on a large-scale, international level. We have initially focused on the Arabic language because it is the official language of twenty-eight states. The diplomatic discourse
in which they engage involves all of these states and its unification reflects unification among these states during representation in the international arena.

5. Diplomatic Translation and Cultural Differences

Diplomacy per se is ubiquitous in almost all walks of life, while translation plays the role of a catalyst to bridge the gap between cultures and languages, making diplomacy a facilitating factor rather than a formidable barrier. This disciplinary tension between cultures and diplomacy on the one hand and translation on the other hand requires translators to reflect on cultural differences when undertaking diplomatic translation. It should be recognized that although international diplomacy has much in common across cultures and languages, the “DNA” of societies still has some areas in which diplomatic translation does not overlap. Cultural differences create barriers and difficulties for the world countries to understand each other (D'Hhooghe, 2015).

The differences in diplomatic translation stemming from unrelated cultures can have various sources: (a) integrated thinking versus analytical thinking; (b) high context versus low context; (c) culture specificity; (d) pragmatics; (e) cultural connotation and implication, to mention but a few (Hooghe, 2015). These kinds of cultural differences account for the political blunders and faux pas or gaffes with which diplomatic relations are rife. This little-known fact is repeatedly emphasized by translation theorists, as it has serious repercussions. In diplomatic encounters, cultural differences and sensitivity are important, and many diplomatic gaffes arise as a result of cultural unawareness among people (Taibi & Ozolins, 2016). Such cultural differences and commonalities, for instance, play a major role in the Sino-American apology diplomacy; opposing cultures and ideologies make language a battlefield of competing focal points of interest and contextual interpretation (Munday & Zhang, 2015). It may be a moot and contested point as to whether language shapes and facilitates culture or vice versa. According to Zaharna (2004):
“[W]hile translation may overcome the language barrier, it may not overcome the cultural barrier. Just as culture shapes the communication of a people, it follows that because communication is at the core of public diplomacy, culture also shapes the public diplomacy of a nation.” (p. 144).

It follows that a cultural difference in diplomacy is not a matter of merely being different; rather, it is a matter of being either “wrong” or “right.” However, the key element is accuracy, ruling out any discrepancies, implications, or entailments that might result in misinterpretation.

The English-Arabic translation of the *Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations* is a telling example of where Arabic and English diverge, and reveals the impact culture has on language. In the diplomatic conventions, Arabic places a short preamble ديباجة to introduce the articles المادة, paragraphs الفقرة and items البند that follow. In other words, the written diplomatic discourse is initiated by a set of introductory sentences that complement and anticipate the well-detailed body of the convention that follows. While English uses the present participle at the beginning of each statement, as described above, Arabic does not tolerate this morphosyntactic form; instead, Arabic utilizes the causative object المفعول لأجله to introduce the reason(s) why some actions will later be applied. For example, one way to translate the English “believing” (as in “Believing that an international convention…”) is إيماناً من جانب الدول الأعضاء. By the same token, the present participle “affirming” in “Affirming that the rules of customary international law should continue to govern questions” can be translated as وتأكيداً من جانبيها بأن. Arabic, therefore, does not tolerate faulty and potentially comical attempts at imitating the syntactical patterns of the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) or translating present participles into something like مؤمنون بأن أو مؤكدين على أن أحكام القانون العرفي or المفعول لأجله; they are culture-specific in that Arabic utilizes المفعول لأجله (the causative object). Again, the use of “shall” in diplomatic conventions does not have to be rendered into the TL as a future
reference. It simply denotes a factual reference that is not bound strictly to a futuristic timeframe; it is present and future at the same time. Therefore, the use of the modal “shall” in “the following expressions shall have the meanings hereunder assigned to them” does not denote only future; rather, it is a factual statement that is best rendered as ‘يكون مدلول العبارات التالية كما يلي وفقاً لأغراض الاتفاقية’ and not something like ‘سيكون مدلول العبارات التالية كما يلي وفقاً لأغراض الاتفاقية’ since the mistranslation will exclude the reference to the constructive statement and unknowingly include only the future. The culture-bound difference in the subtle nuance of ‘سوف’ and “shall” in Arabic and English, respectively, creates an uneasy challenge for less experienced translators. It should also be noted that the use of “shall” is bound to the legal and diplomatic arenas; elsewhere, for instance, “shall” indicates the future and cannot be indicative of a factual (present) reference. In the same vein, although cultural differences create translation barriers, they can be used as resources for complementing and learning from each other and thus helping to achieve common ground (Qizheng, 2012).

Friedrich (2016) argues that we would be remiss if we deny the fact that when the diplomatic translation of words travels from the SL to the TL, the mot juste undergoes a loss of subtle nuance; in other words, a new meaning may emerge or an original one may be lost, thus causing misunderstanding. Therefore, using a translator does not always have a fortunate result. Many translators are lost in the word choice and the tone of the expression, and being fluent in both the SL and the TL does not necessarily mean being fluent in both the source culture (SC) and the target culture (TC). Much of the translator’s role is more than merely linguistic; after all, a good translator is a good cultural mediator or facilitator (Hatim & Mason, 2005; Tosi, 2003; Baranyai, 2011). Another point worth noting is that political lip service causes many diplomats (but not diplomatic translators) to work in a small linguistic melting pot, in which terms of the SL acquire a specialized meaning for them. When they read the term in the TL, it sounds “Greek” to their audience and readership. That is why the public describes
this alien language as unintelligible jargon (Tosi, 2003). This is true of all languages and cultures, in that culture always works in tandem with language; culture is sometimes so stubborn that translators have to find a way to bring the TC and the SC closer. The different ways in which each culture thinks and views ideas—and the different means of expressing such cultural specificity—that mark various cultures can also influence diplomatic wording (Friedrich, 2016).

Regarding polysemy in Arabic and the way in which it can work against diplomatic translation, the word بعثة is polysemous and can be mistranslated into English as “scholarship,” “mission,” or even “delegation.” Due to the overuse of certain words, wrong word choice occurs even among educated people. People misuse بعثة (mission) for منحة (scholarship). Another telling example from the corpus of this research study is the word “staff,” which in Arabic is الهيئة or الهمزة التدريسية; because it is more frequently used in academic discourse, many readers of the TL may think it refers to the academic faculty. Another cultural difference is the difficulty in differentiating between بند، فقرة and مادة، which really creates inaccuracy. The word “protecting” (حماية) is broad in its semantic reference and thus may be translated into Arabic using different wordings, such as حماية or رعاية or حتىة. All these subtle nuances can be subsumed in the SC or SL, but this might not be the case in the TC or the TL. The word “friendly” (حميم) may have subtle nuances in Arabic: حميم may connote a sense of intimacy, which carries negative overtones for the SC since it is associated with علاقات حميمة. Therefore, it is how we piece words together to make the diplomatic convention much less stilted and less pretentious, both in tone and word choice, that should have a welcome place in both the TC and the TL.

6. The Problems of Arabic Diplomatic Terminology

The problems of Arabic terminology are abundant and it may be difficult to identify them all for investigation. There are differences among studies that identify the problems of Arabic terminology. However, the existing research studies on how
terminology is translated into Arabic have not put forward a clear-cut taxonomy or schema of the persistent problems arising from interdisciplinary fields, including science, religion, literature, economics, politics, medicine, and technology, to name but a few. The language of diplomacy can be described as a special language that maneuvers between the SL and the TL, where zero tolerance is enforced. This is true because diplomatic discourse governs public relations and international issues. Unlike the fields of economics, medicine, and technology, examining the problems of Arabic diplomatic terms is somewhat easy to do, thanks to the stability of diplomatic terms. Hereunder, some of the key elements of Arabic diplomatic terminology problems will be examined with reference in most cases to the diplomatic law of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Two English-Arabic document translations in Saudi diplomatic law—the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (VCDR) and the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (VCCR)—will be examined with respect to terminological problems.

6.1 Reasons behind the Problems

The unsystematic development of Arabic terminography is one of the main reasons why thorny problems crop up in Arabic terminology. Strong individual efforts have been made to render the ST terms, but without clear guidelines or methodologies, despite an abundance of qualified specialist terminologists and translators (Darwish, 2009). This has resulted in inconsistency in rendering ST terms in the various Arabic lexicons. Moreover, a lack of close cooperation among the Arabic language academies (each with its own goals and focal points) causes ambivalence and dichotomies in the attempt to develop a unified Arabic terminology of diplomacy, compounding the problem (Sawaie, 2006). This state of in action explains, in part, why and how the production of one uniform body of Arabic diplomatic terminology is stalled; diplomatic language requires special expressions that carry politically emotive tones couched in a high level of word selection devoid of jargon (El-Farahaty, 2015). Similar reasons might underlie the slow pace of
translation in other fields, such as science, technology, and medicine. Arabic has conspicuously failed to cope with the myriad terms coined in the industrial revolution, let alone the information technology (IT) revolution. Admittedly, it is not Arabic per se that is to blame for the flood of IT jargon in Arabic dictionaries; rather, it is the slow pace with which Arabicization coins new entries into the dictionary. Arabic lexicographers are remiss in leaving many ST unnoticed, untranslated, or even mistranslated and taking no action to correct the situation. Al-Kasimi (2008) argues that the scientific and technical terms flooding Arabic make it difficult to establish the presence of an efficient Arabicization mechanism. In the same vein, the overdependence on foreign teachers and on curricula designed exclusively by native speakers of English make it difficult to use the Arabic language as the main language of instruction. Consequently, English and French have become the hegemonic languages of instruction in the majority of Arab universities, especially in science and technology, both during and in the aftermath of Western colonization. This well-known factor helps weaken and marginalize efforts at Arabicization. These are the main reasons behind the problems of Arabic terminology.

6.2 Problems of Diplomatic Arabic Terminology

Epistemologically, translation-related problems are likely to crop up as long as two unrelated languages and two cultures are both involved in the development of diplomatic terminology in Arabic. This was probably not the case hundreds of years ago: “studies on the tenth-century Byzantine–Arab official diplomatic correspondence show that the terminology employed in this follows accurate translations from Greek and Arabic terms, and parallels in phraseology, ideas and concepts” (Ibn al-Farrā’ et al., 2015, p. 208). The use of different languages has been a source of misunderstanding and discord, although there have always been enormous efforts to institute a lingua franca diplomacy; multilateral diplomacy constitutes real linguistic challenges, but creative solutions
are readily worked out (Constantinou et al., 2016). Simply put, different languages may be a source of misunderstanding in diplomacy, but they may also occasionally be a useful source for producing feasible solutions. Characteristically, diplomatic language has its own features, including word choice, phraseology, stylistics, and structures. These key components can be further broken down into sub-components such as accuracy, clarity, intelligibility, transferability, and coherence. Friedrich (2016) reassures us that the language of diplomacy is propelled by five elements: (1) spoken at the right time, (2) spoken in truth, (3) spoken affectionately, (4) spoken beneficially, and (5) spoken in a spirit of goodwill. When something undesirable creeps through these key features, then diplomatic terminology grows problematic and causes uneasiness and misunderstanding; consequently, misinterpretation incurs mistranslation, which in turn can cause the breakdown of diplomacy.

6.2.1. Multiplicity of Terms

One of the common problems in Arabic terminology is rendering a foreign term into Arabic by using multiple terms which in fact describe the same concept. Multiplicity of Arabic terms constitutes a barrier against any development in most fields in the Arab world, especially science and technology. Diplomatic translation is a crucial and sensitive issue, and an accumulation of small mistakes in a translation and failure to grasp intended meanings leads to feelings of mutual distrust. Plurality of Arabic diplomatic terms influences the Arab diplomatic discourse particularly in achieving the purposes of the discourse. Thus, it is a real challenge to overcome linguistic problems in order to avoid misunderstandings in the diplomatic discourse and translation of treaties (Masiola&Tomei, 2015).

