

# **Translating Saddam: Ideology, Intertextuality and Communicative Equivalence in Arabic-English Translation**

**John Evelyn Moreton**

Submitted in accordance with the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds  
School of Modern Languages and Cultures

March 2010

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this work, in love and regret for their passing, to the memory of my parents, Jock and Lois Moreton, who always encouraged me from an early age in research and scholarly activities, and also to that of Nadera Nader-Moreton, who not only helped and supported me so much from the beginning of this endeavour, but by her strong though absent spirit also helped sustain and motivate me through to its conclusion.

## Acknowledgements

At the conclusion of this research effort I owe a debt of thanks to a number of people or institutions who have guided, helped and supported me in several ways. First and foremost I would like to thank my Supervisor at the University of Leeds, Dr Hussein Abdul-Raof of the Department of Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies, for his patience, his constant support and his confidence in me through the personal trials and academic vagaries of my time as a research student. I also thank all the other faculty of the Department for their friendly support and encouragement.

The work for this research was begun while I was employed at the University of Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates, and I am very grateful to the staff of the University Library there for their kind help and support in the early stages. I would also like to acknowledge the initial inspiration and encouragement I received from Prof. Basil Hatim, of the American University of Sharjah, whose local translator training course built on the experience I already had and renewed my interest in both the theory and practice of this fascinating and challenging activity, Arabic-English-Arabic translation.

At the University of Leeds my thanks also go to the staff of the Leeds Humanities Research Institute (a very peaceful and comfortable place to work), and of the Brotherton and Edward Boyle Libraries, who have all been so friendly and helpful. In particular, I am grateful for the special assistance provided by Mrs Maureen Pinder of the Arts Faculty Team. Staff at the British Library in London have also kindly helped with a certain aspect of my research.

Other people in Leeds to whom my heartfelt thanks are due are my fellow research students in the Department from the Arab world, many of whom have acted as invaluable linguistic and cultural informants when I needed help, as well as offering constant friendship and encouragement. In particular my gratitude goes to Abdallah al-Fawzan, Ahmad al-Shilabi, Mohammed al-Sharif and Jalal Yahya.

Finally, as mentioned in the Dedication, my late wife Nadera from Lebanon gave me both practical help and moral support from the beginning, and I can only wish she could have been here to witness the end.

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with a particularly problematic area of Arabic-English translation, an activity likely to expand considerably as this century continues, and especially in non-literary domains. The past decade has seen increasing attention being paid by translation and other scholars to such issues as ideology, intervention, the role of narratives and the involvement of translation in global news dissemination. Not surprisingly, translation from Arabic looms large in all these areas. Political speeches and statements, often containing a disconcertingly unfamiliar blend of political and religious discourse, invite or require translation (or summary) into English by various agencies with their own particular ideological stances and agenda. Even with accurate and competent linguistic transfer there are many forms of possible manipulation. Equally, poor quality translation between two such incongruent languages can easily produce material that appears at least partly incomprehensible and may tend to make the source text and its producer(s) seem ridiculous to the target reader. Examples of this abound in the available translations of two of Saddam Hussein's speeches in the months leading up to the 2003 invasion of Iraq. To prepare the ground for an examination of these translations, this study first traces the history of ideas about translation and the development of the modern 'interdiscipline' of Translation Studies. It then moves on to consider the problems of equivalence and translatability in Arabic-English translation, not only at the word and sentence level but also at that of whole texts, and extends this enquiry into the area of textuality and especially the phenomenon of intertextuality. Intertextuality is then seen to be carried within languages and cultures by the vehicle of ideology and discourse, and thus to represent a particular challenge to translators. Problems in the translation of the Saddam speeches are subsequently identified and discussed in the context of target reader norms and expectations, and in terms of a still rather hazy notion of 'communicative equivalence'.



## Table of Contents

	page
Dedication .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iii
Abstract .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	v
Introduction .....	1

### Chapter One *From Translation to Translation Studies: the background*

1.1 <i>Introduction</i> .....	5
1.2 <i>Translation Practice and Prescription from Cicero to Tytler</i> .....	8
1.3 <i>From Schleiermacher to Jakobson</i> .....	25
1.4 <i>Building the ‘House of Many Rooms’: the emergence of a new discipline</i> .....	31
1.5 <i>Arabic to the fore</i> .....	42
1.6 <i>Conclusion</i> .....	46

### Chapter Two *Arabic-English Translation: Equivalence, Approximation and Translatability*

2.1 <i>Introduction</i> .....	48
2.2 <i>Equivalence, approximation and translatability: the background to the debate</i> .....	48
2.3 <i>‘Equivalence in difference’: the case of English and Arabic</i> .....	55
2.4 <i>Equivalence problems at the micro level</i> .....	67
2.4.1 <i>Word level</i> .....	68
2.4.2 <i>Grammatical level</i> .....	69
2.4.3 <i>Stylistic level</i> .....	73
2.4.4 <i>Cultural level</i> .....	77
2.5 <i>Equivalence problems at macro level</i> .....	92
2.5.1 <i>Sentence level</i> .....	92
2.5.2 <i>Text level</i> .....	95
2.6 <i>Conclusion</i> .....	99

### **Chapter Three *Text, Intertext and the Translator***

<b>3.1 Introduction</b> .....	102
<b>3.2 Text, textuality and reader expectations</b> .....	103
<b>3.2.1 Cohesion and coherence</b> .....	105
<b>3.2.2 Text, non-text and text type</b> .....	107
<b>3.2.3 Textuality, texture, and text structure</b> .....	109
<b>3.2.4 Context and co-text</b> .....	112
<b>3.2.5 Punctuation and sentence length</b> .....	113
<b>3.3 Intertextuality: ‘a world of others’ words’</b> .....	116
<b>3.3.1 Quotation, allusion and parody</b> .....	126
<b>3.3.2 Genre and the evolution of text types</b> .....	132
<b>3.3.3 Intertextuality as a translation challenge</b> .....	135
<b>3.4 Conclusion</b> .....	140

### **Chapter Four *Ideology, Mediation and Manipulation***

<b>4.1 Introduction</b> .....	142
<b>4.2 What is ideology?</b> .....	142
<b>4.3 Ideology in language</b> .....	144
<b>4.4 Ideology and the translator</b> .....	153
<b>4.5 Ideology and Media Translation</b> .....	162
<b>4.6 Conclusion</b> .....	170

### **Chapter Five *Translating Saddam: the challenge of communicative equivalence***

<b>5.1 Introduction</b> .....	172
<b>5.2 Background to the speeches: history, ideology, intertexts and audience</b> .....	175
<b>5.2.1 ‘Saddam’s Iraq’ and the world in 2002-2003</b> .....	175
<b>5.2.2 Saddam: the man and the message</b> .....	182
<b>5.2.3 Common features of the speeches</b> .....	192
<b>5.2.4 The source-text and target-text receivers</b> .....	194
<b>5.3 The speeches and their translations</b> .....	195
<b>5.3.1 <u>Text A</u>: 8 August 2002 – the ‘Great Victory Day’ Speech</b> .....	196

<b>5.3.2 <i>Text B</i>: 17 January 2003 – Speech on the Twelfth Anniversary of the ‘Mother of Battles’</b> .....	<b>207</b>
<b>5.4 Conclusion</b> .....	<b>214</b>
<b>Conclusion, Recommendations and Prospects</b> .....	<b>218</b>
<b>Appendix A1</b> .....	<b>223 - 228</b>
<b>Appendix A2</b> .....	<b>229 – 238</b>
<b>Appendix A3</b> .....	<b>239 – 244</b>
<b>Appendix B1</b> .....	<b>245 – 251</b>
<b>Appendix B2</b> .....	<b>252 – 258</b>
<b>Appendix B3</b> .....	<b>259 – 265</b>
<b>Appendix B4</b> .....	<b>266 – 272</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>273 - 285</b>

## Introduction

The original motivation for the present study arose out of a combination of interests and background experiences on the part of this researcher. One of these was in the art and multifarious challenges of translation, particularly between Arabic and English, and was given a new lease of life as a result of a training course at the American University of Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates. Another was in the teaching of English as a Foreign and Second Language in the Arab world, and especially in the difficult task of teaching second-language writing to Arab students, with all the linguistic and intercultural problems involved in that activity. Along with these was an abiding interest in international politics and concern for better understanding between different cultures of the world. All of these areas of interest happened to be activated by the chance discovery, while trawling the Internet, of the Arabic originals of certain late speeches by Saddam Hussein and their English versions disseminated by his own controlled media, then to be reproduced with only minimal editorial intervention in certain parts of the English-speaking world's news media. Some parts at least of those translations seemed at first sight marvellously outlandish - and reminiscent of some wilder examples of student writing in English. Yet there was obviously a serious problem for any translator, experienced professional or novice, in attempting to communicate the essential message of such source material across so large a linguistic and cultural divide as exists between Arabic and English.

This study, then, is an attempt to investigate the nature of the problem represented by those translations. It does so, of course, by adopting a certain systematic approach and method in an attempt to address the following basic set of research questions:

1. What are the interlingual and intercultural problems facing the would-be translator into English of a given corpus of late (= 2002/2003) Saddam Hussein speeches (and, by extension, of any similar material in Arabic or another comparable 'exotic' language)? (How oral/aural in nature is this source material?)
2. Is a mainly literal translation of this material inevitable and/or the best translation strategy? If so, what problems does it entail?

3. Do ideological and intertextual elements in such material constitute major problems for the translator and the target readership? If so, how can these problems best be resolved or mitigated?
4. How can a theory of 'textual equivalence' or 'communicative equivalence' be applied to the translation of such material?
5. What is the 'market' for such translations? Are they really needed/ used by anybody, and is quality important?
6. What implications or usefulness does this investigation have for improved translator training (esp. Arabic>English)?

The approach adopted has involved, first of all, much reading and delving into the history of translation through the ages as an activity which has always generated debate and dichotomies – real or imagined – and which has more recently broadened out into the contemporary interdisciplinary approach of 'Translation Studies'. It has also involved looking into the whole complex and contentious question of equivalence and translatability, exemplifying it in the context of the Arabic / English language pair, and then seeing the need to venture further into the jungle of intertextuality in order to better understand that phenomenon and to discern a broader picture of equivalence at the level of whole texts. It has considered ideology in language as a springboard for the explanation of intertextuality and equivalence, enabling us to identify (and therefore to teach) some very interesting examples of translation problems. Finally, it has provided the necessary historical and ideological background for a study of two speeches that are typical of Saddam Hussein's later period of speech-making: texts that are pregnant with a wealth of ideology and intertextuality, deploying the discourses of the Qur'ān, of Nasserism, of Ba'athism and Pan-Arabism, and throwing up some good and useful instances of equivalence and translatability problems.

The research finds its place within, and has been inspired by, the growing body of research literature produced by translation specialists in such fields as textlinguistics, cultural problems of translation, ideology, conflict and the use of translation in contemporary newsgathering. Its only claim to originality lies in its application of these new approaches, and of its study of intertextuality, to the problem seen in the Saddam speeches. Perhaps at no previous time in human history has honest, accurate and

meaningful translation been more vital than today; and in the case of Arabic we believe that as this century continues, while only a minority of people will be exposed to Arabic literature whether in the original or in translation, most of us will be exposed to somebody's translation or digest of Arabic texts in the political or politico-religious domain. Therefore the translation of such texts should preferably be of the highest possible standard; but such an aspiration or goal can be realized only if the translators – whether they be working into English as their own or as a second language – can benefit from certain forms of intercultural translation training that target the real challenges they face in coping with this sort of material.

Our study is divided into five chapters. In Chapter One we set the overall scene by surveying the history of significant ideas in translation from the ancient world through to the twenty-first century. In the course of this passage of time we notice that certain debates and supposed dichotomies (such as between 'literal' and 'free' translation) tended to recur in various guises. We also see how by the late twentieth century interest in translation had become much less Eurocentric, with Arabic taking its rightful place as an object of linguistic and cultural interest for students of translation. Then in Chapter Two we go on to consider the notions of equivalence and translatability, applying them to Arabic-English translation and examining and exemplifying issues of both linguistic and cultural equivalence / non-equivalence at micro and macro levels. We also consider the problems of emotive language and of semantic and cultural 'voids' before ending with a preliminary view of equivalence problems at the sentence and text level. Chapter Three takes us forward into the deeper territory of textual equivalence and translatability as we examine the concepts of text, textuality and reader expectations with reference to English and Arabic; this leads into an extended discussion of intertextuality, which we exemplify in the areas of quotation, allusion, parody and genre membership before assessing it as a translation challenge. Ideology and discourse, as part of language in use, are then the initial focus of Chapter Four, where we notice that they are carriers of intertextuality. That chapter also illustrates ways in which ideology affects the work of translators and can engender varying degrees of 'mediation', intervention and manipulation. It concludes by looking at a topic of growing concern, namely the ways in which translation is used in the contemporary, English-dominated news media. Finally, in Chapter Five, we arrive at our study of the Saddam speeches and of their

available English translations; but before examining the texts themselves we first provide essential background by surveying their historical context, the ideology driving them, and the nature of their intertextual elements and their likely audience. We then conclude by reviewing the main points of our enquiry, considering some possible future directions or applications and making some general recommendations for improved translator training in this difficult area.