Most of the researchers who deal with Arabic terminology identify consistent reasons behind this problem. The problem turns on five pivots: (1) the source language (English/French); (2) the Arabic language; (3) the Arab terminologist or translator; (4) organization or coordination of efforts; and (5) the educational policy.
The influence of two languages (English and French) in the Arab states leads to a diversity among them, which overflows into the terminological work. This influence arises especially when “borrowing” terms as a translation technique. The linguistic diversity in one of the source languages (i.e., British English versus American English) is another cause of multiplicity. A dire lack of competent terminologists and specialized translators in terminological work in the Arab world adds to the existing problems in Arabic terminology. Lack of standardization and coordination among the Arab academies is another key reason. Lastly, a major reason for lack of interest in terminology as a science is, as Darwish (2009) mentions, that most Arab educational institutions adopt a foreign language as the language of instruction.

To illustrate, here are some examples of multiplicity in rendering diplomatic terms from English into Arabic, extracted from the Viennese Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. The English term “exequatur” is commonly related to international law and specifically to the VCDR. Faruqi (2014) presents an Arabic translation of “exequatur” into Arabic as براءة استلام and adds an explanatory note next to the Arabic term for clarification. In other Arabic translations, Fauq-al-ʻĀda (2008) translates it with a more detailed explanation as إجازة قنصلية. This multiplicity cannot be justified; it is really more misleading than helpful.

Arab translators utilize the Arabic terms استيلاء and مصادرة as equivalents to the English term “requisition.” Faruqi (2014) translates “requisition” with استيلاء; while he translates the term “confiscation” with استيلاء and مصادرة, Joriege (2013) translates the Arabic term استيلاء as equivalent to the English term “appropriation” and مصادرة as equivalent to “confiscation.” In congruence, Wahba (2000) translates “requisition” into Arabic with the terms استيلاء and مصادرة, but he specifically translates it as استيلاء when it occurs in a context similar to the ST context. There is clearly interference between the English and Arabic terms.
Darwish (2008) argues that the overuse of synonyms has caused them to lose their subtle nuances, a little-known phenomenon that can explain why Arabic terminology tolerates a high level of multiplicity. This is valid in English as well as in Arabic. However, the problem grows worse when one single word with almost no polysemic sub-senses is translated by two different TT words: “precedence” is rendered alternatively in Arabic dictionaries by four synonymous Arabic terms: أفضلية or أسبقية, أفضليه. When two translations are inconsistent at the word-choice level, this can also be attributed to regional dialect. Another telling example of regional variation is the single word “date”: it can be translated into the eastern Arabic dialect as تاريخ, while in the western Arabic dialect it is أجل and in some other Arabic dialects it is نهاية or مدة.

6.2.1.1 The problem of synonymy

Synonymy is a significant linguistic phenomenon in terminological work. It is a multiplicity of terms, where different terms of the same language are used to convey a single meaning. According to Alsulaiman and Allaithy (2016), synonymy is a source of certain problems in Arabic terminology and translation. Along the same lines, Al-Kasmi (2008) also argues that the semantic richness of synonymy in Arabic can be problematic for both terminology and translation. This is due to the fact that novice translators are not fully aware of how and why synonyms can cause problems in translation. However, Darwish (2009) opposes this deeply ingrained belief; he states that Arabic synonyms are not an exact mirror image of one another. Each lexical item in a synonymous group has a meaning that is slightly distinct from others or has its own subtle nuances. Nida and Taber (1969) state:

Actually, the different meanings of a single word are rarely in competition, for they not only have relatively well-defined markers which help to differentiate the meanings, but so often they are so diverse as not to compete with one another for the same semantic domain. (p. 63).
Synonymy in the source language is a significant issue that should be mentioned here. Arabic has synonyms; so does English. The existence of synonymy *per se* constitutes a burden on translators, but provides a broad space for creativity and maneuverability in selecting the proper equivalents in accordance with the context. Sometimes it is impossible to distinguish between three synonymous words, as in the case with *اتفاقية*, *معاهدة*، and *ميثاق* which are “convention,” “treaty,” “compact,” “charter,” and “agreement”; the three Arabic words are often used interchangeably. According to Faruqi (2014) and Baalbaki (2009), the term “convention” can be translated into Arabic by either *اتفاقية* or *ميثاق*. Surprisingly enough, Joreige (2013) translates “convention” as *اتفاقية* and translates the Arabic term *ميثاق* into English as “charter.”

### 6.2.1.2 The problem of polysemy

Polysemy refers to one term possessing a range of different meanings. It is one of the semantic relationships that holds between languages and gives semantic richness to language. But polysemy *per se* presents one of the most common (but significant) problems in legal translation. Radford et al., (1999) state “Most words are polysemous—they have a range of meanings—and over time marginal meanings may take over from central meanings” (p. 232). Polysemy is considered one of the most common causes of ambiguity (Quiroge-Clare, 2003) and causes difficulties in producing a precise and accurate translation. When a translator is unaware of which is the right sense of the polysemic word, semantic ambiguity arises. According to Ghazala (1995), students may understand the polysemic (or multivalent) word as a monosemic (or univalent) word and translate it into a target language on this basis. Consequently, they may commit serious mistakes. One suggested solution to this problem is to deduce the proper equivalent from the context (Armstrong 2005).

Polysemous terms are abundant in diplomatic terminology. A telling example from the diplomatic document VCDR is the English term “service.” It is polysemous in
that it has many different meanings, such as “the act of serving,” “an administrative division,” or “the act of bringing writ.” In VCDR, Art. 1, f, this term means “an administrative division,” whereas in Art. 35 it means “work for another.” The risk in this translation occurs when “personal services” is rendered into Arabic by the same Arabic word that conveys the sense of “serving.” It would be accurately translated if understood in a way that conveys the intended meaning, which indicates that many countries require residents to render personal services such as taking part in civic guards or militia duties (Sen, 1965).

6.2.2 Inaccuracy in Term Translation

Accuracy is an assessment parameter that focuses on the extent to which a target text (TT) reflects the source text (ST) in terms of content (Palumbo, 2009). Other factors in assessing a translation for communicative purposes are adequacy and acceptability. Along these lines, Gambier and Shlesinger (2007) conducted two-fold analyses: (1) comparative ST-TT analyses aimed at identifying different degrees of TT accuracy; and (2) analyses of the corresponding notes in order to discover whether particular note-taking characteristics correlate with the different degrees of TT accuracy identified through the first analyses (Gambier & Shlesinger, 2007, p. 186). Translators are responsible for not only how to translate, but also for what to translate. Devlin (2003) states that accuracy in translation is a significant requirement of both successful communication and avoidance of unnecessary troubles (p. 111).

Again, if the multiplicity of terms is the most important problem in Arabic terminology, inaccuracy is an important problem as well, in sensitive texts that require zero tolerance. Translation-related accuracy of terms (phrases, or even single words) depends on the clarity of the concept itself. The clearer the concept of a term is in the translator’s mind, the closer the translation will be to pinpoint accuracy. For instance, in Art. 23, 2 of the VCDR, the English term “taxation” was rendered into Arabic as مالي and combined with the preceding term, “exemption,”
into one form, إعفاء مالي, This English term was imprecisely translated and may lead to misunderstanding. It would be much better to regard it as a compound phrase, “tax exemption” which is a common term in the legal field. Joreige (2013) and Baalbaki (2009), in fact, present the Arabic term إعفاء ضريبي as equivalent to the English term “tax exemption”. Another example from the VCDR: the English term “billeting” in Art. 35 of the VCDR is rendered in Arabic as إسكان. Faruqi (2014) and Wahba (2000) both define the term “billeting” the same way إيواء, whereas Joriege (2013) presents a back-translation of إيواء as “sheltering.” The implications of the term “billeting” and its counterpart in Arabic إيواء are related to unusual conditions. The two Arabic terms إيواء and إسكان are synonyms, but the first term is, in the target culture, related to unusual conditions and the other to normal conditions, as explained earlier in the componential analysis of the two words. Consequently, the functional meaning of the term “billeting” in the above context is “providing housing for military personnel” (Fowler et al., 2008). The functional equivalent in Arabic is إيواء, which means “housing people who are affected by disasters and wars.”

Again, translating the ST word “premises” as مباني is not accurate; “premises” also can refer to entities other than buildings, such as parks, gardens, lakes, fountains, fences, and gates. To be accurate, “premises” means مقرات. Another good example of inaccuracy is the mistranslation of “services” in the phrase “exempt diplomatic agents from all personal services ”as تكليف. As seen elsewhere in the VCDR, the ST word “establishment” is mistranslated many times, though the context is clear: “establishment of consular relations” is translated as ممارسة الأعمال القنصلية. Inaccuracy also lies in applying a hypernym-hyponym approach where the mot juste is absolutely required, lest the generic words invite other faulty interpretations. In the VCCR, for instance, the ST phrase “consular fees and charges” is mistranslated by the generic words الرسوم وال المتحصلات القنصلية.

6.2.3 Loan Translation (Calque)
Chesterman (2016) confirms that loan-calque strategy covers borrowing both individual words and syntagma. By definition, loan translation or calque “is a special kind of borrowing, whereby one language borrows an expression from of another, but then translates literally each of its elements” (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995, p. 32). Loan translation is a widely used technique in English–Arabic translation. Darwish (2009) regards this technique as a special type of borrowing, which also carries a certain risk when it is misused. He actually draws attention to this important matter, which is noted in many Arabic-translated terms, especially in scientific and technical terminologies. In this sense, Chironova (2014) regards literal translation as a translation technique, but literalistic translation as a translation error. Some diplomatic terms fall into the category of literalistic translation and cause misunderstanding. A good example to cite from the working corpus is the ST phrase persona non grata. It is mistranslated as شخص غير مقبول, which is not a conventionalized term commonly used in diplomatic discourse; the one most frequently quoted and used is شخص غير مرغوب فيه. Another good loan term borrowed from English is chargés d’affaires: the loan translation mirrors exactly the same ST components: قائم بالأعمال. It is noteworthy that, in this case, the TT displays many loan and calque words, as the SL is more hegemonic over Arabic in diplomatic discourse, including “agency” وكالة, “immunity” حصانة, “the Holy See” الكرسي البابوي, “archives” الأرشيف and “diplomatic bag” حقيبة دبلوماسية. Most of the loan-calque words do not constitute real challenges for translators, perhaps because they are conventionalized and do not tolerate any stylistic modification, or creative, flowery wording.

**6.2.4 Wrong Term Translation**

Incorrect translation of the target terms can stem from two possible reasons: (1) poor analysis of the source terms; or (2) the translator’s incompetence in linguistic and sociocultural issues in both the source and target languages (Chan & Polland, 2001). Translation-related errors can arise from word choice, syntax, or pragmatics,
among other factors. Again, convoluted structures and polysemy can produce erroneous translations. A telling example of a wrong translation is found in VCDR, Art. 35, which states:

The receiving State shall exempt diplomatic agents from all personal services, from all public service of any kind whatsoever, and from military obligations such as those connected with requisitioning, military contributions and billeting.

The English term “obligation” was wrongly rendered into Arabic by أعباء. The best rendering should be التزام. Another example is “billeting,” which was wrongly rendered as إسكان العسكريين. The best rendering is إيواء.

The ST word “discharge” does not necessarily mean الرحل النهائي; it means إنهاء خدمة. Elsewhere, in Art. 10, “final departure” is translated in the same way as “discharge” الرحل النهائي while “termination” is translated as إنهاء أعمال. Even the word الرحيل does not suit diplomatic jargon; although الرحيل, الارتحال, الإرتحال are synonymous, none of these sounds appropriate for diplomatic discourse. Another faulty translation is ad interim, which is translated as بصفة مؤقتة; this implies بصفة مؤقتة because بصفة وقتية does not ring right in diplomatic phraseology.

6.2.5 Ignorance of Terms

Some translators believe that some ST terms or words should be removed from the TT because their meaning can be inferred from the neighboring words. This can be true, but not from legal texts (law, diplomatic, or religious). This is known in translation as a translation error: “a translation error is any fault occurring in a translated text and resulting either from ignorance or from the inadequate application of translation technique or translation strategy” (Palumbo, 2009, p. 125). Errors in translation may be due to inaccuracy in the transfer of the ST content or the wrong choice of the TL alternatives in terms of genre, register, style, and values. As explained earlier, the ST phrase inter alia ضمن أشياء أخرى is ignored. Again, “estate, succession or inheritance duties” ضرائب التركات المستحقة is truncated
or conflated; just one of the three ST words is translated while the two others are ignored. The ST term “a wireless transmitter” has been translated as محطة إرسال بالراديو, which cannot be considered ignorance of the term; it is perhaps a functional equivalent by modulation.

6.2.6 Misuse of Genre and Register

One of the persistent problems cropping up in register and genre is that the translator uses generic words. This can downplay and dilute both the genre and register of diplomatic discourse. Not only does the translator mistranslate the ST word “discharge,” the translator also uses an incorrect word choice that does not suit diplomatic jargon: الرحل. Another grievous error in word choice for the diplomatic genre is render in gad interim as بصفة وقتية. Genre and register play a vital role in translation, and translators should not approach a translation task unless they are fully aware of the genre and register of the working ST and the TT (Riccardi, 2002; Jackson, 2012; Lefer & Vogeleer, 2016). One faulty word choice that does not align with diplomatic discourse is the mistranslation of persona non grata to شخص غير مقبول. Another example that does not suit diplomatic jargon is the translation of “messages in code and cipher” as المواصلات بالرمز بنوعه; the phraseology or wording structure is not couched in a diplomatic tone. Generic English is not much tolerated in diplomatic discourse because of the latter’s high level of style, register, and genre.

7. Recommendations

This paper has put forward a number of key recommendations that are critical to future research relating to terminology and interdisciplinary translation. These wide-ranging recommendations can potentially map out strategic and procedural requirements to further optimize and showcase terminology from and into Arabic and English. The following recommendations could form the bedrock of future studies:
Translation practitioners and hands-on translators rarely or never work in coordination with terminologists. Their overdependence on bilingual and monolingual dictionaries makes them believe that their translation is immaculate and impeccable. Based on the mistranslation highlighted in this corpus-based research study, it is recommended that terminologists should be thoroughly involved before having the translation published.

To avoid inconsistency in translation, the current research study recommends that there should be a translation memory (TM), so that multiplicity can be ruled out or reduced as much as possible. The TM should be circulated and no official or non-official translations should be considered endorsed unless referred to and double checked by the TM.

Terminology and conventionalized terms of translation should be incorporated in translation classes and training courses, at both the undergraduate and the postgraduate levels. This could polish many translational skills, including phraseology, word choice or *mot juste*, formulaic language or idiomatic expressions, clichés, stylistics, and collectability;

Translation mistakes and errors should be black listed. They should be part and parcel of the terminologist’s list of do’s and don’ts for translator trainees to be fully aware of when embarking on translation tasks.

Unfortunately, most often it has been and is still customary for translators to have their translations proofread by language experts but *not* by experts in the field or genre of the translation. The translation of a legal document, for instance, should be double-checked by a language expert as well as a field or specialty expert—in this case, not an articled lawyer but a seasoned barrister. The study highly recommends that the translation should be checked by language and field experts to smooth away any problematic terminology.

Before announcing that the source text of a document has been translated, it should be circulated for approval and should be read by a myriad of expert readers to remove any possible mistakes or errors. This requires meticulous
and painstaking efforts, with many specialists working in coordination with one another.
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0 Introduction

‘Science du traduire’ est notre traduction du groupe de mots anglais ‘science of translating’. Cette traduction n’est peut-être pas celle qu’un lecteur français attend. En France, les termes ‘science de la traduction’ et ‘traductologie’ s’utilisent sans doute plus que ‘science du traduire’. Par prudence, nous avons calqué le groupe de mots anglais ‘science of translating’, un groupe de mots qui est fortement lié à la pratique de la traduction, au traduire (*translating*). Le terme ‘science of translating’ apparaît dans le passage suivant :

Is translating, […], an art or a science? Is it a skill which can only be acquired by practice, or are there certain procedures which can be described and studied? The truth is that practice in translating has far outdistanced theory; and though no one will deny the artistic elements in good translating, linguists and philologists are becoming increasingly aware that the processes of translation are amenable to rigorous description. When we speak of “the science of translating,” we are of course concerned with the descriptive aspect; for just as linguistics may be classified as a descriptive science, so the transference of a message from one language to another is likewise a valid subject for scientific description. (Nida, 1964 : 3)

---

1 Le terme ‘science of translating’ est plus restreint que ‘science of translation’. ‘Science of translating’ porte sur le processus (le traduire, l’activité traduisante). ‘Science of translation’ peut porter sur le produit (le texte traduit, le texte cible) et le processus.
Ce passage est tiré du livre-phare au titre (peut-être un peu trop) programmatique *Toward a Science of Translating* du linguiste, traducteur et ethnologue américain Eugene A. Nida (1914-2011). À notre surprise, le livre n’a pas été traduit en français. Nous sommes donc amenés à traduire nous-mêmes le passage anglais que nous avons cité.

La traduction est-elle, [...] un art ou une science ? Est-ce une compétence qui ne peut être acquise que par la pratique, ou y a-t-il certaines procédures qui peuvent être décrites et étudiées ? La vérité est que la pratique de la traduction dépasse de beaucoup la théorie ; et si personne ne niera la présence d’éléments artistiques dans toute bonne traduction, linguistes et philologues sont de plus en plus conscients que les processus de traduction ne se prêtent pas à la description rigoureuse. Quand nous parlons de « la science du traduire », nous sommes évidemment préoccupés par l’aspect descriptif, car tout comme la linguistique peut être classée comme une science descriptive, le transfert d’un message d’une langue à une autre est également un objet valide pour la description scientifique.

1 Remarques préalables

À partir de ce passage nous ferons quelques remarques sur

- la confusion entre l’objet d’un discours (en l’occurrence, *translating*, le traduire) et le discours sur cet objet (1.1),
- le lien entre description et science (1.2),
- le terme ‘science du traduire’ (‘*science of translating*’) (1.3),
- la définition du terme ‘translating’ (1.4).

1.1 Objet du discours et discours sur l’objet
Il est possible de développer un discours scientifique sur un objet non-scientifique. Cette idée n’a rien de surprenant. L’angoisse, par exemple, est un objet non-scientifique dont on peut parler de façon scientifique. Le discours scientifique sera basé sur des données objectives et vérifiables (rythme cardiaque, température corporelle, tension artérielle etc.). La distinction entre discours et objet vaut aussi pour la traduction. Il faut distinguer scientificité de l’objet ‘traduction’ et scientificité du discours sur la traduction. « La traduction est-elle un art ou une science ? La traduction est-elle une compétence que l’on ne peut acquérir que par la pratique ? », ces questions que Nida pose dans le passage que nous avons cité portent sur l’objet, l’activité traduisante. Nous pouvons nous demander si ces questions sont pertinentes pour la science du traduire.

1.2 Description et science

Une science du traduire qui se limite à la description de processus et de procédures est une science décevante, pauvre, superficielle. La science du traduire devrait aller au-delà de la description. La description mène souvent à une accumulation fastidieuse de données qui nous apprend peu de choses sur la traduction. La science du traduire, qui ne s’appellera peut-être plus ‘science du traduire’, devrait intégrer l’aspect réflexif et critique. La description peut être un point de départ, mais n’est pas un objectif final.

1.3 Science du traduire

Le terme ‘discours de la traduction’ est préférable au terme ‘science du traduire’ (‘science of translating’). Il est plus modeste, permet d’éviter les discussions interminables sur la scientificité et invite à approcher l’objet ‘traduction’ de façons différentes et variées. Nous songeons par exemple aux approches
philosophiques et psychanalytiques de la traduction, qui n’auront sans doute pas de place dans la science du traduire telle qu’elle est conçue par Nida. Nida utilise le terme ‘science’ dans un sens restreint : la science est la science descriptive. La science descriptive prétend à l’objectivité. Cette prétention est discutable puisque toute description est teintée de subjectivité, est marquée par le regard du scientifique.

Nous venons d’utiliser le terme ‘discours de la traduction’. Ce terme devrait se distinguer du terme ‘discours sur la traduction’. Les discours sur la traduction portent souvent sur les personnes impliquées dans l’activité traduisante – l’auteur, le lecteur, le traducteur, l’éditeur – et risquent d’oublier l’élément le plus important : la traduction, le texte cible. Les discours sur la traduction passent souvent à côté de l’essentiel. Le discours de la traduction par contre est un discours traductif, un discours qui se concentre sur la traduction même, un discours qui s’intéresse à l’essence de la traduction.

Dans cette optique la question pourrait se poser de savoir si les exemples que nous venons de donner (les approches philosophiques et psychanalytiques de la traduction) nous mettent sur la bonne voie. Le discours de la traduction devrait être un discours traductif, un discours spécifique qui se démarque d’autres discours sur la traduction. Le discours de la traduction devrait se distinguer des discours linguistique, littéraire, politique, sémiotique, sociologique… sur la traduction.

1.4 Définition du terme ‘translating’

‘Translating’ est, selon Nida, ‘the transference of a message from one language to another’, ‘le transfert d’un message d’une langue à une autre’. Cette définition du traduire, n’est-elle pas trop étroite ? Quelles places la forme, le style occupent-
ils dans l’approche de Nida ? La définition de Nida est basée sur une présupposition discutable : Le message est un invariant, un élément qui ne se modifie pas lors du transfert d’une langue à une autre. On pourrait se demander si tout message n’est pas nécessairement imprégné de la langue dans laquelle le message est formulé. Selon nous, le lien inextricable entre message et langue cause inévitablement des modifications lors du transfert d’une langue à une autre.

2 Un passage scientifique ?

Après ces remarques préalables, nous pointons quelques éléments dans le passage que nous avons cité. Il s’agit, selon nous, de trois éléments qui pourraient entraver la scientificité du passage :

- Le groupe de mots ‘the truth is’ dans la phrase ‘The truth is that practice in translating has far outdistanced theory; […]’. Nous pouvons nous demander d’où vient cette vérité ? S’agit-il vraiment d’une vérité ? Cette proposition est-elle scientifiquement vérifiable ?
- L’adjectif ‘rigorous’ dans le groupe de mots ‘rigorous description’. Quels sont les critères pour une description rigoureuse ? Qui décide de la rigueur de la description ?
- Le groupe de mots ‘of course’ dans la phrase ‘When we speak of “the science of translating,” we are of course concerned with the descriptive aspect; […]’. Ce groupe de mots a une fonction rhétorique. Sa fonction n’est pas de faire savoir, mais de faire croire. Il sert à renforcer la position de l’auteur et à emporter l’adhésion du lecteur.