In this study we have used periodically the standard abbreviations ST (= Source Text) and TT (= Target Text) when referring to material that has been translated or to the translation process itself, and Q when Qur'ānic verses are quoted or referred to. As for names, we have used the Library of Congress Arabic transliteration system except in the cases of the names of Arab authors listed in the Bibliography and of persons – Arab or non-Arab - familiar to most readers from history or through the news media in a certain spelling. We use, for example, the most common spelling 'Saddam Hussein', but often refer simply to 'Saddam'. Hussein was, after all, not actually his surname as we understand that term: the *Guardian* journalist Brian Whitaker (2000) has written a useful and entertaining short article explaining for the benefit of puzzled Westerners how Arab names work. Likewise, we write 'Gamal Abdel Nasser', 'Yasser Arafat', 'Osama Bin Laden', 'Muammar Gaddafi', 'Khomeini', 'Mahmoud Ahmadinejad' and 'Hassan Nasrallah'.

## CHAPTER ONE

### FROM TRANSLATION TO TRANSLATION STUDIES: THE BACKGROUND

#### 1.1 *Introduction*

The aim of this chapter is to provide some relevant background to our later investigations into the problems of analyzing and translating highly emotive and rhetorical texts of a nowadays unfamiliar politico-religious character from Arabic into English. After briefly previewing the rapid growth of 'Translation Studies' as a dynamic 'interdiscipline' over recent decades, we step back in history and trace the main stages by which the present-day activities and concerns of translators have been shaped. We begin by surveying as concisely as possible what we know of translation and of writings about translation (and translators) through the long period of history stretching from before the time of the Roman authors Cicero and Horace in the first century B.C. to the end of the eighteenth century. Included in this section are brief glimpses of what was happening outside the 'Western' tradition, for example in the Arab world and China. We shall see how in this period the reflective or prescriptive writings on translation that have come down to us were driven not only by the business of translating literary and philosophical texts but also by the particular phenomenon of Bible translation; we shall also note how, towards the end of this period, there were attempts to systematize the study of translation and to postulate rules or 'laws' that should govern the work of the translator. We then move on to consider the period extending from the influential writings of Friedrich Schleiermacher in the early nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century: a period which saw a continuation of the 'literal' v. 'free' debate in various guises, but also introduced a more philosophical, or 'hermeneutic' approach to discussions about language and translation. After that we trace the emergence of the modern academic discipline of translation studies: beginning with the new concerns relating to meaning, equivalence and translatability; then examining the reasons behind the rise of functional theories, the textlinguistics approach and the 'cultural turn'; finally, considering the changing notions as to the role of translators themselves and



surveying briefly the main lines of research now being pursued. We shall observe how the study of translation and everything connected with it is now no longer narrowly Eurocentric but embraces languages and cultures beyond Europe – Arabic being a prime example and beneficiary of this welcome and overdue development. We also look briefly at machine translation (its role, potential and probable limitations) and the consequences and implications for translation in general of the internet, globalization and the communications technology revolution. It is perhaps as well to emphasize at this point that, although scientific, technical and other forms of non-literary, practical (or ‘down-to-earth’) translating may get an incidental mention in the course of this survey, they are not the main concern here. This is not to ignore or downplay the fact that they (like interpreting, which is also outside the scope of this study) have certainly played a crucial role in human history and in the history of international relations and of the development of civilizations - and therefore in the history of translation in general (Woodsworth 1998; St André 2009). To conclude this background survey, we offer a brief review of some of the important recent studies in the specific area of Arabic/English/Arabic translation, with particular regard to the problems encountered in the translation of text types that are essentially argumentative, emotive, politically charged and/or religiously sensitive in nature, before we preview the subject matter of the next chapter.

It was in 1975 that George Steiner (1998: 251) first delivered his magisterial verdict on what he saw then as an underlying paucity of ‘original, significant ideas’ (ibid) in the whole complex field of translation practice and theory:

Over some two thousand years of argument and precept, the beliefs and disagreements voiced about the nature of translation have been almost the same. Identical theses, familiar moves and refutations in debate recur, nearly without exception, from Cicero and Quintilian to the present day.

*After Babel* is, of course, justly famous for the broad sweep of its erudition, covering several difficult aspects of language and translation while concentrating on literary translation and on Steiner’s concept of the ‘hermeneutic motion’. Its author, who did not believe that the process, or processes, of translation could ever be captured by any ‘theory’, betrays in the words quoted above a certain irritation or frustration with the recurring dichotomies that have historically bedevilled most discussion of the nature and purpose of translation. Such irritation finds an echo in the view expressed a couple of decades later by Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1997: 1-2) as they argue for an integrated concept of

translation as essentially an act of communication – despite the dichotomies that exist between manifestly different kinds of translation and those that have arisen constantly in debate over the translator’s priorities, e.g. ‘literal’ v. ‘free’ translation (from Cicero in the first century BC onwards), ‘formal’ v. ‘dynamic’ equivalence (Nida 1964), or ‘visible’ v. ‘invisible’ status for the translator (Venuti 1995).

It was in fact during those two intervening decades (and most particularly in the 1990’s) that an unprecedented amount of research and publication had taken place in the field of what is now generally referred to as ‘Translation Studies’. Indeed, Steiner begins his Preface to the Third Edition of *After Babel* with these words (written in August 1997):

Both the philosophy and practice of translation are in constant motion and debate. In the five years since the second edition of this book there have been marked developments. (Steiner 1998: vii)

‘Translation Studies’ had become established, certainly by the 1990s, as a new and independent academic discipline, whereas in the past, translation had been regarded in the academic world mainly as a branch of comparative literature or applied linguistics or as a tool for language learning (Kelly 1969: 51-54; Munday 2001/2008: 7-9). Many translation scholars, notably Mary Snell-Hornby (1988), had already called for the new discipline to be viewed as inherently ‘interdisciplinary’, requiring an ‘integrated approach’. Mona Baker, in her entry on ‘Translation Studies’ in the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998), explains how it was James S. Holmes who, in a paper originally delivered in 1972 and entitled *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*, had argued for the adoption of this particular designation to cover the discipline as a whole (Baker 1998a: 277). This new discipline, she adds (*ibid*), had at one time implied more emphasis on literary translation and less on other types of translating, including interpreting; now, however, it was seen as embracing ‘the study of translation at large’, taking in not only literary and non-literary translation, interpreting in its various forms and the newer arts of dubbing and subtitling, but also ‘the whole spectrum of research and pedagogical activities, from developing theoretical frameworks to conducting individual case studies to engaging in practical matters such as training translators and developing criteria for translation assessment.’ Baker points out that, even though interest in translation and the considerable body of literature on the subject could be traced back through at least two thousand years, ‘it was not until the second half of the twentieth century that scholars began to discuss the need to conduct systematic research on translation and to develop coherent theories of translation’

(ibid). Jeremy Munday opens his very balanced and useful survey *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (2001/2008) with a straightforward definition of the subject matter that emphasizes its highly diverse and interdisciplinary nature:

Translation studies is the academic discipline related to the study of the theory and phenomena of translation. By its nature it is multilingual and also interdisciplinary, encompassing any language combinations, various branches of linguistics, comparative literature, communication studies, philosophy and a range of types of cultural studies including postcolonialism and postmodernism as well as sociology and historiography (ibid: 1).

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, Munday wrote in the first (2001) edition of his work, this new discipline was continuing ‘to develop from strength to strength across the globe’ (ibid: 6).

## **1.2 *Translation Practice and Prescription from Cicero to Tytler***

There had, of course, been translation before Cicero. In the various civilizations of the ancient Near East we know that translation was an important part of the business of government, and that it was often assigned to teams of scribes (Nida 1964: 11). It can reasonably be inferred, in any case, that translating or at least interpreting have existed as skills since the dawn of human history. Furthermore, we have evidence for the interplay of language and power in the ancient world. Willis Barnstone (1993: 147), writing about the long-lost bilingual and trilingual translation monuments of the ancient Near East, gives us the example of the Persian King Darius in 516 BC having the record of his many victories chiseled onto a rock face at Behistun in western Iran. The message was conveyed by texts in three languages, backed up by a graphic display of the same story using large relief panels. Barnstone (ibid) offers the interesting comment that ‘Darius may be the first living being to give us both interlingual and intersemiotic translation in one massive display’.

According to Gideon Toury (2009: 427), the Hebrew Bible ‘includes clear references to translation, including liaison interpreting (for example Genesis 42: 23)’. Furthermore, there are several passages in it which ‘reveal traces of actual translation (for example Ezra 1: 7-8 in Hebrew vs. Ezra 5: 14 or 6: 5 in Aramaic)’ (ibid). Michael Alpert (1998: 269) also tells us that the Bible gives us the first historical report of at least oral translation in the Book of Nehemiah 8:8. Here we read that Ezra the scribe and others helped those Jews who in the

sixth century BC had returned from exile in Babylon and had forgotten the Hebrew language to understand their Law through a process of oral translation and commentary (that is, into the Aramaic *lingua franca* which they did understand). In the Jewish tradition, the Torah was seen as divinely inspired but at the same time written for human beings to understand: it therefore needed to be translated and supplied with commentaries for the benefit of those who either knew no Hebrew or had forgotten it (ibid). Toury describes what happened in the following centuries:

Later on, in the Land of Israel as well as in neighbouring countries where the Jews had settled (most notably Egypt), translation started to be carried out *from* Hebrew, mainly into Aramaic and Greek – first orally, then in writing. The main objective of this translational effort was to render the Scriptures accessible to the less learned so as to enable them to follow the services (Toury 2009: 427).

The earliest written translation of the Hebrew Bible into another language was the Septuagint or Hellenistic Bible. This was prepared in the third century BC for the benefit of the Greek-speaking Jews of the Diaspora in Alexandria, who by 300 BC had come to represent a considerable portion of that city's inhabitants and who no longer knew Hebrew (Alpert 1998:269, Barnstone 1993:165). According to Barnstone (ibid: 52, 166 – 172), it was the creation of the Septuagint (traditionally, by seventy-two scholars who miraculously worked together to finish a perfect job within seventy-two days) that prompted the first extant text we have concerning the practice and theory of literary translation. This is the letter written in Greek in the late second century BC by an Alexandrian Jew named Aristeas to his brother, and known to us as the *Letter of Aristeas*. This document describes how this particular translation job was commissioned, carried out and rewarded; it also portrays the method and standards used in the translation process and offers an assessment of the success of the Septuagint project. Its main significance is that it represents 'the most eloquent apology for the necessity of absolute literalism in translation' (ibid: 167), arguing that with divine help a 'perfect' translation could be achieved, with commensurately wonderful rewards for the same and, conversely, suitably harsh punishment for error and for subsequent alterations. It appears that the main purpose of the letter was to deal with criticisms that had been made of the Greek translation by setting out to stress the accuracy and authority of the Hebrew original and thus to authenticate the Greek version. André Lefevere explains how the legend of the Septuagint has given us 'the basic categories of the

history of translation' (not least those of 'trust' and 'authority') and how – despite the large amount of error it in fact contained – this translation project was immensely influential:

...But the fact that the Septuagint was, in reality, a 'bad' translation did nothing to undermine its image – on the contrary, it still is the translation used by the Greek church to this day, and it served as the basis for translation into many other languages of the Ancient Mediterranean world (Lefevere 1990: 15).

Harvey Minkoff (1988: 35) also writes of how the Septuagint's 'underlying concept of literal translation entrenched itself and in effect established a translation tradition that still exists today', giving the English language expressions that mirror the biblical Hebrew not just in vocabulary (e.g. the use of the word *soul* to mean a person) but also in idiomatic expressions such as *in my heart of hearts*.

We shall see later how the story of the Septuagint makes a good introduction to the main strands of controversy that were to dominate most discussion of translation issues through history. This is because the problems surrounding it were, as Barnstone (1993: 170) aptly puts it, 'the universal ones inherent in every interlingual rewording: correctness, authority, felicity of language, and specifically the debate between literal and freely literary, fidelity to the word or to the general sense.' Barnstone goes on to highlight another main theme running through the story of translation:

In the instance of sacred texts there is a fundamental problem of meddling with the sacrosanct. A common solution is to consider the translation not so much a self-sufficient verbal object as an instrument for returning to the earlier text (*ibid*).

As we shall note later in this section, the Bible was at least considered susceptible to translation into all languages and cultures of the world, whereas the orthodox Muslim view of the Qur'ān is that it is (for a variety of reasons) 'translation-resistant' (Abdul-Raof 1999).