Peut-on utiliser ces éléments dans un texte scientifique ? Que fait le traducteur avec des éléments pareils ? Peut-il les omettre afin de garantir la scientificité du
texte ? Est-il permis de « scientifiser » le texte original ou faut-il plutôt préserver les éléments rhétoriques ?

3 Science du traduire et traduction scientifique

La science du traduire n’est peut-être pas le premier domaine auquel on pense en entendant le terme ‘traduction scientifique’. Mais selon nous les compétences requises pour traduire des textes traductologiques et des textes portant sur d’autres domaines scientifiques sont les mêmes. Le traducteur scientifique est un spécialiste en langues et un spécialiste du domaine. Les textes traductologiques ont cependant une caractéristique absente des autres textes scientifiques. Ils parlent explicitement de la traduction. Le traducteur d’un texte traductologique se regarde dans le miroir et se demandera sans doute dans quelle mesure son activité traduisante devra s’adapter au discours sur la traduction développé dans le texte qu’il est en train de traduire. Afin de concrétiser cette idée, nous l’appliquons au passage anglais que nous avons cité et traduit en français au début de cet article.

4 Traduire un passage traductologique

Ce passage est tiré du livre Toward a Science of Translating, livre dans lequel se développe un discours sur la traduction. Ce discours se résume souvent et sans doute un peu trop rapidement au terme d’ ‘équivalence dynamique’ : la traduction devrait avoir le même effet sur les lecteurs de la traduction qu’a eu l’original sur les lecteurs du texte original. Le principe de l’équivalence dynamique est sans doute un beau principe, un principe attrayant au premier abord, mais il est difficilement applicable. L’effet sur les lecteurs est souvent une idée que le traducteur se construit, une idée liée au sujet qui traduit. Mesurer de façon objective, scientifique l’effet réel sur les lecteurs demande des techniques
spécifiques. Nous songeons par exemple à la technique de l’*eye tracking* (suivi du mouvement des yeux).

En outre, la question se pose de savoir si les lecteurs forment un groupe homogène. Qui sont les lecteurs de *Toward a Science of Translating* ? Qui sont les lecteurs potentiels d’une traduction française qui se fera peut-être un jour ?

**5 Sous-titre**

*Toward a Science of Translating* est le titre du livre qui est au centre de cet article. À ce titre s’ajoute un sous-titre : *with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Il est remarquable que ‘science du traduire’ et ‘traduction biblique’ sont liées. Ce lien n’est-il pas dangereux ? Objet du discours et discours sur l’objet sont en principe deux choses différentes, mais on ne peut pas exclure que le discours soit influencé par l’objet du discours. Les motifs de la traduction biblique ne sont presque jamais purement scientifiques. La propagation de la foi pourrait être un motif de la traduction biblique. Un motif pareil ne risque-t-il pas d’entraîner la scientificité du projet de Nida ? La traduction biblique n’est-elle pas une embûche sur le chemin vers la science ?

**6 Textes scientifiques et textes religieux**

Nous essayons de donner une réponse à ces questions en nous basant sur un autre passage tiré de *Toward a Science of Translating*, dans lequel Nida distingue la traduction scientifique de la traduction religieuse :

>The dangers of subjectivity in translating are directly proportionate to the potential emotional involvement of the translator in the message. For scientific prose such involvement is usually at a minimum, but in religious texts it may be rather great,
since religion is concerned with the deepest and most universal value systems.
(Nida, 1964 : 155)

Les dangers de la subjectivité dans la traduction sont directement proportionnels à l’implication émotionnelle potentielle du traducteur dans le message. Pour la prose scientifique une telle implication est généralement minimale, mais dans les textes religieux, elle peut être assez grande, puisque la religion est concernée par les systèmes de valeur les plus profonds et les plus universels.

Selon Nida, la distance entre le texte et le traducteur est plus grande dans le domaine scientifique que dans le domaine religieux. Nous reprenons cette idée, qui nous paraît défendable, pour questionner le choix du domaine qui sert de base à Toward a Science of Translating. Ne serait-ce pas plus prudent de construire une science du traduire en se référant à un domaine dans lequel l’implication du traducteur est moins grande que dans le domaine religieux ? Subjectivité de la traduction et subjectivité du discours sur la traduction sont en principe deux choses différentes. Mais la subjectivité de la traduction biblique pourrait influencer l’objectivité de la science du traduire.2

7 Langage scientifique

Nous avons commenté deux passages tirés de Toward a Science of Translating. Nous terminerons cet article en lisant deux autres passages qui incitent à se poser des questions3.

---

2 Mao, Gu et Liang (2012) font quelques remarques sur le lien entre religion et science dans leur article ‘Commentary on Nida vs. Chomsky’s Translation Theories’.

Scientific and technical language, […], is a specialized development in societies which have become intellectually aware of their own experience (activities, perceptions, and conceptions). (Nida, 1964 : 222)

Le langage scientifique et technique, […], est un développement spécialisé dans les sociétés qui sont devenues intellectuellement conscientes de leur propre expérience (activités, perceptions et conceptions).

If, however, the translation of scientific texts from one language to another participating in modern cultural development is not too difficult, it is not surprising that the converse is true – that translating scientific material from a modern Indo-European language into a language largely outside the reach of Western science is extremely difficult. (Nida, 1964 : 223)

Si, cependant, la traduction de textes scientifiques d’une langue à une autre langue qui participe au développement culturel moderne n’est pas trop difficile, il n’est pas surprenant que l’inverse soit vrai – que la traduction de matériel scientifique à partir d’une langue indo-européenne moderne dans une langue largement en dehors de la portée de la science occidentale soit extrêmement difficile.

La combinaison ‘Western’ – ’science’ est intéressante⁴. La question est de savoir si la science doit nécessairement être occidentale. N’y a-t-il pas de science en dehors de l’Occident ? Le concept de ‘science’ de Nida n’est-il pas imprégné d’ethnocentrisme ?

8 Conclusion

---

⁴ Le terme ‘Western science’ apparaît aussi à la page 152 de Toward a Science of Translating.
Toward a Science of Translating est un livre indispensable pour tout traductologue, un livre qui fournit la base pour le développement d’un discours sur la traduction. Le livre de Nida n’est évidemment pas le seul à fournir cette base ; deux autres livres publiés à la même époque, Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction de Mounin (1963) et A Linguistic Theory of Translation de Catford (1965), sont eux aussi des livres fondateurs.

En résumé, malgré les qualités évidentes de Toward a Science of Translating, quelques aspects du livre nous paraissent problématiques : les éléments rhétoriques, le choix du domaine religieux et la conception ethnocentrique de la science.
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الترجمة الشفهية: تاريخها وأنواعها
(Heidi Salaets)
جامعة لوفان في بلجيكا

1.

الترجمة الشفهية:

ليس بمعنى مهنة الترجمة الشفهية (Translation) مماثلة للمترجمة التحريرية (Interpreting)، فمنحنى هنا إزار مهنتين مختلفتين كليًا تتقابلا في جوانب وتفترقان في جوانب أخرى. إضافة فرعان من فروع علم اللغة التطبيقية يشكلان معا - أو بالأحرى - يُشار إليهما معًا بمصطلح "علم الترجمة" (Translation Studies).

إن الترجمة الشفهية أقدم من الترجمة التحريرية وأسبق منها ظهورًا وممارسة، ذلك لأن أنظمة الكتابة التي تطورت في وقت متأخر نسبيًا وأوائل الألفية الرابعة قبل الميلاد، بينما اللغة قديمة قدم الإنسان.

يقول ابن منظور في "ترجمان"5: "الترجمان، بالضم والفتح، هو الذي يترجم الكلام أي ينقله من لغة أخرى، وأجمع الترجم: اللعن، ومنه الشيطان الرجيم... والرجم: القول بالظن والحدس... وراجم عن قومه: ناضل عنهم". وقول ابن دريد6: "ورجم الرجل بالغيب، إذا كتب كلمته بما لا يعلم. وأرجم الرجل عن قومه، إذا ناضل عليهم... والراجم: قبح الكلام؛ ترجم القدم، ترجم القوم بينهم مراجم قبيحة، أي بكلمات قبيحة".

وباستقراء الجذر /رجم/ في اللغات الجزائرية يتبين أن معناه الأصلي "الكلام، المناداة، الصباح، القول الغريب، التواصل". فكلمة "نُرجم" في الأكدادية، وهي أقدم اللغات الجزائرية تدونيا، مشتقة فيها من الجذر /رجم/، واللغة واللغة واللغة زيادتان، أما في الأوغاريتية فيعني الجذر /رجم/ في هما "الكلام" بشكل عام، والمعين غالب للمجذر /رجم/ في العربية هو القول بالغيب و telefon والكلام غير المفهوم أو غير الدقيق. وقيل أهل التفسير إن "الرجم" هو السباب. فالرجم هو "المشتوم المسبوب". ويفسرون قوله تعالى "لئن لم تكن له أركانك" أي "أركانك". وبين السباب والكلام غير المفهوم حكى رفع لن تتوقف عنده الآن، بل تكتفي منه بالاستنتاج بأن "الرجم" فعل لساني أي كلام وليس غير ذلك.

إذن: المعنى التشتقائي الأصلي للاسم /ترجمان/ ولفعل /ترجم/ هو "الكلام غير المحدد". فهو "الصباح" في الأكدادية و"الكلام والقول" في الأوغاريتية "الظن والسبب والشتم والترجم أي التراشق بالكلام" في العربية. وعندية أن "الكلام غير المحدد" بمعنى "كلاما غير محدد" حتى اليوم لأن معنى "الترجمان" الأول هو المترجم الشفهي الذي يتترجم كلاما

5 ابن منظور (بدون تاريخ). لسان العرب. بيروت، (مادة /ترجم/).
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي الذي نقلته. لذا، لا يمكنني تقديم نسخة بسيطة أو ترجمة خاطئة من النص العربي المذكور.

(نقطة: سعيد بن يوسف القوفي (1893-1899).)
لقد دخلت كلمة (ترجمان) اللغات الأوربية في القرن السادس عشر وكانت وقتها تشير إلى الترجمان الذي كان يعمل لدى السلطان العثماني للترجمة بينه وبين الأوروبيين. وللكلمة في اللغات الأوربية أشكال كثيرة تقتصر الآن على ذكر Drogman وDragoman، واللغية الإسبانية تجا معها Trujamán، واللغية الفرنسية تجا معها Drogman وDrogman وTruchman وTrucheman وDragoman observable. ول اللغات الأوربية كما تقدم.

إذن معنى الترجمة الشفهية سابق لمعنى الترجمة التحريرية كما نرى من هذا التأصيل للكلمة، وهذا ثابت في آثار الأكاديين والسريان والعرب كما يستشف من قول عوف بن محَلم:

إنَّ اللَّهُمَّانِ وَبِـْلىَعُتُهَا = قد أحْوَجَتْ سََعي إلى تُرْجمُان

ومن قول أبي الطيب المتنبي:

مَعْانٍ الشَّعب طَبِيبًا في المغاني = بمثله الربع من الَّزَّمَانَ.
ولكنَّ الفَنِّي العربيّ فيها = غريب الوجه والمسان:
ملعب جَنَّةِ لو سَارَ فيها = سليمان نَسَى بُترُجمُان

وقال أيضاً قول الراجز:

وَمَنْهَل وَرَدَتُهُ التِقاطا = لم ألقَ، إذ وَرَدْتُه، فَرَاطَا
إِلَى الحَمَامِ الوُرْقَ والغطاطا = فَهُنَّ يُلْغِطنَ به إلغاطا
كالترمُجُانُ أَقْفَيْ أَنياطا٨

وقد نظم اليهود اليوم الفرق بين الترجمة التحريرية والترجمة الشفهية بأن استعراوا أو بالأحرى اشتقوا اليوم من الأصل (ترجم/ترجم) كلمة (حالزاه = مترَّجِم) بناء على الاشتقاق العربي لها وذلك للدلالة على (الترجم التحريري/translator)، وأضافوا لكلمة (ترجمان) السابقة (م) لتصبح (حالزان = مترَّجِمْ) وذلك للدلالة على (الترجم الشفوي/interpreter)، واحتفظوا بالكلمة القديمة (حالزاه = مترَّجِمْ) للدلالة على الأصل التاريخي للكلمة!

8 انظر ابن منظور (ب الدين تاريخ). لسان العرب. بيروت (مادة (ترجم/ترجمة).
وأول من مارس مهنة الترجمة في التاريخ هم الأكاديون الذين اضطروا إلى ترجمة بعض المصطلحات السومرية المرتبطة
ارتباكًا وثيقًا بالكتابة المسمارية التي اخترعونها السومريون، فترجموها إلى لغتهم الأكادية. فالتوصل الأكادي السومري
هو أقدم تواصل لغوي في تاريخ التدوين الإنساني، ذلك أن السومرية أقدم لغة بشرية دُوّنت فيما تناهى إلينا (3200
قبل الميلاد) وأن الأكاديون أزاحوه (2900 قبل الميلاد) وحلوا محلهما في حكم بلاد الرافدين حيث بنا دونهم
الاكادية البابلية، وما أن السومريون هم الذين اخترعوا الكتابة المسمارية، أقدم كتابة في التاريخ المعروف، وأول من
وضع أسس علم الإدارة والسياسية، فقد أخذ عنه الأكاديون ذلك عندما أزاحوه عن الحكم وحلوا محلهم،
ماما اضطرهم إلى ترجمة علومهم وعمالاتهم ومصطلحات حضارتهم. وما حفظ الدهر لنا من أوابد الأكاديون ألا ما
تحتوي على مسارة لغوية باللغتين السومرية والاكادية هي أقدم ما يلف في هذا المجال. وهكذا نرى أن علم الترجمة
ولد مع أقدم حضارتين نشأتا في الشرق، وأن علم صناعة المعجم ولد مع علم الترجمة، وأنه ظل يلازمه حتى اليوم!

وعلوه فإن (Dragoman) العربية العبرية البابلية، الفارسية التركية الكردية، اليونانية اللاتينية الروسية، الألمانية الفرنسية
الإنكليزية، كلمة ليست كثيرة في الترجمة، ذلك لأنها مصطلح يعود في أقدم تدوين له – أي بصورة الأكادية –
إلى مطلع الألفية الثالثة قبل الميلاد، حيث بدأ في ظهرة الترجمة. إنها مصطلح يختصر خمسة آلاف سنة من تاريخ
الترجمة المدون، ويرمز إلى تواصل لغوي بين الأمم الشرقية والغربية غاية في الغنى، وإلى تلاقح ثقافي وفتح على الأخر
غاية في الثراء.

2. أنواع الترجمة الشفهية:

1. الترجمة التتبعية القصيرة:

يراد بالترجمة التتبعية القصيرة ترجمة الكلام القصير نسبيًا المتكون من جمل وعبارات قصيرة يتفوها بما شابثا ثم يتوقف
كي يترجمها الترجمان ثم يبتسين الكلام ثم يتوقف من جديد. كي يترجمه الترجمان. وغالبًا ما يكون هذا النوع من
الترجمة الشفهية من عبارات وجمل قصيرة يترجمها الترجمان بالاعتماد على ذاكرته بدون تدوم على الورق لقصر
العبارات والجمل التي يترجمها.

تكون الترجمة التبعية القصيرة في اتجاه واحد، كأن يتحدث مستية أو شخص يمد معلومات للجمهور، فيترجمها
الترجمان للجمهور دون عودة إلى المتحدث. ويمكن أن تكون في اتجاهين ثم مثل الترجمة التبعية التي تكون في
المحاكم ومنحدر الواردات الرسمية.

2. الترجمة التبعية الطويلة:

يراد بالترجمة التبعية الطويلة ترجمة جمل وعبارات طويلة يتفوها بما شابثا ثم يتوقف كي يترجمه الترجمان ثم يستأنف
الكلام ثم يتوقف من جديد. كي يترجمه الترجمان. وغالبًا ما يكون هذا النوع من الترجمة الشفهية من مقاطع طويلة

128
يترجمها الترجمان بالاعتماد على نظام اصطلاحي للتدوين باستخدام أدوات الكتابة من قلم وورق وما أشبه ذلك فيختصر العبارات والجمل التي يسمعها ويدونها مستخدماً لذلك الرموز والاختصارات المصطلح عليها في أنظمة التدوين (وسنفرد لذلك مقالة مخصصة في المستقبل).

تكون الترجمة التبعية الطويلة في اتجاه واحد، كأن يلقي أحدهم كلمة فيترجمها الترجمان للجمهور دون عودة إلى المتحدث. ويمكن أن تكون في اتجاهين أثنين مثل الترجمة التبعية التي تكون في المحاكم وفي الأدارات الرسمية أو في مراكز التعليم والتدريب.

3.2 الترجمة الفورية:

يراد بالترجمة الفورية ما يفهم من كلمة فورية، أي الترجمة الآنية، أي في الوقت نفسه الذي يتكلم فيه المتكلم المارد ترجمة كلامه إلى لغة أخرى غير تلك التي ينطق بها كلامه. ومع ذلك فإنه لا يمكن التسلسليم بأن الترجمة تكون آنية بالفعل، لأنها زمنًا قصيرة يفصل بين كلام المتكلم وترجمة الترجمان، يطلق عليه في علم الترجمة الشفهية (décalage)، ذلك أن الترجمان بدأ بترجمة الكلام الذي يسمعه بعدما يعالجها في ذهنه ثم ينتجه باللغة المترجم إليها، وهذا لا يكون فوريًا. فالترجمان الفوري لا يستطيع التحدث من عندياته، إنما يحتاج إلى المعلومة كي يترجمها. وأحيانًا لا تكمل المعلومة إلا بعدما يطرح المتحدث جملة عديدة، فيضطر الترجمان إلى الانتظار كي تكتمل المعلومة في ذهنه. وكلما كان المعلومة معقدًا، كلما طال الانتظار الترجمان كي تكتمل المعلومة أو الفكرة في ذهنه قبل أن يترجمها.

وغالبًا ما تكون الترجمة الفورية في المؤتمرات والندوات فيجلس الترجمان في غرفة تحتوي على الأجهزة اللازمة للترجمة الفورية. من ثمة تسمية الترجمة الفورية "ترجمة المؤتمرات" أيضًا. وتعتبر الترجمة الفورية أصعب أنواع الترجمة الشفهية لأنها تحتاج إلى (1) علم واسع باللغتين اللغة المنقول منها واللغة المنقول إليها، و(2) وعدد كبير جدًا من المفردات والمصطلحات باللغتين اللغة المنقول عنها واللغة المنقول إليها، و(3) ذاكرة قوية، و(4) رباطة جأش وحصانة ضد ضغط العمل لتحمل ظروفه الصعبة.

ومن قواعد الترجمة الفورية: أن يتعاون عليها ترجمانان أثنان يتناوبان على الترجمة كل نصف ساعة، لأن الترجمة الفورية الأكثر من نصف ساعة ترهق الترجمان فيفقد الدقة في الترجمة. ومن قواعدها أيضًا أن يحصل الترجمان على نص الخطبة أو المشاركة أو الكلام الذي يلقيه المتحدث في المؤتمر لدرسه واستخراج مصطلحاته الصعبة وتلاوته عند حدوث خلل في الأداء لاستبدال ذلك الخلل. وهذا يفترض على المتحدث الذي يلقي كلمة أن ينظم بالنص ولا يخرج عن هي.

ومن مصاعب الترجمة الفورية الإرتجال والاستشهاد بالشعر أو بعضوي دينية، فهذه لا تترجم فوريًا لصعوبتها، وينبغي على المتحدث ترجمة الترجمان بما قبل الشروع في الحديث.
4.2 الترجمة الهمسية:

الترجمة الهمسية ضرب من الترجمة الفورية إلا أنها تكون في سياقات معينة كالترجمة لمسؤول أو رئيس أو ملك، فيجلس الترجمان بالقرب من المتجموم إليه وهمهن الترجمة همما في أذهنه. وقد تكون أيضًا في سياقات أخرى كالترجمة ل الجنرال أو الرئيس في طوالام مونوميني من عشيرة أشخاص على الأكثر يتوضئهم ترجمان يهمس لهم الترجمة همما دون أن يؤثر أداؤه على الجالسين إلى الطالبات المذكرة أو على المتحدث.

وإذا كان النظافة واللباقية مطلوبتان من المترجمين وغيرهم في أثناء العمل على الدوام، فإن الترجمان أحيوان ما يكون إليهما في هذا الضرب من الترجمة، خصوصًا إذا كان يترجم لأولي الأمر والموضوعين، فهذا يتطلب نظافة ولباقة وأدبًا جميًا.

5.2: الترجمة من الورقة:

اختلاف الترجمة من الورقة (à vue) عن أنواع الترجمة الشفهية المذكورة أعلاه كون مصدرها نصًا مكتوبًا وليس كلامًا. وغالبًا ما يكون مصدر هذا الضرب من الترجمة الشفهية نصًا يحتوي على معلومات يُراد ترجمتها لشخص ما، أو مجموعة من الأشخاص، أو محضرًا قضائيًا يُبنى على شخص تتم التحقيق معه في قضية ما، أو تقريرًا الج. ولعل أكثر أنواع هذه الترجمة ورودًا هو محضر التحقيق عند الشرطة، إذ يُطلب من المتجموم أن يترجم للمخوَّق معه أو المنهم أو الشاهد نص أقواله وتصريحاته، فيقوم المتجموم في هذه الحالة بقراءة النص وترجمته شفهًا إلى المعين في الأمر.

6.2 الترجمة التنصتية:

إن نوعية الترجمة الشفهية في المحاكم ولدى أجهزة الشرطة في تحسن مستمر بفضل المشاريع الأوربية التي تهدف إلى التحسين من مستوى الخدمة المقدمة للمتهمين الأجانب من جهة وتمكن القضاة من القيام بهمهم على أكمل وجه من جهة أخرى. وهذا ما جعل ترجمة التنصت على المكالمات الرافضة ("الترجمة التنصتية") = "wiretap translation" تزدهر في السنوات الأخيرة لأما وسيلة ناجعة جدًا في محاولة الجرم المنظمة.