Curious though it may seem, the *Letter of Aristeas* and another version of the Septuagint story by the Jewish Neoplatonist philosopher Philo are the only significant documents on translation that have come down to us in Greek. It appears that the ancient Greeks, despite their extensive contacts with other peoples and cultures (not least in the Near East) and their undoubted use of translators and interpreters, attached little importance to translation practice or theory. This is quite probably because the Greek-speakers of both the Classical and Hellenistic periods did not feel any need to learn other, 'barbarian' languages: it was

for others to learn and use Greek, the *lingua franca* of their world at that time (Barnstone 1993: 219-220, Connolly and Bacopoulou-Halls 2009: 419).

The scene now shifts to Latin, the language that was to play the central part in the cultural and intellectual history of Europe for the next two millennia. Since Latin 'remained the dominant cultural language of Western Europe until the end of the eighteenth century, translation into Latin has played a significant role in shaping European culture' (Kelly 2009: 477). It was during the third century BC that enterprising Roman writers, beginning with Livius Andronicus, initiated a tradition of working under commission to produce free adaptations of Greek plays in order to entertain Roman audiences with coarser tastes than those of the original Greek audiences. The two most famous of these writers were the dramatists we know as Plautus and Terence, who Louis Kelly notes 'are probably the world's first commercial literary translators' (ibid). Later, in the first century BC, translation came to be seen as a branch of rhetoric, an art that had by this time been introduced to Rome by Greeks. We should bear in mind at this point that educated Romans at least benefited from the presence in their midst of Greek tutors and writers and therefore inhabited a society with 'a bilingual cultural quality' (Barnstone 1993: 220). Now was to begin a tradition that would last almost up to the present time of 'treating translation as a literary apprenticeship' (Kelly 2009: 477).

The statesman, lawyer and philosopher Cicero and the poet Horace are two of the principal names we associate with the development of a truly Roman literature in the first century BC (Kelly: ibid). Their highly influential comments on translation served to initiate what Steiner (1998: 248) calls 'the long period in which seminal analyses and pronouncements stem directly from the enterprise of the translator'. Since there had been a tendency to think of translation as basically literal, word-for-word rendering as far as possible between Greek and Latin (two very different languages), Cicero first warned those who were to be trained as orators against such attempts at literal translation. He himself is famous as a translator of Greek rhetoric and philosophy into Latin, and because of his sensitivity to words made a great contribution to the study of terminology (Kelly 2009: 478), foreshadowing an important modern discipline that complements translation studies. In the history of translation theory, he is most famous for what he has to say in his treatise *De optimo genere*

*oratorum* (*On the Best Kind of Orator*) of 46 BC. Commenting upon how he has translated the most famous speeches of the great Attic orators Demosthenes and Aeschines, he tells his Roman students that he approached the task not ‘*ut interpretes*’ (like a literal translator) but ‘*ut orator*’ (like an orator), feeling it was not his business to render the texts ‘*verbum pro verbo*’ (word for word), but rather to preserve the general style and force of the language. Clearly he was thinking of the desired equivalent effect on his target audience (Munday 2001/2008: 19). Some twenty years later Horace, in his *Ars Poetica* (*The Art of Poetry*), is concerned primarily with the theme of cultural rivalry with Greece, and his famous lines about not trying to render word for word but seeking to be an inventive imitator should, according to Rita Copeland (1991: 29), be understood in this context. In her detailed examination of Roman theories of translation, Copeland (*ibid*) writes that Horace ‘proposes a theory of rhetorical imitation where the force of invention intervenes between model and copy...’, arguing that for him and other Roman theorists ‘the impulse to displace Greek literary culture is felt as strongly as the impulse to mediate and preserve its values.’ Concerning the comments by Cicero referred to above, she argues that the real interest of this oft-quoted text derives from what Cicero says *after* the well-known words, namely that his intention behind the whole project is, as Copeland (*ibid*: 33) puts it, ‘to provide an “accurate” Roman model, using the full resources of *Latinitas*, of the principles of Attic Greek oratory.’ In other words, Cicero offers his translation as a yardstick by which future Roman orators would be able to measure their own efforts at imitating the famous Greek orators.

Two more significant Latin texts dealing with translation, this time from the first century AD, are the Epistle VII. ix of Pliny the Younger and the *Institutio Oratoria* (*Institutes of Oratory*) X.v by Quintilian. Pliny recommends translation as *exercitatio*, or practice in composition that develops literary technique:

...The most useful thing, which is always being suggested, is to translate Greek into Latin and Latin into Greek. This kind of exercise develops in one a precision and richness of vocabulary, a wide range of metaphor and power of exposition, and moreover, imitation of the best models leads to a like aptitude for original composition... (Copeland *ibid*: 31).

Here there is at least a suggestion that the translator can or should be a kind of rival to the original author; and this theme of the translator imitating and even surpassing previous models is to be found also in the writings of the great rhetorician Quintilian, who saw value

not only in interlingual translation and imitation from Greek into Latin but also in *intralingual* paraphrase and imitation of Latin into Latin (Barnstone 1993:108). Quintilian is also noteworthy, according to Barnstone (*ibid*: 26), for making a distinction (re-iterated by scholars such as Schleiermacher many centuries later) between the two main categories of translation: literal information transfer (e.g. of commercial, diplomatic and scientific information) and literary transposition (covering works of literature, religion and philosophy) – in other words a distinction between the practical and the aesthetic or creative.

The more practical, down-to-earth category of translation was no doubt the main business of a translation office that was set up by the Emperor Augustus as part of the Roman imperial household. As long as there existed an empire to administer, translation remained important (Kelly 2009: 478). Most of this translation work was done by Greeks who had come to Rome as slaves, and we have no record of any translation into Latin from languages other than Greek. In addition to the administrative translating the later Roman Empire also saw an increasing amount of medical and pharmacological translation (*ibid*).

We have already seen how the Greek Septuagint was the first attempt to translate the Hebrew Bible. The first Latin versions of the New Testament (known as the *Vetus Latina* or Old Latin versions) date from the second century AD (Kelly: *ibid*). These proved, however, to be unsatisfactory, and were revised towards the end of the fourth century AD by the great St Jerome, whose work is generally considered to be the culmination of this early Christian tradition of translation (*ibid*: 479, Nida 1998: 23). Jerome's Vulgate – as it came to be known later – was to dominate biblical scholarship until the Reformation (Kelly: *ibid*). However Barnstone (1993: 193) argues that there have been popular misconceptions about what Jerome actually did, and that in fact 'the attribution of the entire Vulgate to him detracts from his most substantial achievements in turning Christianity back to its first real encounter with the recensions of the Hebrew Bible'. Kelly (2009: 479) points out that Jerome seems to have been the first translator and translation commentator to use *veritas* or truth as a critical concept, being concerned primarily with the accuracy of the source text: this led him to produce a critically accurate Greek text for the New Testament as a basis for his light revision of the traditional Old Latin version, and also to seek help from Jewish scholars in checking the Hebrew text of the Old Testament (*hebraica veritas*).



St Jerome's statements about translation principles are to be found in his letters. The best known of these statements comes in Epistle 57 (written to one Pammachius in 395 AD), entitled *De optimo genere interpretandi (On the Best Way To Translate)*. Here he cites the authority of both Cicero and Horace as he defends himself against previous accusations of translating incorrectly and frankly sets forth his general strategy as a translator:

In fact I not only admit but openly declare that in translation from Greek texts (except in the case of sacred Scripture, where the very order of the words is a mystery) I render the text, not word for word, but sense for sense. For this I have the authority of Cicero... (Copeland 1991: 48-49).

As Munday (2001/2008: 20) explains, Jerome was arguing against literal, word-for-word translation because of its tendency to follow slavishly the *form* of the source text (ST) and as a result to produce absurdities in the target text (TT); whereas the sense-for-sense approach allowed the actual *content* of the ST to be rendered between languages. For Jerome this did not apply to sacred texts, but nonetheless his line of argument proved to be very influential:

In these poles can be seen the origin of both the 'literal vs. free' and 'form vs. content' debate that has continued until modern times (ibid).

A century after St Jerome it was Boethius, the philosopher, translator and author of the *De consolazione philosophiae (The Consolation of Philosophy)*, who marked the end of the Roman era of translation and the beginning of the mediaeval era (Kelly 2009: 479). Boethius took an uncompromising stand in favour of a literal approach, following Jerome's ideals of the pursuit of truth in translation. By his time – that is, at the threshold of the Middle Ages in Europe – things were changing fast and there was now a new tone for translation into Latin: in Kelly's (ibid.) words, 'Literary translation with its rhetorical, poetic imperatives had disappeared, and translation was now in the hands of philosophers and theologians.' Summing up the essence of classical Roman translation theories, Copeland (1991: 221-222) tells us that 'translation was a vehicle of the conflict between the disciplines of rhetoric and grammar, and of the cultural contest between Rome and Greece. Defined through the aims of rhetoric, translation was an aggressive project through which Roman literary culture could both assimilate and displace the textual tradition of Greece.' In the Middle Ages, she goes on to say, the commonplaces about translating "sense-for-sense" that had been inherited from Cicero and Horace were mediated through St Jerome's

system, ‘which reverses Cicero’s priorities and makes translation according to “sense” an ideal of access and conservation rather than a model of rhetorical displacement.’

At this point, it is worthwhile to break away briefly from the European scene in order to consider some developments in translation that were taking place elsewhere in the world during the first millennium AD. China and the Arab world have important traditions of translation, and Munday (2001/2008: 20-23) points out that in these traditions the same sort of tension between the poles of ‘literal’ and ‘free’ approaches to translation seems to have arisen during the period in question.

Hung and Pollard (2009: 370-372) provide an interesting account of one of the most significant periods in China’s cultural and social history, when translation played a crucial role that went far beyond the usual confines of government and commercial work. This was the great translation movement that came in the wake of the spread of Buddhism and continued in three main phases of development over nine centuries (the second to the eleventh AD). The task was to translate the Buddhist sutras from Sanskrit into Chinese, and this process ‘provided a fertile ground for the practice and discussion of different translation approaches’ (the discussion usually taking place, apparently, in special translation forums). Over the centuries we can discern a movement away from word-for-word rendering (resulting in contorted target-language syntax) of texts considered sacred towards a freer approach that gave the target text a much more literary and polished quality; and then finally a renewed concern for the style of the source text and an acknowledgement that different types of source text required different approaches. Many, if not most, of the concerns relating to the process of translation that were articulated in European antiquity are also evident here.

Likewise, in what we now call the Middle East the rise of Islam and the expansion of the Islamic Empire brought into being a new cultural environment in which translation was to thrive. Mona Baker and Sameh Fekry Hanna set the scene:

The new empire lay at the intersection of Eastern and Western civilizations and brought together the most sophisticated cultural traditions of the period: Greek, Indian, Persian and Egyptian. One of the most important consequences of this development was the shift of Arabic from a mainly oral language, spoken by an

ethnically homogeneous community of native speakers, to a written and spoken lingua franca of a vast civilization comprising many ethnic and linguistic groups (Baker and Hanna 2009: 329).

They go on to explain how translation became the means whereby the Arabs sought to access the new sources of knowledge that were now available to them from other civilizations, and how it was the introduction of paper into the Muslim world early in the eighth century that greatly facilitated this process. Indeed, the Arabs, they inform us (ibid:330), ‘are credited with initiating the first organized, large-scale translation activity in history’, with an unprecedented level of activity taking place particularly in the period from the early eighth through to the eleventh century. This began during the Umayyad period and reached a peak under the Abbasid caliphs in Baghdad, and especially during the caliphate of al-Ma’mūn (early ninth century). Citing al-Khūry (1988: 24), Baker (ibid) mentions that there are three important factors that distinguish this great era of translation from anything known before: a) the range of source languages, b) the range of topics and subjects translated, and c) the fact that the whole translation movement was state-sponsored and supported, with the flow of work being organized and regulated by ‘translation chambers’. Bernard Lewis (2000: 73) also notes that ‘there was probably more translation activity into and out of Arabic than any other language in pre-modern times.’

The early Abbasid caliphs through the eighth century continued the Umayyad practice of commissioning the translation of scientific writings. However, it was the caliph-scholar al-Ma’mūn who improved on the previous ‘translation chambers’ and established in 830 what was to become the most famous centre of translation in Arab history, the *Bayt al-Ḥikma* (*House of Wisdom*), with a staff of translators working into Arabic from Greek, Syriac, Persian, Sanskrit and Nabatean (Baker and Hanna 2009: 331). The same tension between literal translation and a more TT-oriented, ‘sense-for-sense’ type of translation that we have already noted in Europe and China seems to surface again in the mediaeval Islamic context. Describing the development of the classical Arabic language, Kees Versteegh (2001: 68) points out that those translations that were done into Arabic from Greek writings (via Syriac versions) before al-Ma’mūn set up the *Bayt al-Ḥikma* ‘were written in a clumsy style that betrays its Greek origin in every line’. Later, however, this was to change:

In the writings of the greatest of all translators, Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq (d. 260/873), there is no trace of such translated language. He explicitly rejects the literal translations of his predecessors and uses a businesslike,

terse style that makes full use of the syntactic possibilities of Arabic and shuns the ornate epistolary style (ibid: 69).