إن الترجمة التنصتية تترجم معقدة جداً ومكلفة جداً بسبب مصادرها الكثيرة، وتتطلب مهارات لغوية (شفوية وتحريرية) وثقافية واسعة. لذلك تقرر إدخال الترجمة التنصتية في مناهج إعداد المترجمين التحريبيين والشفهيين معاً عمليًا لتنظيمها بعد بقائها لسنوات عديدة خارج مناهج التدريس نظرًا للمنافسة البوليسية والقضائي الذي تتم هذه الترجمة فيه.
تمر الترجمة التنصتية في الغرب عبر مراحل ثلاث: (1) الاستماع إلى المكالمة الهاتفية الجارية بلغة أجنبية وتلخيص مضمونها، (2) ترجمة النص المنقحر إلى اللغة المنقولة إليها. لذلك تحتاج إلى مهارات تحريرية وشفهية ونصية، و(3) ترجمة النص المنقهر إلى اللغة المنقولة إليها. لذلك تحتاج إلى مهارات تحريرية وشفهية ونصية. وتنتمي المهارات النصية في هذا السياق إلى القدرة على نقحرة النص الشفهي وتدوينه وتحويله إلى نص دون التفريط بأي من عناصر التواصلية ومنها العناصر العاطفية أو العناصر غير الشفهية كتلوين الصوت والنبر وما إلى ذلك من عناصر تواصلية تُؤدى عبر الصوت.

المراجع

ابن منظور (بدون تاريخ). لسان العرب. بيروت: دار صادر.

سعود بن يوسف الفيومي (1893-1899). تفسير التوراة بالعربية. تحقيق يوسف ديرنبورغ. باريس. الكتاب مطبع بالعنوان الفيلسفي:


وسائط الذاكرة الجمعية ووظائفها

زهرير سوكاح

مقدمة

تشهد الساحة الفكرية والثقافية في الغرب اهتماما منقطع النظير بما يعرف بـ "دراسات الذاكرة" (memory studies)، وتعد دراسات الذاكرة البنيوية، التي تتبنى من "الذاكرة" الإنسانية، في بُعدها الاجتماعي والجماعي، موضوعا رئيسيا لها تطورا وتطبقا، وذلك يهدف فهم علاقتها المتداخلة مع مختلف الظواهر الاجتماعية، التي تُقسم باختصار، الدراسة الإنسانية والاجتماعية بُعيدة الطبيعة لدرجة أنه لا توجد تجربة خُصية استطاعت إعادة استرجاع ذلك التراب الكلاسيكي القديم بين العلوم الإنسانية - الاجتماعية والعلوم الطبيعية مثلما فعلته تجربة "الذاكرة".

1. ما الذاكرة "الجمعية"؟

يُعد التفاعل مع تجربة الذاكرة من أقدم الاهتمامات الفكرية للإنسان، ويتضح في تاريخ الفيلسوفية اليونانية13 نماذج على هذا الاهتمام، حيث أشارت الدراسة في أفقها الفردية لكومنا من المميزات الشخصية للفرد، وهو الموقف الذي تتبناه العلوم الاجتماعية والدراسات الدراسات الاجتماعية في عددها إلى بدايات القرن الماضي، لكن أهم تعاطي علمي مع الذاكرة كظاهرة جمعية وموضوعية، لم يبرز إلا في العقود الأخيرة من القرن العشرين بعد إعادة اكتشاف نصوص عالم الاجتماع الفرنسي موريس هالبفاكس Maurice Halbwachs من ظاهرة الذاكرة الجمعية14، فبخلاف التصورات السائدة في عصره، والذي كانت تُعرَف الذاكرة على أنه عملية داخلية، وبلا تدخل بيئة مخصصة، شدد هالبفاكس على الإطار الاجتماعي لعملية الذاكرة الفردية، والتي تمتلك لها مكانة ضمن المنظومة الاجتماعية كنتيجة طبيعية لتفاعل الفرد مع محيطه الاجتماعي؛ فعن طريق الحوار مع الآخر.

12 لمزيد حول مفهوم الذاكرة الجمعية، ينظر:
13 زهير سوكاح، "الدراسات الذكورية وتتطوريها في ميدان العلوم الإنسانية"، مجلة دراجومان، الجمعية الدولية
لمترجمي العربية، المجلد 3، العدد 5، 2015، ص 128-140، هنا ص 128.
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(مثلًا: مع أفراد الأسرة أو الأصدقاء أو غيرهم) يتمكن المرء من تذكر مخاطب وتجارب هامة في حياته، مستخلصاً أن عملية التذكر الفردية لا يمكن أن تنشأ أو أن تتحقق إلا ضمن إطار اجتماعي معين، ذلك أن هذا الإطار الاجتماعي، الذي ينشئه ثقة مجتمع ما، يسهم على تأسس نسق جمعي يجعل الحزات والتجارب الذاتية للفرد قابلة للفالح ولفيال بصورة جمعية. وتستفي هاليفاكس هذا النسق التذكري الجمعي بـ "الذاكرة الجمعية"، وهي في تصوري شرط لا محيد عنه لوجود هذه الجماعة نفسها، حيث أنها تؤسس موطنتها عبر فعل التذكر الجمعي، وهنا نلاحظ ربط هاليفاكس بين الذاتية وال투وية، معتبرًا أن التذكرة الجمعية ما هي إلا نتيجة لتكوين مشترك للنواحي الخاص بهذه الجماعة، فما يتم استجوابه على هذا المستوى ما فوق الفردي، ما هو بالأساس إلا استجابة لمصالح ورغبات جمع معين أو جمعية معينة، والمشاركة التذكرية- الجمعية تعني أن المشاركون ينتهيون إليها إلى هذه الجمع أو هذه الجماعة.

على ضوء هذا، فالذاكرة الجمعية مجتمع أو جماعة، هي في الأساس تعبير هوياتي عن سياق مجتمعي؛ ذلك أن الذاكرة الجمعية لا تستحضر صور طبق الأصل للماضي بشكل عشوائي أو عفوي، وهذه ما يلخصه هاليفاكس بقوله: "الذاكرة لا تقوم بإعادة إحياء الماضي، بل تقوم بإعادة بناءه وتشكله في زمن الحاضر [...]. التذكر هو عملية إعادة بناء الماضي مساعدة الحاضر." وفقاً لسيما لهاليفاكس، "الذاكرة الجمعية على ألوان: "ما يبقى من الماضي في الحياة التي تعيشها المجموعات، أو ما تفعله هذه المجموعات بالماضي، وهذا يظهر جليًا أن إعادة تجنب ما يبقى من الماضي تفترض استخدام وسائط مشتركة تنتمي إلى النسيان، وتجعل بالنهاية للذكر الجمعي، مثل الحوار بين أفراد الأسرة حول أحداث ماضية، غیر أن وسائط الذاتية أشمل وأعم، وهذا ما يجعل البحث الذاركاني يهتم كثيراً بالتقنيات لاستخدام وسائط في محاولة لفهم ميكانيزما الذاركية ووظائفها الهوياتية على الصعيد الوفري الجمعي معاً جعل الباختة الألمانية أستريد إل تعتبر أن البحث الذاركاني هو أيضاً في نفس الوقت بحث في الوسائط.
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أكلا غوف، التاريخ والذاكرة، ترجمة جمال شحيد، لبنان: المركز العربي للأبحاث ودراسة السياسات 2017، ص162.
أكلا غوف، التاريخ والذاكرة، ترجمة جمال شحيد، لبنان: المركز العربي للأبحاث ودراسة السياسات 2017، ص162.
2. ما "وسائط" الذاكرة الجمعية؟

يظهر مما سبق أن الوسائط الاستذكارية هي أدوات لا تسمح بالربط بين المتذكر وذكرياته الذاتية فحسب، بل تسهم على إكساب التذكر الفردي بعده الجمعي ومن ثم الثقافة والحضارة؛ فالذكريات الفردية لا تصدر مشتركة، أي جمعية ومنتسبة لثقافة معينة، إلا إذا تم تثبيتها عبر وسائط ذاكرية، حيث تصدر لها أهمية ثقافية جمعية، وهذا ما يتحقق بشكل واضح في الحوارات كما أشار إلى ذلك هالبفاكس، أو في المقابلات مع شهود عيان حول واقع أو حدث معيين، حيث تحولو التجارب الفردية إلى جزء مكون من التذكر الجمعي. وفي المقابل لا يتمكن الفرد من الوصول إلى المعرفة الذكورية لمجتمعه إلا عبر هذه الوسائط الاستذكارية، أي عبر التواصل، كما ترى إرل، مضيفة أن بما أن تذكر واقع ماضٍ ليس في نفس الوقت صورة حقيقية عنه، بل هو الأساس إعادة بناء نشط للحاضر عن طريق تذكر الماضي، فإن هذا يظهر أهمية معرفة تلك الوسائط في عمليات بناء الحاضر انطلاقا من تجارب الماضي واستحضاره.

مبدئيا يمكن تعريف الوسائط بأنها أنظمة تتوسط بين العالم الداخلي والخارجي وتربط بين البعدين الفردي والجماعي للتذكر; يتعين أن تكون هذه الوسائط لا يمكن للفرد المشاركة والتعاون مع محيطه الاجتماعي على المستوى الذكري.

وفي المقابل لا يمكن للجمعية أن تكون الوسائط الاستذكارية، أي عبر التواصل، كما ترى إرل، مضيفة أنه بما أن تذكر واقع ماضٍ ليس في نفس الوقت صورة حقيقية عنه، بل هو الأساس إعادة بناء نشط للحاضر عن طريق تذكر الماضي، فإن هذا يظهر أهمية معرفة تلك الوسائط في عمليات بناء الحاضر انطلاقا من تجارب الماضي واستحضاره.

3. أنماط الوسائط الذاكرية

بما أن تاريخ الذاكرة الجمعية هو أيضا تاريخ وسائطه، فقد اهتم الباحث الذكوري بفحص العلاقة التاريخية العميقة بين الذاكرة ووسائطها عبر محاولة إعادة تقسيمها في الذاكرة الجمعية.

25 تقابل مفردة "وسط" (جمعها وسائط) في اللغات الأوربية ما يلي: بالإنجليزية medium، والألمانية medium، والفرنسية médium.
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في هذا السياق يتحدث لوروا غورهان Leroi-Gourhan عن خمس مراحل تاريخية لوسائط الذاكرة الجمعية، وهي:

1. مرحلة النقل الشفوي
2. مرحلة النقل الكليبي المستندة إلى جداول وفهارس
3. مرحلة البطاقات البسيطة
4. مرحلة التدوين الآلي
5. مرحلة التسجيل الإلكتروني.

أما جاك لوغوف فيتحدث في كتابه "التاريخ والذاكرة" (Storia e memori) عن خمسة مراحل لتاريخ وسائط النذكر، وهي: الشفاهة، الكتابة، الطباعة، الصور، والحاسوب. ويشكك أكثر نفسيلا يقدم لنا التقسيم التالي لوسائط الذاكرة، كما هو مبين في الجدول أدناه:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gudehus/ Eichenberg/Welzer</th>
<th>وسائط الذاكرة الجمعية حسب</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الكتابة، المطبعة، فنون الذاكرة، الطباقس الاجتماعية، المنتجات، فن العمارة، الأراضي، المكتبات، المتحف، النصب التذكارية والتماثيل، أماكن الذاكرة، الأدب، وسائل الإعلام المطبوعة، المذياع، الصور، الفيلم، التلفاز، التصوير، الإنترنت، الجسد.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

على ضوء هذه التقسيمات المتنوعة يقدم هذا المقال تقسيما قويا يشمل وسائط الذاكرة حسب التسلسل التاريخي لظهورها، أي في علاقاتها التاريخية مع الذاكرة الجمعية مع تقديم نبذة عن وظيفة كل وسيلة من هذه الوسائط؛ حيث يستأنس المقال في هذا الصدد بالتفريق الثلاثي الذي قدمته إرل حول الوسائط الذاكرية، ذلك أنها تفرّق ما بين الوسائط الأساسية؛ أي اللغة البشرية في شقيها الشفوي والكتابي، وبين الوسائط المستحيلة، التي تفرز عنها اللغة، مثل: الكتب، والطاقة، والطباخ، والتلفزيون، والعالم، والحواس، والإترنت. إلى جانب الوسائط المدمجة، مثل النصب التذكاري والأعياد الوطنية، وهي تقبلنا إلى مفهوم "أماكن الذاكرة" حسب بيير نورا، غير أننا نستند بالضرورة للتحليلات المتبقية من الذاكرة الجمعية، التي يعتبرها نورا قد تلاشت، بل هي في الأساس وسائط متنوعة للذاكرة في بعدها الجمعي ضمن معظم المجتمعات البشرية.

اللغة البشرية بوصفها وسيلة مركزية للذاكرة

30 Loguef 2017, ص105. نقلا عن لوروا غورهان.
31 المصدر السابق، ص168-106.
تعتبر اللغة البشرية من أهم الوسائط المركزية للذاكرة في بعديها الفردي والجمعي؛ فلا يمكننا تصوير نقل الذكريات من دون هذا الوسيط الطبيعي. على ضوء هذا يمكن تقسيم النقل اللغوي الذاكر إلى ما هو شفهي، وما هو كتابي. فالترواح الشفهي والتدوين الكتابي يشكلان كلاهما ركيزتين أساسيتين للذاكرة الجمعية، فعبرهما يتم "بناء ونشر تصورات مشتركة للماضي لبزعم الأساطير من الزمن السحيق". وفي هذا الصدد يفرق لوغوف الحضارات البشرية من زاوية نظر ذاكراتية إلى حضارات غير تدوينية (شفاهية)، وحضارات تدوينية (كتابية). ففي الحضارات غير التدوينية التي لم تصل إلى مستوى التدوين الكتابي، تولت "اللغة الشفهية والطقوس والشعائر والأعراف مهمة تجريب الماضي وبناء وتأسس الهوية للجماعة وتقدم اهتمام معين نحو المستقبل". وفي هذا آخر مرونة في نظره من الحضارة التدوينية، فبينما ينتمي "النقل الاستذكاري الحرفي بالكتابة، فإن المجتمعات غير التدوينية - باستثناء بعض عادات الاستذكار المكررة التي يتمثل أهمها بالغناء - تؤول الذكر عن طريق النظمونية، ومن الإمكانات الإبداعية"، لكن مع انتقال معظم الثقافات البشرية إلى المجال الكتابي لم تعد تلعب هذه الطقوس والأعراف إلا دوراً هامشياً في التذكر الجمعي ضمن الحضارات البشرية بوصفها وسيطاً وقيدياً.

من الشفاهة إلى الكتابة

رغم أن لوغوف، في تفرقه بين الحضارات الكتابية والشفاهية، يعتبر أن ذاكرة الحضارة الشفاهية تنقسم بالإبداعية والحيوية لكونها أكثر حرية واستقلالية من ذاكرة الحضارة الكتابية المقدرة في الغالب بتخصص محدد، إلا أنه يرى في ظهور الكتابة البشرية "نحلًا عميقًا لذاكرة الجمعية ذاتها"، فبإبتداء من "العصر الحجري الوسيط"، ظهرت صور تطور "حروفاً أسطورية" توازنت مع المفهومية، مما نتج عنه حسب لوغوف شكلين من الذاكرة الجمعية؛ الشكل الأول هو "إحياء الذكرى أو الاحتفال بحدث مرموق في صرح ذكاري"، بينما ارتبط الشكل الثاني بال"وثيقة المكونية على حامل معدي خصيصا للكتابية". ويرى لوغوف أن هذا الوسيط الكتابي قد تم وظيفان أساسيتين وهم: "تخزين المعلومة"، إلى جانب "تأميم الانقلاب من المجال السمعي إلى البصري"، وبالتالي فقد تطورت الوثيقة الكتابية منذ تلك الحقبة لتحول إلى وسيلة إلزامي لحفظ المعلومة، لكن دون أن يفقد الوسيط الشفهي مكانه؛ ففي العصر الوسيط كانت الوسائط الشفوية والكتابية للذاكرة مربطة فيما بينهما بشكل وثيق، فانتشرت وتدأت المعهده كأنها "مرفوعاً بالأساليب والطرق الشفاهية، فالمخطوطة والكتاب كانت لا تزال تحافظ على ظهر قلب".

من الكتابة إلى الطباعة

نتطور الكتابة واستنساخ الكتب أصبح بالإمكان حفظ ونقل محتويات الذاكرة عبر الوسيط الورقي، والذي يشكل إمكانية تخزينية هائلة لهذه المعلومات. إضافة إلى هذا فقد كانت تلك النصوص المنسوبة، بسبب ندرتها، تحافظ على ظهر قلب.

---
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عن قلب، ولا سيما في العصر الكلاسيكي القديم وحتى بعد ظهور الطباعة على يد الألماني غوتنبرغ، فقد بقيت فنون الذاكرة، أي حفظ النصوص واستعراضها من الذاكرة، شكلاً مهماً من أشكال التذكر ولاسيما في المجال الذي.

وهنا يرى لوغوف أن الطباعة قد ساهمت في احتضار فن الذاكرة، أي أن الحفظ عن ظهر قلب 39، إلا أن الباحثة الألمانية إرل ترى أنه رغم تناسي فن الذاكرة مع انتشار طاعة الكتاب، إلا أنه لا يزال يوجد إلى يومنا هذا "فنانون الذاكرة" الذين يتعاملون مع الطرق الكلاسيكية القديمة في التعاطي مع الذاكرة.40

من جانب آخر، ترى إرل أن طاعة الكتب ساهمت في خلق ثورة حقيقية في الذاكرة داخل أوروبا ابتداءً من عصر الأندون وإلى يومنا هذا، في حين يعتبر لوغوف بدوره أن الطباعة قد أحدثت تغييراً ثورياً أيضاً في الذاكرة الغيرية، مضفيًا "لكن آثار الطباعة لم تظهر بلاء إلا في القرن الثامن عشر، عندما توصل تقدم العلم والفلسفة إلى تغير مضمون الذاكرة الاجتماعية واللغزية: فالقرن الثامن عشر الأوروبي سجل نفاية العلم الخادم في المكتبات، وكان غالبًا ما تطلبوا الذاكرة الاجتماعية في الكتب وخلال عقود، العصور الأدبية الرومانية، وتاريخ الشعوب الكبرى، وعصر الإشكال، وعصر الرومانيا لا أصبح مركزياً بشكل كامل والفلسفة والحقوق والعلوم والفنون، والفنون والفنون والأدب...

ولم تعرف أي حقبة من حقبات التأليف البشري توسعاً متسارعاً للذاكرة الجمعية مثل هذا التوسع. 41 وكان من نتائج هذا الوسيط الطباعي أن وجد القارئ نفسه، بالنظر إلى الكم الهائل من الكتب المطبوعة، أمام ذاكرة جمعية هائلة ما عاد يقوى على الإحاطة بمقدارها بحسب تعريف لوغوف. وبالتالي فقد ساهمت طاعة الكتب ذاتها في نشوء وسائل ذاكرة جديدة، مثل الأرشيفات والكتب الكبيرة والمكتبات العلمية وال kotkatowات الوطنية ولاسيما ابتداء من القرن الثامن عشر. وأمام ذلك لم يمكّن الغرب للمكتبات المحفوظة في هذه الوسائط الجديدة تخيم أيضاً إيجاد مؤسسات، هدفها تكوين متخصصين للتعامل مع المحفوظات الكتابية مختصة وخطما. 42 وهذا يشير لوغوف إلى محاولته القرن الثامن عشر على الأقل بالنسبة للذاكرة الجمعية الأوروبية، حيث ساهم هذا القرن في توسعي حق الذاكرة الجمعية وإعطاؤها دوراً حاسماً. ولا أدل على ذلك من انتشار القواميس والموسوعات المطبوعة ورقية، فقد "وصلت القواميس إلى حدها الأقصى، حيث أصبحت تشكيك شكلًا متطورًا جداً من الذاكرة الخارجية."43

من الطباعة إلى التصوير الفوتوغرافي

إلى جانب محاولات القرن الثامن عشر، برى لوغوف أن الذاكرة الجمعية في سياقاها الغربي قد عرفت قفزة نوعية إضافية في القرن الحادي عشر، أي في القرن التاسع عشر، وذلك بفضل النتائج المترادمة التي تزامنت عن ظهور الطباعة، والتي شكلت حسب لوغوف "الحولية النهائية وحافة تراكم الذاكرة منذ العصور القديمة". 44 حيث أحدثت الذاكرة الجمعية بحسب في ذلك القرن حجماً كبيراً، لأن "الطلب من الذاكرة الفردية للشخص أن تستمر في الإحاطة بمخزون الذاكرة".

40 Ibid., p. 128.
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المكتبات ومحتوياتها المطبوعة" أصبحت منذ انتشارها أمرًا مستحيلًا، هذا "تم ابتداء من القرن الثامن عشر وجزء مهم من القرن التاسع عشر وسبل كثير من وسائل الذاكرة في بعديها الفردية والجماعية، وهو التصوير الفوتوغرافي، لتشكل بدوره وسيلة ذاكرة مركزية، حيث أصبح يضمن حسب تعبير إرل "نوعًا من الصحة عن الماضي من صور فردية أو جماعية وعائليه وغيرها".45

أشار الشركة في هذا الوسط المستحدث وظيفة أخرى إضافية، وهي دمقرطة التذكر، الذي صار في مناولة الجميع بحسب لوغوف، مضيفة أن "التصوير الفوتوغرافي، الذي قلب الذاكرة رأسًا على عقب [...] عددها ودمقرطتها وأضاف عليها تفوقًا معينا"، ذلك أنه مكن من "محافظة على ذاكرة الزمن والتطور الزمني المتسلسل [...] يعبر ألبوم العائلة عن الحقيقة المرتبطة بالذاكرة الاجتماعية. تصوير الماضي المرتبة حسب التسلسل الزمني [...] تشير إلى ذكرى الحداث التي تحقق المحافظة عليها ونقلها [...] لأمّا تخفيف من وحدة ماضيها بتأكيدات وحدة الحياة. هذا، لا سيئًا أكثر قيولة وأشد احترازًا وأثر طمأنة من "الألبوم العائلي" حسب تعبيره.46

من التصوير الفوتوغرافي إلى الحاسوب

وأوضح، فقد ظهرت الفوتوغرافيا ابتداء من القرن التاسع عشر كوسيلة جديدة للذاكرة، والتي صار ولمدة طويلة وسيلة حصرية لتصور الواقع كما هو، قبل أن تسرق منه الأضواء بعد ذلك كاميرا التصوير المتحركة (أو التصوير السينمائي). وسرعان ما توالت بعد هذا الوسط الفوتوغرافي باقي الوسائط الحديثة، وذلك بقدرته متساوية: مثل الجرائد والمذياع والسينما والتلفاز، وأخيرا الحاسوب وشبكته العالمية المعروفة بالإنترنت. ولهذا يعتبر لوغوف أن كل هذه التحولات في الذاكرة إبان القرن العشرين، وخصوصا بعد سنة 1950 م، تعكس ثورة حقيقية على صعيد الذاكرة، مشددا على أن "الذاكرة الإلكترونية" هي عصر أساسي من عنصريها، حيث يصفها من كونها "العنصر الأكثر إدهاشا".47 نفس الفكرة نجدها أيضا لدى إرل، التي تعتبر الذاكرة الإلكترونية بسب قدرتها التخزينية اللامتناهية وقدرة بينها التشاركة المتوفحة، قادرة على إحداث تأثيرات هائلة في القدرة على التذكر وتشكيل الذاكرة؛ فمع اختراع الحاسوب أصبح استدعاء الذكريات في الحاضر أبداً ممكنًا في أي وقت ومكان، كما أن شبكة الإنترنت قد ساهمت بشكل فعال في ترضى تصورات ذاكرة جمعية ضمن أي مجتمع بشري.48 في هذا الصدد يقيم لوغوف مقارنة بين الذاكرة البشرية والذاكرة الإلكترونية معتبرًا أن "الذاكرة البشرية مرة وحيدة، في حين تفرض ذاكرة الآلات نفسها بقبطها الكبير حداً الذي يتقارب مع نوع الذاكرة الذي يمثله الكتاب، لكنها تتمتع بسهولة في الاستحضار لم يسبق لها مثيل. "غير أنه يبرز الفارق الجوهري بينهما بقوله: "لكن يجب القول إن الذاكرة الإلكترونية
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لا تعمل إلا إذا أمت، ولا تعمل إلا بحسب البرنامج الذي وضعه الإنسان، مستخلصاً من كوهدا في آخر المطاف