Thus, the celebrated Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq and also al-Jawharī are considered standard-bearers of the second method or approach to translation that emerged during the period in question, an approach that ‘consisted of translating sense-for-sense, creating fluent target texts which conveyed the meaning of the original without distorting the target language’ (Baker and Hanna ibid: 333).

It appears from what we know of Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq’s methods that he shared with St Jerome a great concern to establish the accuracy of the source texts from which he translated. Another interesting feature of this ‘Golden Era’ of translation is that it produced some reflection on such issues as whether it was actually possible to translate certain text types, whether translations provided reliable information and the effect of interference from Greek and Syriac on the structure of the target language, classical Arabic. Such reflection may have been prompted at least in part by criticisms directed at the translating profession by figures like the great ninth-century writer al-Jāḥiz. Despite all this, Baker and Hanna (ibid: 333-334) point out in their summing-up of the significance of this period that, had it not been for ‘the intense programme of translation carried out under the Abbasids’, the intellectual achievements of the Islamic world in the tenth and eleventh centuries (which in turn prepared the way for the European Renaissance) could hardly have been possible: ‘Thus translation lay at the centre of *the* most important period of intellectual activity in the history of the Islamic World’.

As we return to Europe to take up the story of translation there in the Middle Ages and the early modern period, it is worth bearing in mind the point well made by Lefevere:

Before we go on, let us call to mind – and firmly anchor there – the fact that European culture from, say, AD 500 to, say, 1800, was in essence bilingual, or even multilingual. There was a generally respected ‘language of authority’, first Latin, then French, which would be known by all those professing to be scholars, ecclesiastics or literati... European literate culture between 500 and 1800 can therefore be said to have been a bi(multi)lingual coterie culture... (Lefevere 1990: 16)

During the Middle Ages, it was the Catholic church which played a central role in initiating and authorizing translation into and from Latin, the language it tended to view as the norm – as opposed to the vernacular languages which it considered corrupt and barbaric. However, it was translation into the vernaculars, from the Middle Ages through the Renaissance and

into the nineteenth century, that gradually broke up Lefevre's 'coterie culture' and helped to create and consolidate a national linguistic and literary consciousness in Britain and elsewhere (Ellis and Oakley-Brown 2009: 345). In late fourteenth-century England, translation into Middle English increased dramatically, and became a professional activity associated with commercial 'scriptoria' or translation and editing workshops (ibid: 347). A major figure in this period is the poet Chaucer, who translated a great deal and produced a translation of the famous *Consolatio* of Boethius which was later to be denigrated by none other than Samuel Johnson for being a 'version strictly literal' arising from Chaucer's 'zeal for fidelity' (quoted in Barnstone 1993: 97-98). Importantly for the history of translation, it was Chaucer's decision to publish only in English which 'contributed powerfully to the establishment of English thereafter as the principal literary language of England' (Ellis and Oakley-Brown: ibid).

Barnstone (ibid: 203) records that, in the first decade of Elizabeth I's reign in the second half of the sixteenth century, there were four times as many translations produced as in the previous half-century. The motor behind this extraordinarily dynamic movement was the concern both to make the Bible accessible to ordinary folk in their vernacular languages and to tap into the riches of classical literature. The first concern had begun to find expression in England some two centuries earlier thanks to the efforts of that contemporary of Chaucer John Wyclif, the 'morning star of the Reformation'. A significant document in translation history is the General Prologue to the Wyclif Bible, which makes a strong case for translating the Scriptures from Latin into the vernacular English of the period, arguing that such translation 'signifies the right of the people to have Holy Writ in a form which they can read and understand' (Barnstone ibid: 201). Copeland (1991:225) sees the definition of translation given in the Prologue as a 'hermeneutic of access': a model according to which there is scope for multiple translation – both *interlingual* (between different written languages) and *intralingual* (rewording within the same written language) – the essential point of which is 'to manifest a truth that lies beyond the accidents of translation, a truth to which there should be a communality of access'. Later, in the early part of the sixteenth century, it was notably William Tyndale in England and Martin Luther in Germany who not only challenged the might of the Roman Catholic establishment with their translations of the Bible into their respective vernaculars, but also gave the language

of ordinary people a new status and importance. Luther in particular occupies an important place in translation history because of his famous polemic of 1530, the *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* (*Circular Letter on Translation*). In this he responded to accusations that he had altered Holy Scripture in his translations and defended his principles of translation which, following those of St Jerome, generally rejected a word-for-word approach and also viewed translation essentially in terms focusing on the target language and those reading it (Munday 2001/2008: 23-24). Nida (1998: 23) sees Luther's statement as introducing 'significant new views about translational equivalence in the Scriptures'.

The efforts of Tyndale and Luther were, of course, aided and abetted by the introduction of the art of printing in the West from the middle of the fifteenth century, when Gutenberg in Germany first type-set and printed multiple copies of St Jerome's Vulgate. Barnstone (1993: 193) highlights the significance for translation of the fact that the first printed book in Europe (two centuries later than in China) was in fact a translation, as was the first book to be printed in English-speaking North America, the *Bay Psalm Book* of 1620.

In England, Wyclif and his Lollard associates and later William Tyndale (executed for heresy in 1536) may indeed be considered 'martyrs' of translation. However, their work contributed to the production in 1611 of what Barnstone (*ibid*: 211) calls 'the most famous translation in the world', the *King James Bible* or *Authorized Version*, with its Preface containing the sonorous pronouncement: 'Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel...' The most interesting aspect of this great project and its legacy, according to Barnstone, is not merely the fact that it was really an intralingual revision of previous English translations or versions:

The dream of the Protestant West, as of each denomination with a Bible of its own, has to do with the ancient question of naming and renaming peoples and places for political reasons in order to validate the uniqueness and originality of their own document. The word of the Bible is the word of the Bible. For nearly four centuries to most Protestants that word has come from one authorized book, the King James Version, which despite the descriptive noun *version* in its title, they perceive as neither version, translation, nor adaptation but the *original Holy Writ* (*ibid*: 213).

We should remember at this point that secular translation also had at least one important martyr. As we noted above, the rise of translation during the sixteenth century was powered not just by Bible translation but also by the desire to access the riches of classical Greek

and Latin literature. In his translation of one of the dialogues of Plato, the French humanist Étienne Dolet made the mistake of suggesting that there was no afterlife, and for this crime he was condemned as a heretic by local Catholic theologians and burnt at the stake in 1546 (just ten years after Tyndale's demise) (Munday 2001/2008: 23, Barnstone 1993: 203-204). Fortunately for the cause of translation history, Dolet did not die before producing a statement on translation which is often seen as the first formulation of translation theory in the early modern period. This is the treatise which he called *La Manière de bien traduire d'une langue en l'autre* (*How to translate well from one language into another*), published in 1540, and it represents an early essay in the prescriptive tradition that was to predominate at least up to the end of the eighteenth century. Myriam Salama-Carr sums up the main points of Dolet's prescription:

Dolet cites five rules for translation: understanding the meaning of the original text, mastering both source and target languages, avoiding word-for-word renderings, using the speech of ordinary people, and employing an appropriate tone. The fourth principle, using the speech of ordinary people, can be seen as a response to the tendency of sixteenth-century scholars and Latinists to introduce neologisms and Latin structures into the vernacular (Salama-Carr 2009: 405).

Steiner (1998: 276) says of Dolet's 'rules' that they 'have the virtue of obviousness' and that they may be traced back to Italian grammarians and rhetoricians of the early sixteenth century. He also (ibid) makes an important underlying observation about the contribution of Dolet and his successors in France through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: 'French pre-eminence in the theory of translation during this period was no accident: it reflected the political and linguistic centrality of French culture during and after the break-up of European Latinity (a phenomenon which, of course, inspired the search for an agreed discipline of translation)'.

It was against this same background in sixteenth-century France that influential arguments *against* translation were articulated. Such arguments (found for example in the pamphlet *Défense et illustration de la langue française* of 1549 by Joachim du Bellay) raised once again the notion of 'untranslatability' – but this time in a secular context. This notion was founded, writes Steiner (ibid: 252), 'on the conviction, formal and pragmatic, that there can be no true symmetry, no adequate mirroring, between two different semantic systems'. Du Bellay, himself a poet, Latinist and translator of Virgil, made a distinction between poetry (then the dominant literary form) and non-literary texts, regarding the former as

untranslatable (though worthy of imitation). As Salama-Carr (2009: 406) explains, the translated literary text ‘was seen as unable to provide “the grace and elegance of the original”, the introduction into French of an alien language form being an insurmountable obstacle’. Meanwhile Jacques Amyot (1513-93) was a translator of this period who played a significant part in introducing French readers to certain Greek works, notably Plutarch’s *Lives*, which interestingly provided an intermediate source for Sir Thomas North’s translation of the same, published only twenty years later (in 1579), from which Shakespeare obtained material for his Roman plays. Amyot’s translations were later criticized for being too literal; however he had the interests of the TT reader firmly in mind, and he and other translators of the time are noteworthy for providing ample glosses, definitions and amplifications which tended to make the translated texts longer than the sources (Salama-Carr: *ibid*).

The seventeenth century saw important developments in translation practice and commentary in both France and England. In the former, Nicolas Perrot d’Ablancourt was a leading representative of the school of translators who saw their task basically as adaptation according to the mores and expectations of the time, and consequently produced the free, ‘dynamic’ translations of the classics known as *Les Belles Infidèles*. D’Ablancourt ‘adapted classical texts to current canons and genres (through omissions and “improvements”) to such an extent that some of his translations are considered travesties of their originals’ (*ibid*: 407). This approach did not, however, go unchallenged. A major text later in the century is the *De Interpretatione* (1661) by Pierre-Daniel Huet, which ‘urged the translator to show humility towards the source text’ (*ibid*). In other words, he argued for a greater respect on the part of the translator for the original language and context and also the foreign qualities of the source text. Huet was in fact advocating a sensible and scrupulous ‘middle path between literalism and licence’, as Steiner (1998: 278) puts it, and the importance of his contribution goes well beyond that:

Huet has a keen eye for the misuse of translation as self-enhancement; he speaks scathingly of translators who indulge their own *ingenium* at the expense of the text. He shows insight, albeit rudimentary, into the philosophic problem underlying all translation: his *De Interpretatione* takes the term in its full cognitive sense...there can be little doubt that he was a polyglot and that his response to the quality of different languages was vivid (*ibid*: 279).



In England, meanwhile, there was also a marked tendency in the mid-seventeenth century for poets and translators (especially those of the Court) to produce extremely free versions of the classics. Two principal examples of this tendency are Sir John Denham and Abraham Cowley. The latter commented on his strategy of translation in his preface to the *Pindarique Odes* (1656), attacking ‘faithful’ attempts at word-for-word rendering of poetry and championing the idea of *imitation* (as practised in Europe) as the way to convey the spirit of the original in a foreign tongue. Barnstone (1993: 86) sees Cowley as ‘the earliest and most bellicose proponent of not only naturalizing [i.e. ‘domesticating’] foreign texts in English but producing libertine imitations’. Likewise Lawrence Venuti (1998: 241) identifies the work and commentaries of writers in the French and English traditions at this time such as D’Ablancourt and Denham as good instances of a ‘domesticating’ strategy: with them and others like them, he argues, ‘it is evident that domestication involves an adherence to domestic literary canons both in choosing a foreign text and in developing a translation method’. This now-familiar tension or dichotomy between the ‘domesticating’ and ‘foreignizing’ strategies is something we shall encounter again in due course.

The dominant figure towards the end of this century in England – and indeed one of the major names in the history of translation theory – is John Dryden (1631-1700). He was one of the two leading figures in translation activity at the end of the seventeenth century – the other being Alexander Pope (Ellis and Oakley-Brown 2009: 350). His famous analysis of the translation process and systematic attempt at prescribing good practice was to draw praise from Dr Johnson, and in Steiner’s words (1998: 267) it ‘laid down ideals and lines of discussion which are ours still’. Typically in the context of his age, Dryden’s analysis was presented in a preface, the Preface to *Ovid’s Epistles, Translated by Several Hands* (1680). Here he divides translation into three different methods or registers: 1) metaphrase, 2) paraphrase and 3) imitation. The first means a ‘servile, literal’ approach such as that of Ben Jonson’s translation of Horace’s *Ars Poetica* – an approach which Dryden derides with a famous simile: ‘Tis much like dancing on ropes with fettered legs...’ The third method, imitation, is at the other extreme: it refers to a very free form of translation – in effect adaptation – which involves the forsaking of both words and sense (a prime example being Cowley’s versions of Pindar and Horace). Dryden was worried that, while imitation as a translation method would give ‘visibility’ to a virtuoso writer and translator such as

Cowley, it nonetheless amounted to ‘the greatest wrong which can be done to the memory and reputation of the dead’ (Steiner 1998: 268). He therefore advocated his second method, paraphrase, a *via media* which he says means ‘...translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered’. A fine example of the paraphrase approach, according to Dryden, is the 1658 translation of Book IV of Virgil’s *Aeneid* by Edmund Waller and Sidney Godolphin, and it was also an approach that he himself followed in his many translations from the classics (ibid: 269). However it appears that, in time, Dryden came to see even paraphrase as something of an ‘extreme’ approach, and as Munday (2001/2008: 26) points out, he changes his stance somewhat in the dedication he wrote for his 1697 translation of the *Aeneid*, in which he tells the reader that he ‘thought fit to steer betwixt the two extremes of paraphrase and literal translation; to keep as near my author as I could, without losing all his graces, the most eminent of which are in the beauty of his words’. Dryden was essentially a believer in ‘naturalizing’ or ‘domesticating’ the source text into the translator’s native idiom (Barnstone 1993: 27). Right translation will ideally ‘not pre-empt the authority of the original but show us what the original would have been like had it been conceived in our own speech’ (Steiner 1998: 269).

The influence of Dryden can be detected well into the eighteenth century. It is evident, for example, in the work of that other great contemporary poet, Alexander Pope, who in the preface to his translation of Homer’s *Iliad* (1715 – 20) ‘insists on moderation, and the need for an accuracy which avoids literalism or paraphrase’ (Ellis and Oakley-Brown 2009: 351). Much translation was done during this century, most (but by no means all) of it literary in nature. Salama-Carr (2009: 408), writing specifically about the French translation tradition, notes that on the whole, ‘...this was a period of transition during which translation theory was getting ready to leave the age of classicism behind and prepare the ground for the Romantic insistence on literalism’.

The end of the eighteenth century saw another major contribution to the systematic, prescriptive study of translation. This is the Scottish lawyer, historian and translator Alexander Fraser Tytler’s *Essay on the Principles of Translation*, first published in 1791,

which ‘with a systematic approach typical of the period, reacts against Dryden’s concept of paraphrase and the loose translations that resulted from it’ (Ellis and Oakley-Brown 2009: 352). In Tytler’s work we can discern elements that connect it to the previous writings of both Dolet and Dryden, and indeed the *Essay* may be regarded as the culmination of all these attempts to systematize the study of the translation process and to prescribe ‘rules’ or ‘principles’ that ought to govern that process. Tytler proposed three such governing ‘principles’:

According to Tytler, translation should give a complete transcript of the idea of the original work, the style and manner of writing should have the same character as in the original, and translation should have all the ease of the original (Ellis and Oakley-Brown: *ibid*).

In this we can detect a reaction against the whole tradition of loose translation and indeed against Dryden’s concept of ‘paraphrase’.

Munday (2001/2008: 27) points out that, whereas Dryden had sought to define ‘good translation’ basically in author-oriented terms (that is, by urging translators to imagine themselves as the original author, but writing in the target rather than the source language), Tytler sees it rather from the perspective of readers of the target language when he writes of the merit of the original source text being ‘so completely transfused into another language as to be as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs as it is by those who speak the language of the original work’. In other words, while for Dryden the emphasis was on ‘domesticating’ the original author, Tytler’s ideas actually foreshadowed the principle of ‘equivalent effect’ [that is, upon target-language receptors] that was put forward by Eugene Nida nearly two centuries later (Nida 1964: 159). The kind of vocabulary used by Tytler and his predecessors (‘genius’, ‘wit’, ‘taste’ etc.) is naturally very much part and parcel of the eighteenth-century cultural outlook, and the standards invoked for assessing the quality or success of a translation are essentially aesthetic and subjective; at the same time, however, ‘a sea change is observable in Tytler’s claim that the original text provides the ultimate point of reference...’ (Ellis and Oakley-Brown 2009: 352). Finally, Munday (2001/2008: 28) makes the important observation that, by ranking his three ‘rules’ in order of comparative importance, Tytler in effect foreshadows the ‘hierarchical categorizing’ that becomes a feature of more modern translation theory, with its discussion of ‘loss’ and ‘gain’ in the translation process.

### 1.3 *From Schleiermacher to Jakobson*

The early nineteenth century saw the start of a fundamental shift in the way the process of translation was viewed. Our focus now moves to Germany, where from the late eighteenth century a Romantic and philosophical concept of language and translation had been developed in the writings of major figures such as Herder, Goethe and A.W. Schlegel (Kittel and Poltermann 2009: 416). Kelly (1979: 48) points out a significant new idea taken up by these Romantic writers:

The eighteenth century had assumed that the basic universal in language was a logical arrangement of meaning and meaningful units. For the Romantics, however, the basic universal was a creative energy which expressed itself in meaning; this was what was to be called 'pure language'.

It was against this background in early nineteenth-century Germany that a foreignizing strategy in translation first came to be formulated clearly and decisively in the writings of Friedrich Schleiermacher, the Protestant theologian, philosopher and translator (Venuti 1998: 241-2). His 1813 lecture in Berlin entitled *Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzens (On the Different Methods of Translating)* is, according to Robinson (2002:225), 'the major document of Romantic translation theory, and one of the major documents of Western translation theory in general'. In it, Schleiermacher steps outside of the traditional dichotomies of word-for-word v. sense-for-sense and faithful v. free, and instead focuses on the question of how to bring together the ST author and the TT reader. He maintains that there are only two methods or paths open to the 'true translator':

The translator either (1) disturbs the writer as little as possible and moves the reader in his direction, or (2) disturbs the reader as little as possible and moves the writer in his direction. The two approaches are so absolutely different that no mixture of the two is to be trusted, as that would increase the likelihood that the writer and reader would miss each other entirely; it is important, therefore, that one or the other be followed as closely as possible (Robinson 2002: 229; *Robinson's own translation*).

Thus Schleiermacher's ideal may be summed up as 'bringing the reader to the author, or training the target-language readership to accept, even to crave, translations steeped in the foreign flavour of their originals' (ibid: 225).

It is also worth noting that, as part of the prolegomena in his lecture, Schleiermacher makes a distinction between two different types of translator – 'a distinction that runs through German translation criticism since' (Kelly 1979: 212). On the one hand there is the

*Dolmetscher*, who works in the field of commerce, law and administration, while on the other is the *Uebersetzer*, the ‘proper translator’ who engages with scholarly and artistic material (Snell-Hornby 1995: 10; Munday 2001/2008: 28). As we noted earlier, this was a distinction made several centuries before by Quintilian (Steiner 1998: 264-265). From the perspective of our own age, Snell-Hornby (ibid: 11) makes the reasonable criticism of Schleiermacher’s ‘eigentliche Uebersetzen’ (translation proper) that it ‘applied only to literary works of art, and his theoretical framework was hence limited to only one section of what is now understood as translation’. Munday (ibid: 29) also points out two particular consequences of Schleiermacher’s approach. One is that translators may be wrong to assume that they can communicate their own impression of a given ST to a TT readership that may not be educated, sensitive or perceptive to the same degree; the other is that a special language of translation may be needed, so that the technique of ‘compensation’ can be deployed as appropriate in the translation of a foreign text.

According to Kittel and Poltermann (2009: 417), Schleiermacher advocated the use of a *proper* language for translation (involving language change) since... ‘only by deviating from established norms could the alien or foreign increment be visualized in the target language. Most important, though, Schleiermacher was convinced of the innovative, but also of the regenerative powers of translation’. The influence of this founder of modern hermeneutics can hardly be overstated. His main achievement was to valorize the foreign text and respect its ‘otherness’ (Munday 2001/2008: 28-29; Fawcett 1997: 116), and his ideas of a ‘pure language’ of translation and of translation giving fresh life to an original text were taken up again in the early twentieth century by Walter Benjamin (Munday ibid: 29; Venuti 2000: 11-12). The hermeneutic approach to the translation process was also to find new expression in Steiner’s ‘hermeneutic motion’ – ‘the act of elicitation and appropriative transfer of meaning’ (Steiner 1998: 312). It was above all in the German-language area that Schleiermacher’s hypotheses exerted a lasting influence on practically all modern translation theories (Kittel and Poltermann 2009: 417).

The foreignizing ideas of the German Romantics in general, and Schleiermacher’s vision of a separate translation language in particular, were also to influence many of the famous practitioners of translation in nineteenth-century Britain. In an apparent break with the

strong domesticating strategies that had been the norm from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century, many Victorian translators (Thomas Carlyle, Francis Newman, William Morris and D.G. Rossetti, for example) were concerned to communicate the ‘otherness’ and remoteness of the original text in both time and place (Bassnett 1991: 67-68; Ellis and Oakley-Brown 2009: 352-353). However, Bassnett (ibid: 68-69) notes ‘an interesting paradox’ inherent in this concept of translation. On the one hand the translator showed reverence for the foreign text and invited the cultivated and intellectual reader to share in what was considered a morally or aesthetically enriching experience; furthermore, the foreign text was seen as an item of beauty and worth to be added to a nation’s ‘collection’. On the other hand, translators were implicitly rejecting the ideal of universal literacy since they were producing translations in deliberately archaic language for the benefit of a minority.

The intellectual reader represented a very small minority in the increasingly diffuse reading public that expanded throughout the century, and hence the foundations were laid for *the notion of translation as a minority interest* (ibid: 69; my emphasis).

In the Victorian Britain of the mid-nineteenth century an upsurge of interest in translation was fuelled by the great debate between Francis Newman and Matthew Arnold over the nature and purpose of translation, with specific reference to translating Homer (Hardwick 2000: 29). In his 1856 translation of the *Iliad*, Newman had sought to be ‘faithful’ by trying to convey the linguistic and cultural remoteness of Homer through the use of archaic language and rhythms: in other words he was deliberately foreignizing, whilst at the same time seeking to make Homer’s epic accessible to ordinary readers (Robinson 2002: 256). This approach was vehemently attacked by Matthew Arnold in his Oxford Lectures *On Translating Homer* of 1860-61. Arnold advised lay readers to put their trust in scholars, who alone were in a position to judge whether the translation produced more or less the same effect upon its audience as the original (Bassnett 1991: 69; Venuti 1998: 243). The TT readership therefore had to be brought to the original ST by means of the translation (Bassnett: ibid); and Arnold dismissed as ‘Newmanizing’ the kind of foreignizing strategy advocated by his opponent in this debate (Hardwick 2000: 35). Ironically, as Bassnett (ibid: 69-70) points out, the elitist concept of education and culture that was implicit in Arnold’s attitude was to have the effect of devaluing translation, since it suggested strongly that it was always preferable to read any given work (such as the *Iliad*) in the original language.

Nevertheless, the debate was clearly a salutary one, and Lorna Hardwick (ibid: 29) sums it up as follows:

The underlying conflict between the approaches of Arnold and Newman was about whether translations should, or could, seek to 'universalise' meaning and remove cultural differences. The dispute provided a wider perspective on the continuing debate about how to convey the style and spirit of the original while remaining 'faithful' to the letter, that is to its form and constructions.

Arnold himself maintained that, while both sides probably agreed that the translator's 'first duty is to be faithful', the point at issue was 'in what faithfulness consists' (Robinson 2002: 251).

As we move on to review briefly the early part of the twentieth century, we note that it is still *literary translation* that is the focus of attention in translation theory and practice. The influence of the German Romanticism and hermeneutics of the previous century can be seen in, for example, Benjamin's 1923 essay *The Task of the Translator*, with its ideas of a 'pure language' of translation and of a translation itself having a kind of autonomous status and participating in the 'afterlife' of the foreign text (Venuti 2000: 11). A major practitioner and theorist of this period was the poet Ezra Pound, an avid experimenter with literary form who sought to re-vitalize the English language with his distinctly foreignizing poetry translations (Venuti ibid: 11-12; Ellis and Oakley-Brown 2009: 354). Bassnett (1991: 74) describes his work as of immense importance in the history of translation, with his skill as a translator 'matched by his perceptiveness as critic and theorist'. She also gives some prominence to the lesser-known but important contribution to translation theory at this time of Hilaire Belloc, who in his 1931 Taylorian lecture at Oxford *On Translation* highlighted the fact that translation suffered from a status problem: because its value had been underestimated, standards had been lowered and the resulting degradation meant that neither its importance nor its difficulty had been grasped (ibid: 2). In addition to addressing the question of status, Belloc's lecture offered 'a brief but highly intelligent and systematic approach to the practical problems of translating...' (ibid: 74) and, interestingly, Belloc's six general rules for the prose translator seem to look forward to the more recent notions of the *unit of translation* and *intertextuality* (ibid: 116-117). The latter notion is one that we shall be analyzing and examining in some detail later in Chapter Three.