"ليست إلا عنصرًا يساعد الذاكرة (البشري) والفكر البشري ويخدمها."50

"أماكن الذاكرة" وصفها من وسائط الذاكرة

أيضاً ندرج أماكن الذاكرة (Les Lieux de mémoire) ضمن وسائط الذاكرة الجمعية ذات البعد الرمزي في الغالب، ويرجع الفضل في نجاح هذا المصطلح للمرح الفرنسي بير نورا، وفقاًً لما تلك الوسائط المتعددة والمتصلة، والتي يمكن أن تُستخدم، حتى ولو من الناحية المادية، للتأسيس المعياري للمهوية الجمعية عن طريق التذكر المشترك للذاكرة المشتركة للاضاحي الجمعية عبر هاته الوسائط الذاكرة التي يسمى بها أماكن الذاكرة، والتي تتضمن أمكنة جغرافية وشبهية وثقافة، وغيرها.51 غير أن بير نورا يشير إلى ثلاثة أبعاد تضفي على مفهوم مادي أو شيء حس يعببي، صبَّغة تذكاري-هويتي، وهي: "الباد المادي، والبعد الوظيفي، والبعد الرمزي. البعد المادي لأماكن الذاكرة لا يجب أن يحل [....] إلى أن هذه الأماكن تقتصر على أشياء ملموسة ذات طبيعة مادية فقط مثل المبانى العمرانية أو اللوحات الفنية أو كتاب وغير ذلك، فالأحداث التاريخية حاسمة أو تقاليد صممت لإحياء ذكري شخص ميت تتورّب أيضا على بعد مادي جلي لأغا'[....] عبارة عن "مقطع مادي" محدد من فترة ووحدات الزمن. كل هذه التمثيلات تمتلك بعدا وظيفيا، يمكن أياً أن تُحقق وظيفة محددة ومضمونة ضمن المنظومة الاجتماعية [.....].

أيضاً يتعين على هذه التمثيلات كتزيد إلى مرتبتين أماكن الذاكرة أن تكون أيضا ذات بعد رمزي، أي حاملة مفعمة رمزي معين، وهذا يظهر بشكل جلي حينما تنتقل مثلها ممارسات أو أفكار معمية إلى طقوس مادية ذات طبيعة حضارية وشيئية، فقط بعد هذا "الانتقال الرمزي" تصير هذه التمثيلات حاملة لنفس الطبيعة الحضارية والشيئية التي تملكها أماكن الذاكرة.

وفقاً مفهوم "أماكن الذاكرة" مصطلحا جامياً وكيستيف الاستعمال في ميدان العلوم الثقافية لتوصيف وسائط ذاكرة عينية ومادية. ومما الأمكان المادية للذاكرة جسد الإنسان والمصمم التذكاري والгенية، وما أنجحه في العمارة من بناء ذات أهمية تاريخية، وهي كلها وسائط مادية للعب دوراً هامة في المجتمعات البشرية منذ القدم. إلى جانبها، نجد أيضا الأسئلة والمنشآت والمصاحف والنصوص الأدبية52 والصورة، التي - كما أسلفنا - لا تنال تحل إلى يومنا هذا دورها محلياً هاماً. وإضافة إلى هذه الوسائط نجد أيضا الوسائط الأمامية والمادية وبالعملات بينهم على الإطلاق الشائع والطقوس، قديماً وحتىها مثل الأيام التذكارية والطوابع البريدية والمجموعات التذكارية.53
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4. وظائف الوسائط الذاكرية

رغم هذا التنوع الكبير والتحدد الدائم الذي تميز به وسائط الذاكرة الجمعية إلا أنها تشارك كليهما في كوكباً ذات وظائف محددة، تقسمها إرل إلى ثلاثة وظائف أساسية، وهي: التخزين (Speicherung) والاستغلال (Zirkulation) ومستدامة في نفس الوقت أن الوسائط الذاكرية يمكنها أن تحتوي على كل هاته الوظائف الثلاث أو على الأقل أجزاء محددة منها. ويتضح انها الوظائف الثلاث، أو أكثر آكانت هاته الوظائف وجعلها من قوة في المجتمع، غير أن إرل ترى أنه المحتويات الذاكرية معرضة في إطار اليوم إلى الاندثار رغم هذه الوظيفة التخزينية في حالة ما فقدها متغيرها وانقضت رمزيتها الذاكارية التي كانت تحتلها، مثال التماثيل والنصب التي قد تحول من الناحية الذاكارية إلى مادة منينة إذا لم يعد من الممكن معروفة عنها ذاكارياً. وتميز عن هذه الوظيفة الاعتيادية للوسائط الذاكرية، الوظيفية التداولية التي تسمح بتبادل ونشر المحتويات الذاكارية وبالتالي تزايدها ضمن الجماعة الذاكارية على اختلاف طبيعتها المجتمعي. غير أن هذا النوع من التواصل الثقافي والاجتماعي عبر تقاسم ومشارك المحتوى الذاكر لا يجري بالضرورة ضمن الجماعة الذاكارية الواحدة، بل يمكنه أيضاً الربط بين جماعتين تذكرتين أو أكثر بشكل متزامن وهذا ما فعلته حسب إرل، الطباعة وانتشار الجرائد في القرنين 18 و19، وحالياً ما يقوم به التلفاز والإنترنت في عصر العولمة.

إضافة إلى هذا ترى إرل أن الوظيفة التداولية للوسائط الذاكارية غالباً ما تكون ذات هدف ديداكتيكي أو حتى إديولوجي، وهذه الإشارة مفهومة؛ فما يتم تداوله وتخصيصه ضمن الجماعة الذاكارية الواحدة غالباً ما يكون انتقائياً والغرض منه إ يصل تصوريات محددة بشكل متزامن بين أفراد تلك الجماعة أو بالتعاقب الجمالي، أي من جيل إلى جيل. أما الوظيفة الاستعادية فقد أهتم بها البحث النفسي في مجال الذاكرة الفردية أم انقل الاهتمام بما بعد ذلك إلى أبحاث الذاكرة الجمعية في العلوم الإنسانية والإجتماعية، وتُقَع، حسب إرال، الأماكن الجغرافية مثل برج إيفل في فرنسا أو نهر الراين في ألمانيا هذه الوظيفة الاستعادية ضمن ثقة نذكر كل من هاذين البلدين، لأنها تتحل الجماعة الذاكارية إلى معاً ماضياً. غير أن هذه الأماكن الجغرافية والطبيعي لا تحظى بحيتها هذه الوظيفة الاستعادية دون غيرها، فأخذت ماضية جمعية تشارك فيها الجماعة الذاكارية يمكن أيضاً استرجاعها وفق حاجيات هاته الجماعة، ولينا في السياق العربي والإسلامي كل من مفردتي "نكبة" و"الأندلس"، على سبيل المثال إلا الحصر، خبر مثل على ذلك، فيكفي مجرد سماع المفردتين إلى الربط الفرد والجماعي بأحداث ووقات تاريخية معينة لها مكانة في الذاكرة الجمعية للمنطقة العربية – الإسلامية، وهذا ما جعلنا نوضوح إلى مفهوم أماكن الذاكرة لبير نورا، الذي أشارنا إليه سابقًا.
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على سبيل الخاتمة

يظهر جليا أن البحث الذكاري في العلوم الثقافية ورغم نبوءة الداخلي، قد أنصب اهتمامه في السنوات الأخيرة حول وسائط التخزين والتدوين والنشر والفهم، ولهذا المعني فإن "تاريخ الذاكرة هو أيضا تاريخ الوسائط".59 وفي هذا الصدد يطرح الزوجان أسَان إلى ما يشبه النظرية النسبية في ميدان الوسائط بقولهما: "كل ما يمكن أن يُعرف في هذا العالم أو يُفكر فيه أو يقال عنه مرهون بالأساس بالوسائط التي تجعل من هذا شيء عن طريق التواصل معرفة قابلة للقبول والإدراك والتفكير."60

وصفوة القول: إن الوسائط ليست أوعية أو أمكنة محايدة لكل ما هو ذو طبيعة ذاكرية. لكن هذا لا يعني في نفس الوقت أن الذكريات أقل أهمية من وسائطها، فهما في علاقة تأثيرة متداخلة، فلا وجود لتخزينات ذاكارية بدون وسائط، ولا وجود لوسائط ذاتية بدون محوار، وهذا ما يعكس تحديدا أهمية الريان الذي صارت تتم فيه الذاكرة الجمعية ووسائطها في عصرنا الحاضر ولاسيما في السياق العربي. وفي تحليله للوضعية الراهنة لبداية أبحاث الذاكرة الجمعية يرى لوغوف إنه منذ النصف الثاني من القرن العشرين وإلى يومنا هذا صارت الذاكرة "جزءًا من الريانات الكبرى للمجتمعات المتطرفة والمجتمعات النامية من أجل السلامة والحياة، ومن أجل البقاء والإرث"، متجاوزاً في ذلك التاريخ بوصفه علما أو طبًا دينيًا عامًا، وأحياناً في جهد الأدف صنفها صدي مماثلًا (وماية) للعمل التاريخي،61 وهو تلك النظرية التقليدية عن الذاكرة الجمعية بوصفها مجازًا، والتي تزال سائدة في منهجات التفكير العربي حول الذاكرة الجمعية وعلى قلتها، ويمكن هنا للباحثين بناء المزود من الجهود للاطلاع على هذا الاميدان الذي صار من الأهمية بما كان ولاسيما في سياقه العربي، الذي يعاني قميشه لظاهرة الذاكرة الجمعية ووسائطها على حساب ذاكرة متسلطة حتى على مايضيها وهنا يبرز الدور الذاكري الرائد للباحث والمثقف العربي، الذي يقول عنه إدوارد سعيد: "[...] من أكبر أدوار المثقفين في المجال العام هو أن يعملوا كنوع من الذاكرة العامة، أن يتمكروا ما نسبى أو تم تجاشه[...] أن يتمكروا الجمهور بمسائل الأخلاقية التي قد تكون محتملة خلف صحب الجدل وضحته."62

المراجع

العربية


---

61 لوغوف ص.166.
سوكاح، زهير: "نظريات الذاكرة الجمعية وتطورها في ميادين العلوم الإنسانية", مجلة دراجومان، الجمعية الدولية للترجمي العربية، المجلد 3، العدد 5، 2015، ص. 128-140.

---


المترجمة