Venuti (2000: 12-13) sees a certain tension within the world of translation in the early decades of the twentieth century:

Translation theory and practice in the early twentieth century are marked by two competing tendencies: on the one hand, a formalist interest in technique, usually expressed as innovative translation strategies that match new interpretations of foreign texts; and on the other hand, a strong functionalism, a recurrent yoking of translation projects to cultural and political agendas.

Ezra Pound was clearly an example of the first tendency. As examples of the second, Venuti (ibid: 13) cites the efforts by Buber and Rosenzweig to help revive German Jewish culture through a close rendering of the Hebrew Bible. He also (ibid) puts a rather different slant on Belloc's contribution by pointing to those parts of his lecture that rejected any foreignizing approach on the grounds that translation had a socially important function in the West, namely to preserve cultural unity following the decline of Latin as a 'common bond of comprehension'.

In this period the issue of translatability was frequently raised – as it had of course been before. It accounts for the 'misery' in Ortega y Gasset's famous philosophical dialogue of 1937 entitled *The Misery and the Splendour of Translation*: the apparent impossibility of translation because of linguistic and cultural (in the anthropological sense) incongruencies that arise 'from different mental pictures, from disparate intellectual systems' (Venuti ibid: 14). Literary and other texts have, of course, been subjected to translation for many centuries (Steiner 1998: 264); nonetheless translators have frequently felt sad and frustrated, victims of what Steiner (ibid: 283) calls 'a special *miseria* of translation, a melancholy after Babel'. During the 1940s and 1950s, as Venuti (2000: 67-70) explains, this fundamental issue of translatability continued to dominate discussion. Approaches to the subject ranged between the extremes represented, on the one hand, by the skepticism of the analytical philosopher Quine and the writer and literary critic Nabokov, and, on the other, by the pragmatic optimism of linguistic analysts such as Nida, Vinay and Darbelnet, and Jakobson (ibid). This was a period in which, along with early excitement following the end of the Second World War regarding the possibilities of machine translation, there were some significant attempts by theoretical linguists to analyze and formalize the procedures involved in translation, and to draw up taxonomies of the changes or 'shifts' that occurred in the translation process (Fawcett 1997: 34; Munday 2001/2008: 56). A well-known example of this is the *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais* by the Canadians



Vinay and Darbelnet, first published in French in 1958 and itself translated into English only as recently as 1995 (Munday *ibid*: 56). In this influential essay in comparative stylistics the authors identified two general translation strategies, *direct* and *oblique* translation (in effect corresponding to the traditional division of ‘literal’ v. ‘free’), and advocated seven different translation techniques – each applicable at the linguistic levels of lexis, grammar and text. These are: *Borrowing*, *Calque* and *Literal translation* (to be used wherever *direct translation* is possible); and *Transposition*, *Modulation*, *Equivalence* (a term used here only in a limited sense) and *Adaptation* (to be used as elements of a strategy of *oblique translation*) (Fawcett 1997: 34-40; Munday 2001/2008: 56-58). Munday (*ibid*: 59) points out that Vinay and Darbelnet stressed the central importance of stylistics for the translator, and that they defined the *unit of translation* as ‘the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually’. Fawcett (*ibid*: 40) reminds us that, despite later criticisms, the work of Vinay and Darbelnet was pioneering and that – even though they were essentially linguistically-oriented - they certainly took problems of culture seriously in their treatment of the technique of *adaptation*.

The general problem of ‘equivalence’ between languages facing the would-be translator was by now beginning to be addressed by scholars who viewed the problem from a cultural (or ‘ethnographic’) as well as a linguistic angle. An interesting and perceptive early document is J. B. Casagrande’s 1954 paper *The Ends of Translation* (Casagrande 1954: 335-340), in which the main point is made very lucidly:

The attitudes and values, the experience and tradition of a people, inevitably become involved in the freight of meaning carried by a language. In effect, one does not translate LANGUAGES, one translates CULTURES (Casagrande *ibid*: 338; original emphasis).

The whole process of translation, argues Casagrande (*ibid*: 340), while certainly possible, is nonetheless a creative and not a mechanical one, whatever the purpose – a process which ‘in all but its simplest forms presents a real challenge to him [*sic*] who would undertake it’.

Linguistic meaning and equivalence are at the heart of the famous paper *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation* (1959) by the structural linguist Roman Jakobson. First of all, Jakobson (who was influenced by the semiotics of C.S. Peirce) distinguished three kinds of translation: 1) *Intralingual*, 2) *Interlingual* and 3) *Intersemiotic*. Of these, it is of course

*interlingual* translation that is ‘the traditional, although by no means exclusive, focus of translation studies’ (Munday 2001/2008: 5), and Jakobson describes it as *translation proper* – ‘an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language’ (Venuti 2000: 114). According to Venuti (*ibid*: 69), the great achievement of Jakobson’s paper is ‘to have introduced a semiotic reflection on translatability’ (including the notion of ‘creative transposition’ to cope with that most difficult of areas, the translation of poetry). Jakobson’s paper is perhaps especially known, however, for the somewhat cryptic statement: ‘Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics’ (Venuti *ibid*: 114). This preoccupation with the concept of equivalence was to inform a great deal of the translation theory of the next two decades.

#### **1.4 *Building the ‘House of Many Rooms’: the emergence of a new discipline***

It was the British linguist J.C. Catford who, working under the influence of Firthian and Hallidayan linguistics, originated the term ‘translation shifts’ in his study *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965) (Munday 2001/2008: 60). Having defined translation bluntly as ‘an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another’ (Catford 1965: 1), he went on to draw a distinction between *formal* and *textual* equivalence – the latter being applicable whenever close adherence to the linguistic form of the source text is not possible. This textual equivalence is achieved by means of the linguistic phenomenon that Catford calls ‘shifts’, defined as ‘departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL (source language) to the TL (target language)’ (Catford *ibid*: 73). There is no scope here to examine Catford’s theory in detail. His approach has been heavily criticized by a number of translation scholars, for example by Snell-Hornby (1995:14-15), who describes it as ‘now generally considered dated and of mere historical interest’. Munday, on the other hand, acknowledges that Catford’s work is ‘an important attempt to apply to translation advances in linguistics in a systematic fashion’, and that the element of scientific probability in his attitude to equivalence ‘was linked to the growing interest in machine translation at the time’ (Munday 2001/2008: 61). Hatim (2001: 17) notes that, although Catford’s examples are decontextualized and his proposals highly theoretical, he was in fact ‘no stranger to contextual linguistics’ (which was emerging in the 1960s) but had made a strategic choice

to give an account of translation equivalence in a narrow sense. On the negative side, Munday (ibid: 61) further says of Catford: ‘He does not look at whole texts, nor even above the level of the sentence’.

Whatever one thinks of Catford’s contribution, a very different sort of landmark in the early days of translation studies was that created by the work of the American linguist and Bible translator Eugene Nida. Hatim (2001: 18) describes the new change of emphasis:

The emphasis is on the relationships between language, culture and society and on how some of the more practical insights yielded by linguistic analysis may be applied to the study of translation. This has meant that the narrow focus on linguistic meaning and structure widens considerably to take in a variety of contextual factors.

Nida started from a ‘universalist’ view of language, believing that ‘anything which can be said in one language can be said in another, unless the form is an essential element of the message’; he also – and significantly – held a ‘communicative’ view of the translation process, shifting the focus to the role of the receptor (Hatim ibid). Nida’s theories of *formal* and *dynamic* equivalence are well-known and were to exert a strong influence on the later theories of Peter Newmark in the UK and Werner Koller in Germany (Munday 2001/2008: 43-48). These theories will not be examined here since notions of equivalence form the basic subject matter of our next chapter.

There is, however, another important aspect of Nida’s contribution that deserves to be mentioned. The title of Nida’s first ground-breaking book in the 1960s was *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964) and, as Munday (ibid: 38) points out, this title is significant: Nida borrowed theoretical ideas from semantics, pragmatics and Chomskyan linguistics and was concerned ‘to move translation (Bible translation in his case) into a more scientific era...’ One of Nida’s main critics, Edwin Gentzler, questions whether there can really be a ‘science’ of translation and contends that Nida’s religious (i.e. Protestant Christian) beliefs motivated his scientific approach and that he ‘seems to be conflating the translator’s role with that of the missionary’ (Gentzler 2001: 56). Nonetheless Gentzler (ibid: 59) does concede that Nida’s work ‘enjoys surprising academic influence in the fields of linguistics and translation outside a biblical context’ – particularly in Germany, where the teaching of translation has been dominated by figures such as Wolfram Wilss championing the idea of a science of translation (*Uebersetzungswissenschaft*).

As mentioned at the beginning of this survey, it was the American-Dutch scholar James S. Holmes who wrote a seminal paper in 1972 (not widely available until 1988) called *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*. According to Gentzler (ibid: 93), this is 'generally accepted as the founding statement for the field'. Holmes drew attention to the fact that for scholars and researchers in this field life was difficult since

...papers on the subject of translation are dispersed over periodicals in a wide variety of scholarly fields and journals for practising translators. It is clear that there is a need for other communication channels, cutting across the traditional disciplines to reach all scholars working in the field, from whatever background (in Venuti 2000: 173).

He went on, first to propose the name 'translation studies' for the new academic discipline, and then to put forward an overall framework to describe what it is supposed to cover, in other words its 'nature' (Munday 2001/2008: 9-13). The framework was divided into two branches, the 'pure' and the 'applied'; and, as Munday (ibid: 12) comments, 'the fact that Holmes devoted two-thirds of his attention to the 'pure' aspects of theory and description surely indicates his research interests rather than a lack of possibilities for the applied side'.

During the 1970s and 1980s there was a discernible reaction both to what Munday (ibid: 72) terms 'the static linguistic typologies of translation shifts' and to the past preoccupation with seeking equivalence at word or sentence level. In Germany the work of Katharina Reiss was pioneering in that it steered translation theory towards a communicative and 'functionalist' approach that sought equivalence at the level of the whole text by linking language functions to text types and translation strategy (ibid). This functionalist translation theory, as it is known, was developed by several scholars in the German-speaking areas, notably Reiss, Vermeer, Snell-Hornby, Nord and Holz-Manttari. Its 'foundational text', according to Gentzler (2001: 70), is the *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* [Foundations for a General Theory of Translation] (1984) by Reiss and Vermeer, which puts forward the *Skopos* theory that had already been developed by Vermeer, using the Greek word *skopos* (= aim or purpose) to refer to the actual purpose of a translation and of the action of translating (Gentzler ibid; Munday 2001/2008: 79). Since this theory focuses essentially on the *purpose* of the translation, knowing why a particular source-text is to be translated and what the function of the target-text will be are crucial to the translator (Munday ibid: 79). Gentzler (ibid: 71) notes interestingly that the emergence

of the functionalist translation theory ‘marks an important moment in the evolution of translation theory by breaking the two-thousand-year-old chain of theory revolving around the faithful vs. free axis’. Hatim (2001: 79), assessing the value of *Skopos* theory, sees it as ‘a timely reminder of how useful text-classifications are in sharpening the translator’s awareness of discourse and other textual and extratextual factors’.

Discourse did indeed become a subject of increasing interest to many linguists and translation scholars through the 1980s and 1990s. The functionalist approach described above indicated an impatience with earlier linguistic preoccupations with micro-level translation problems, and sought to consider translation as ‘an act of intercultural communication’ (Munday 2001/2008: 87). The text analysis model produced by Christiane Nord in 1988 was an attempt at translation-oriented analysis of text at or above the sentence level; however, the growing discipline of discourse analysis went beyond the study and description of sentence structure, cohesion and other properties of a text to look at ‘the way language communicates meaning and social and power relations’ (Munday *ibid*: 90). Discourse is in fact defined by the textlinguistics scholar Hatim as ‘the use of language in speech or writing to relay attitudes and negotiate meaning in the light of such conceptual frameworks as ideology’ (Hatim 2001: 229).

Along with discourse analysis, the research discipline now generally known as text linguistics has established itself as an important part of translation studies. An increasing interest in the macro-level analysis of translation has been manifested over roughly the past three decades, with the result that Hatim, reviewing the scene at the start of the new century, could write:

...translation practitioners (and theorists of all persuasions) are becoming increasingly interested in what linguistic knowledge about the nature and function of *texts* has to offer, and in the research methodology associated with the fairly new discipline of text linguistics (Hatim *ibid*: 9; original emphasis).

A highly influential early work in this field is Robert de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Dressler’s *Introduction to Text Linguistics* (1981), known especially for setting forth a model of the textual standards that all texts should uphold in order to be effective as communication. Their seven ‘standards of textuality’ are: *Cohesion*, *Coherence*, *Situationality*, *Intertextuality*, *Intentionality*, *Acceptability* and *Informativity* (Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3-10; Hatim *ibid*: 117). The linguist M.A.K. Halliday’s ‘systemic

functional' model of language and discourse was also, as Munday (2001/2008: 90-100) shows, very influential in shaping several important studies of translation using a discourse analysis and text linguistics approach. These include: House's model for translation quality assessment in its original and revised forms (House 1977 and 1997), with its distinction between 'overt' and 'covert' translation; Baker's popular and influential coursebook *In Other Words*, which covers issues of equivalence through a series of levels, from that of the word to those of the whole text and the pragmatic dimension (Baker 1992); and the two ground-breaking studies by Hatim and Mason, *Discourse and the Translator* (1990) and *The Translator as Communicator* (1997), which in Munday's (ibid: 104) words '...move beyond House's register analysis and begin to consider the way social and power relations are negotiated and communicated in translation'.

Hatim himself (2001: 117) explains how, in the model of translation he developed with Ian Mason in the works cited above, a key notion is that of *rhetorical purpose* (e.g. narration or argumentation). This subsumes earlier ideas about 'communicative purpose' and 'text function' and is 'seen as pivotal both in the processing of texts and in the process of translation' (ibid). An important assumption within this model is that, although texts are essentially hybrid in nature, there is generally one predominant function or rhetorical purpose being served. Hatim and Mason have developed Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981: 163-4) distinction between *monitoring* and *managing* texts: the former means that 'the focus is on providing a reasonably detached account (as in various forms of exposition, such as the typical summary or review)' while the latter indicates that 'the dominant function of the text is to steer the situation in a manner favourable to the text producer's goals (as in various forms of argumentation)' (Hatim ibid: 118).

Albrecht Neubert and Gregory Shreve, in their *Translation as Text* (1992), state that in the textlinguistics approach the focus is on 'equivalence *at a textual and communicative level*, not at the sentential and lexical level' (ibid: 24) (my emphasis). Similarly, Baker (1992: 112) explains that in her treatment of equivalence 'we will assume that the ultimate aim of a translator, in most cases, is to achieve a measure of equivalence at text level, rather than at word or phrase level' (albeit noting that for the translator of sacred texts the latter form

of equivalence may well be just as important, if not more so). Baker also draws attention to the future research potential of text linguistics:

...More importantly, text studies are a relatively recent development in linguistics. There is, admittedly, a long tradition both in linguistics and in literary studies of analyzing the works of individual writers, particularly literary writers, but relatively little work has been done on such areas of text studies as the conventions of non-literary writing within a community or the preferred patterns of organization in different types of discourse (Baker *ibid*: 113).

Indeed, much the same point had already been made by Hatim and Mason (1990: 173).

Running parallel with this interest in text linguistics and the whole notion of 'text in context' during the 1990s – and indeed challenging it – was the so-called 'cultural turn' in translation studies (Hatim 2001: 10; Munday 2001/2008: 125). This meant a shift in emphasis towards analyzing translations and the translation process from the angle of cultural studies (of various kinds). The challenge to linguistics-oriented theories or models of translation was thrown down by Bassnett and Lefevere in 1990, when they wrote: 'Linguists have moved from word to text as a unit, but not beyond...' (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990: 4). They were concerned primarily with 'the interaction between translation and culture, on the way in which culture impacts and constrains translation...' (Munday *ibid*) and argued that 'translation studies scholars have to deal not only with texts and/or repertoires of texts in historical paradigms, but also need to look at those institutions that influence their production' (Gentzler 2001: 193). The new interdiscipline of cultural studies has impacted upon translation studies in various different fields, notably the concepts of 're-writing' (i.e. manipulation), gender, postcolonialism and the 'invisibility' of the translator (Lawrence Venuti's now famous term for the tendency of translators in the dominant Anglo-American culture to produce fluent, domesticating rather than foreignizing translations) (Munday *ibid*: 125, 144). Venuti himself admits that culturally oriented research – as a competing paradigm within the increasingly authoritative but diverse discipline of translation studies – 'tends to be philosophically skeptical and politically engaged, so it inevitably questions the claim of scientific objectivity in empirically oriented work which focuses on forms of description and classification, whether linguistic, experimental, or historical' (Venuti 2000: 333). In his assessment of the 'cultural turn', Munday (*ibid*: 135-136) acknowledges the wealth of new insights brought to translation studies by the cultural theorists, but at the same time sees the latter as driven by their own

ideologies and agendas and consequently prone to their own forms of ‘manipulation’. A fuller discussion of ideology in language, and consequently of the ways ideology and manipulation in various forms affect the translation process, will be offered in Chapter Four.

By the 1990s, then, translation studies had established itself as a new and authoritative academic discipline, or rather as an ‘interdiscipline’ in the minds of many scholars. Hatim (2001: 8) cites Neubert and Shreve (1992) as calling it a ‘house of many rooms’ – the different rooms being, in their words, ‘often simply different discourses and perspectives on a common object of interest – translation’. The ‘interdisciplinary’ approach, as advocated notably by Snell-Hornby *et al.* (1994), has generally been on the increase. However, in the first edition of his comprehensive introductory textbook Munday (2001: 189) warned of its limitations:

Much research in translation studies makes use of techniques and concepts from a range of backgrounds. Yet the construction of an interdisciplinary methodology is not straightforward, since few researchers possess the necessary expertise in a wide range of subject areas, and the original academic background of the individual researcher inevitably conditions the focus of their approach.

The question whether this interdisciplinary dimension is really a strength or a weakness is one that is yet to be resolved, and the issues surrounding it have received further explanation and discussion in Munday’s second edition (Munday 2001/2008: 14-15, 197-199). Fears have naturally been expressed about the dangers of fragmentation affecting translation studies, especially because of the tensions between linguistics and cultural studies and the separate training and research requirements in the growing field of interpreting (Baker 1998a: 279-280; Munday *ibid.*: 197). A further significant observation made by Munday (*ibid.*: 15) is that the trend towards translation studies being, in some places, ‘colonized by language departments’ has – ironically – had the effect of exacerbating the perceived artificial gap between practice and theory. A consequence of this has been the devaluation of translations (even whole-book ones) by the UK Research Assessment Exercise compared with academic articles – a problem also highlighted recently in a trenchant polemic by Ian Higgins, who demonstrates from his analyses of certain literary texts that

whether the translator is an academic or not, translation is a mode of written reading demanding as much analytical rigour, sophistication and research as, and more imaginative creativity than, most other critical writing (Higgins 2008: 231).



Nevertheless, on the positive side, practitioners and students of translation have certainly broadened their outlook as a result of ‘interdisciplinarity’, while over the past decade and more there has been a staggering proliferation (world-wide) of translating and interpreting courses, conferences, professional associations, books, articles and journals in several languages (Hatim 2001: 9; Munday *ibid*: 6-7). Research has been and is being undertaken in a very wide variety of areas, for example semiotics, pragmatics, ideology, gender studies, genre studies, media and internet translation, corpus research, translation history and teaching, translating into the second language and process research (i.e. into what happens in the mind of the translator, using such tools as ‘Think Aloud Protocols’ and ‘Immediate Retrospection’) (Hatim *ibid*: 155-161, 187-217). This last-mentioned field in particular reflects the changing focus in ideas about translation and the role of the translator. According to Hickey (1998: 2), this new focus is ‘on describing and analyzing the procedure or processes, rather than commenting on the product itself and asking how well or badly any particular translation has been done. This non-prescriptive approach, among others, is interested in how translation is actually done, examining the methods that have been used throughout history and asking how texts fit into the receiving cultures.’ Munday (2001/2008: 199) concludes his updated survey on a positive note, remarking that the growth and popularity of translation studies is attested by the diversity of contributions and the sheer number of scholars worldwide ‘who now locate themselves within [this discipline]’:

Trends and fashions change over time, of course, so it is imperative now that those within the field continue both their specialization, understanding and using new tools and methodologies at their disposal, and working collaboratively for the better comprehension of the ways in which translation operates at all levels (*ibid*).

As an example of fruitful and necessary collaboration across traditional disciplinary divides, we may cite the recent *Translation in Global News* (2009) by Esperança Bielsa and Susan Bassnett, the former a sociologist and the latter a prominent translation and cultural/literary studies scholar. This is a work to which we shall refer again in Chapter Four, towards the end of our discussion of ideology and manipulation.

The worldwide explosion of interest in translation and related issues referred to above has undoubtedly been aided by the contemporary phenomenon of the internet. The latter has not only made it easier for scholars to interact with one another and to organize conferences etc., but it has also (being the dominant medium through which international

communication takes place) had a great impact upon the conventional markets for translation work, and at the start of the new millennium was set to do so increasingly, according to Minako O'Hagan and David Ashworth (2002: 9-15). In the business world 'globalization' and 'localization' have been buzz-words for quite some time now; the latter process, according to O'Hagan and Ashworth (ibid: 66) 'is now being applied to both the Content and Package of wide-ranging products and services to render the Message as a whole into an appropriate form in the cultural context of the Receiver.' O'Hagan and Ashworth (ibid: 79-107) saw in 2002 a considerable role in the near future for Web-based 'teletranslation' and 'teleinterpretation'. They also (ibid: 38-39) described some ways in which machine translation (MT) could be employed successfully on the internet, while pointing out that, even with closely related languages, the subject matter of a given document might render MT ineffective. In 1995 Snell-Hornby (1995: 66) had made the point that an integrated approach to translation studies could not completely ignore MT; indeed machine-*aided* translation (her emphasis) or MAT, which can store useful linguistic items such as terminological data, was set to have a considerable future. Yet this was 'a far cry from the euphoria of the 1950s, when linguists [Warren Weaver, for example] seriously thought that the machine was embarking on a triumphal march across the territory of translation as a whole' (ibid).

Nowadays of course the majority of translation work being done is in the non-literary domain, and in the world of the internet there is bound to be a useful, if limited, role generally for both MT and MAT. In the case of Arabic/English/Arabic online automatic machine translation, Awatif Miz'il Abu Al-Sha'r and Muhammad Raji Zughoul (2009) have extended their earlier (2005) research and produced a 'multi-level analytic and evaluative study' based on six English and Arabic texts. Their multi-level analysis 'focuses on lexical and grammatical ambiguity, syntactic structure and on semantic transfer from the source language into the target language; while the corresponding evaluation 'concentrates on the dimensions of adequacy, accuracy and acceptability of this type of automatic translation'(Abu Al-Sha'r and Zughoul 2009: 33). The texts in question (ranging from the general to the specialized) were randomly selected and translated from source to target language 'using more than one of the available online machine translation systems: Al-Kāfi, Al-Wāfi, An-Nākel, Al-Misbar, Tarjim of Ajeeb and Google Research' (ibid). The

conclusion of the researchers is that the available softwares 'are till now unable to give a satisfactory output': in some cases the [MT] output 'is too detached from the original text' and it is 'sometimes odd, funny, inaccurate and even nonsensical' (ibid: 81-82). We cannot list or review here all the shortcomings identified in this research; but they include a predictable body of 'old chestnuts'. Many problems arise from the fact that 'the basic unit of an automatic translation is the word not the sentence': thus, translations produced are essentially 'mere substitutions of lexical items' on a one-to-one or word-by-word basis, resulting in the neglect of referential and contextual meanings and the overall circumstance that 'MT is far away from "knowledge of the world" that accounts for the cultural aspects and the changes that influence the language' (ibid: 80).

Much of this can be observed in an example provided by an online automatic translation into English of an original Arabic editorial in the London-based newspaper *Al-Quds al-'Arabi* ['Arab Jerusalem'] on 30 November 2009. The editorial comments on the facts behind the Dubai debt crisis, which was in the news at around that time, and the Arabic text begins as follows:

### إنهيار "إمبراطورية الجشع" في دبي رأي القدس

الإنتعاش في دبي كان ضخماً بمقاييس فاجأت العالم بأسره، حتى انها أصبحت محجاً لكل الباحثين عن الثراء السريع، ورجال الاعلام الغربيين الذين كتبوا المعلقات عن هذه المعجزة التي قامت فوق صحراء ملتهبة، ولكن هذه المعجزة لم تعمر طويلاً، وانفجرت "الفقاعة" في زمن قياسي ايضاً وبشكل مدو.

المسؤولون في دبي سيدخلون التاريخ على انهم اعظم خبراء تسويق العصر الحديث، فقد نجحوا في بيع بلادهم وازدهارها البراق الى العديد من البنوك العالمية الكبرى، علاوة على عشرات الآلاف من الحالمين بالثراء من الفقراء الذين شاهدوا اسعار العقار تتضاعف في اقل من عام، فاستدانوا او باعوا كل ما لديهم من اصول للدخول في مصيدة المقامرة العقارية هذه، فخسروا كل شيء تقريباً في طرفة عين...

The automatic English translation provided for these opening sentences (and continuing to the end in much the same way) runs as follows:

*The collapse of the 'empire of greed' in Dubai*

*The view of Jerusalem*

*Recovery in Dubai was a huge surprise the world at large scales, so it has become a pilgrimage site for all researchers to get rich quick, and the men who wrote the Western media postings on this miracle that has inflamed over the desert, but this miracle did not last long, and went off 'bubble' in record time also and resoundingly.*

*Officials in Dubai will enter history as having the greatest marketing experts in the modern era, they have succeeded in selling their country and prosperity to many of the bright major global banks, as well as tens of thousands of dreamers of wealth to the poor who have seen property prices double in less than a year, or sold Fastdanwa all of their assets to enter into the trap of gambling real estate these Fajsroa almost everything in the blink of an eye...*

The straightforward title of this piece is translated competently enough, but then the problems begin to become apparent when رأي القدس comes out as 'the view of Jerusalem' (rather than 'Al-Quds Al-'Arabi opinion / viewpoint / editorial'). The rendering of the first paragraph then betrays a general process of 'mere substitutions of lexical items', as mentioned above, and the cohesion and sense breaks down as one would expect. We find such curiosities as لكل الباحثين عن الثراء السريع coming out as 'for all researchers to get rich quick' instead of 'for everybody looking to get rich quick / make a quick killing', and وانفجرت "الفقاعة" rendered as 'and went off "bubble"...' rather than the expected collocation 'the bubble burst...' A little further on in the next paragraph, after seeming to make a good attempt at rendering sense for sense, the automatic translation stumbles, producing 'tens of thousands of dreamers of wealth to the poor who...' rather than 'tens of thousands of poor people dreaming of getting rich who...' It then (temporarily at least) gives up the ghost and lapses into nonsense with 'or sold Fastdanwa all of their assets to enter into the trap of gambling real estate these Fajsroa almost everything...', when the

meaning is '*and so [the poor people] took on loans or sold all the assets they had to get into this trap / snare of gambling on real estate, and went on to lose the lot practically overnight...*'

While the attempt at automatic translation for an opinion article of this kind certainly produces some stretches of comprehensible meaning that can be followed, it is hardly likely that anyone hoping to be able to read an Arab view of the Dubai debt crisis would be either impressed or encouraged by this offering, which contains a lot of the oddity, inadequacy and even nonsense referred to by Abu Al-Sha'r and Zughoul above. It is surely in those more difficult areas of cross-cultural translation such as argumentation (and especially in the case of languages separated by large cultural and linguistic divides, such as Arabic and English) that technology, however sophisticated, 'cannot compete with the creative power of the human mind' (Snell-Hornby 1995: 66).

### **1.5 Arabic to the fore**

Towards the end of the twentieth century, amid the plethora of different theories and perspectives regarding translation, we are able to identify two significant ways in which the world of translation had changed. One is that, even though many practising translators are still specialists in the area of literary or sacred texts, many others make a living in a very different context - that is to say, in the area of secular, non-literary and commercial or technical translation or interpreting. More recent forms of translation such as subtitling and dubbing also provide a rich seam for research. The other great change is in the move away from a narrow, Eurocentric attitude in the study of translation and towards the inclusion of many important languages and cultures beyond Europe. This has of course been assisted by the communications revolution, which has made it easier for all those interested in the study of translation to be in contact, whether they be based in Europe, North America, Brazil or China.

It was Mona Baker who, in the introduction to her translation coursebook *In Other Words* (1992), made a strong case for including major non-European languages such as Arabic, Japanese and Chinese. She explains (Baker 1992: 7) that, while keeping English as the

constant source language in her book, she had decided – unconventionally – to use such languages amongst others as target-language examples in order ‘to counterbalance the current preoccupation with European languages in translation studies’. She goes on:

It is high time the European translation community realized that there is life – and indeed translation – outside Europe and that professional non-European translators use a range of strategies that are at least as interesting and as useful as those used by European translators. Moreover, it is particularly instructive for translators of any linguistic background to explore difficulties of translation in non-European languages because the structure of those languages and their cultural settings raise important issues that could otherwise be easily overlooked in discussions of language and translation (Baker *ibid*).

Indeed, the range of languages that make an appearance in this book is very impressive, constituting a welcome and overdue development in translation studies. Arabic is certainly a major beneficiary, appearing regularly along with ‘back-translations’ and a wealth of background cultural information.

The two important studies authored jointly by Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990 and 1997) also make generous use of examples from Arabic as well as from European languages. The approach is basically a linguistic one, but with emphasis on culture, ideology and semiotics. Two other, perhaps lesser-known books by Hatim alone are even more useful for the would-be translator between English and Arabic. The first, *Communication Across Cultures* (1997a), sets out to unite the disciplines of contrastive linguistics, text linguistics and translation theory in a contrastive study of English and Arabic, an ‘exotic’ language with a rich rhetorical tradition and a number of linguistic features that contrast with those of English (Hatim 1997a: xiv-xv). There is plenty of attention to pragmatics and to the concept of ‘evaluativeness’ in texts, and early in the book there are two very useful chapters on ‘Argumentation across Cultures’ and ‘Argumentation in Arabic Rhetoric’. The study furthermore encompasses and exemplifies such phenomena in language as ideology and intertextuality, which we shall be examining as part of our own study later on. Some of the material and examples in this book re-appear in the second work, *English-Arabic/Arabic-English Translation: a Practical Guide* (1997b). This manual exemplifies Hatim’s textlinguistic approach in a very practical way. Envisaging the ‘text-context relationship’ as a continuum running from ‘extremely detached and non-evaluative’ to ‘extremely involved and highly evaluative’, the Guide ‘tries to capture this gradual increase in the degree of evaluativeness across texts and the need to adjust translation strategy accordingly’ (Hatim

1997b: 10-11). There are English and Arabic texts to study and translate, helpfully accompanied by notes and glossaries, which will help to train translators to make meaningful comments about the process of translation and its attendant problems. The third part of the book deals with the translation of argumentation in a systematic fashion and with well-chosen examples, concluding that Arabic favours ‘through-argumentation’ over ‘counter-argumentation’ (ibid: 174).

A more recent and very different translation guide is *Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Arabic to English* (2002) by James Dickins, Sándor Hervey and Ian Higgins. It is heartening to see Arabic coming under the spotlight relatively early in the Routledge *Thinking Translation* series, which had previously covered the predictable European quartet of French, German, Italian and Spanish. The authors start from the conviction ‘that a structured course will help most students to become significantly better at translation...’ (ibid: 1), and their course (concentrating on method rather than theory) moves progressively from genre-independent issues (e.g. cultural transposition) to specific genre-dependent ones (e.g. the translation of technical, constitutional and consumer-oriented texts). It also addresses such problematic areas as the translation of metaphors. The texts are chosen from a wide variety of sources, practical assignments are given, and translation students working through this course will learn a good deal of translation theory while getting to grips with a number of practical issues.

A number of books by Hussein Abdul-Raof are of great training and reference value to the student and translator of Arabic. One such is *Arabic Stylistics: A Coursebook* (2001a). This describes and analyzes sentence structure, lexis, text structure, the different text types and rhetorical devices, and then concludes with some practical exercises in the stylistic analysis of texts. At the end of his review of Arabic text types, Abdul-Raof provides an analysis of argumentative texts, exemplifying their main stylistic hallmarks (ibid: 127-133). Two of his translated examples are religious in character, whereas Hatim’s (1997b) material is all from the secular domain. Abdul-Raof has also investigated the problems inherent in translating the Qur’ān, whose discourse he identifies as ‘a special and sensitive genre’ displaying ‘prototypical linguistic and rhetorical characteristics’ (Abdul-Raof 2001b: xiii), so as to account for ‘the problem of untranslatability of the Qur’ān from a linguistic and applied

translation studies perspective' (ibid: 1). This study is clearly a very useful resource as we proceed to examine the concepts of equivalence and translatability as they apply specifically to Arabic>English translation. So also are Abdul-Raof's more recent (2004a, 2005a) studies analyzing, respectively, stylistic variation and consonance in the Qur'ānic genre, and his pragmatic analysis of Arabic rhetoric (2006), with its obvious relevance to the work of the translator, not least in its demonstration of 'the communicative skill of allusion which is a highly effective rhetorical mechanism that employs an implicit signification' (ibid: xiv).

A further, very useful and important study is the collection of articles edited by Said Faiq under the title *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic* (Faiq ed. 2004). This was, when it appeared, a welcome and timely application of the 'cultural turn' in translation studies to Arabic. The well-balanced collection includes studies not only of literary translation but also of such topics as Islamist discourse, Qur'ān translatability, native Arabic linguistic terminology and Arabic/Hebrew translation. Overall, it reflects a growing concern with the power of translation (and of the English language) to serve and enhance negative stereotyping and to deform cultural identities.

The brief review given above is intended to convey some idea of how much Arabic has come to the fore in recent years as an object of linguistic and cultural scrutiny. It does not, of course, do justice to the wealth of academic articles that have appeared (often arising out of special conferences or colloquia) in the field of Arabic translation studies, or to the establishment (since April 1992) of the journal *Turjumān* (published in Morocco), which has contained articles in English, Arabic, French and Spanish covering an ever expanding range of issues in Arabic translation studies such as equivalence, lexicography, machine translation, textlinguistics, ideology, and cultural or lexical forms of incongruence with other languages. Important studies focusing upon, or at least including Arabic (both translation and interpreting) have also appeared from time to time in other journals, for example *The Linguist* (the professional journal of the UK Chartered Institute of Linguists), *The Translator*, *Babel*, *Meta* and *Target*.



In a wider sense the Arabic language and its associated culture(s), including the notion of ‘political Islam’, has also come to the fore in the first decade of the new century and millennium as a result of certain tragic events: the ‘9/11’ attacks on the USA in 2001; the emergence of the al-Qā’idah ‘organization’ and the sporadic transmission of warning messages from its leaders; the invasion and occupation of Iraq since March 2003, and the very perilous (indeed often fatal) involvement of Iraqi translators and interpreters in the resulting conflict – as in the case, for example, of Bassam Rady of Basra and seven of his murdered former colleagues reported in *The Times* newspaper of 28 November 2009. The unresolved problems and conflicts of the Middle East region and the difficult relationship between this region and ‘the West’ are bound to drive forward an ever growing interest in Arabic-English-Arabic translation as this new century unfolds; and that interest must inevitably embrace not only linguistic but also cultural, historical and ideological perspectives.

## 1.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have traced the history of translation practice and theory with a very broad brush from antiquity to the opening decade of the twenty-first century. We have noticed along the way several posited and recurring dichotomies (literal v. free, domesticating v. foreignizing translation etc.) and we have also seen how translation thinking has traditionally been related to either sacred or literary texts. Some of the principal landmarks in the development of the contemporary ‘interdiscipline’ of translation studies have been identified, and we have noted how the internet and modern technology are having a profound impact upon the increasingly diverse world of translation. We have also seen that translation theorists and practitioners (usually the same people, in fact) have increasingly seen the need to take such matters as culture, ideology and power relationships into account when planning or reflecting upon the processes involved in translation. Finally, we have looked at some manifestations of the growing interest in the Arab world, in Arabic language and culture and, more specifically, in the various challenges of Arabic-English-Arabic translation. These two languages are, as Abdul-Raof (2001a: 3) puts it, ‘linguistically and culturally incongruous’; and therefore we need to proceed in the next

chapter to examine – from both linguistic and cultural perspectives - how and to what extent ideas about translation ‘equivalence’ may be applied to this particular language pair.

## CHAPTER TWO

### ARABIC-ENGLISH TRANSLATION: EQUIVALENCE, APPROXIMATION AND TRANSLATABILITY

#### 2.1 *Introduction*

This chapter sets out to present, as a basis for our later investigations, a useful practical survey of the types of equivalence problems that arise and challenge translators working between Arabic and English – and particularly in the direction of English. We shall first review the debate over the concept of **equivalence** and see how and why the term is a tricky one for translators, even though it still represents a working principle that most would subscribe to. We shall look into the kernel of the problems facing translators between Arabic and English and find that its nature is as much cultural as linguistic (if indeed the two elements can really be separated). We shall also review a selection of items of difference and difficulty, mostly at the traditional level of the word or phrase, and in addition consider the role of **emotiveness in language**, along with that of semantic and cultural voids, as **factors in non-equivalence**. We shall consider and exemplify the major challenges that face the Arabic-to-English translator at both the micro and macro levels of language: challenges that require decisions and strategies which we will need to look into further in subsequent chapters.

#### 2.2 *Equivalence, approximation and translatability: the background to the debate*

After outlining a variety of techniques and strategies employed in translation, Peter Fawcett (1997:53) goes on to observe that their ultimate goal ‘is to achieve “equivalence”, a concept that has probably cost the lives of more trees than any other in translation studies.’ Certainly there has been no shortage of equivalence theories and typologies put forward over the past few decades; however, a notion traditionally assumed to be pivotal to the whole enterprise of translation (Hermans 1999: 47) has more recently been noticeably

downgraded as a theoretical concept. It (or at least the idea of ‘total equivalence’) has, indeed, been variously described as a ‘dead duck’ (Newmark 1982: x), a ‘chimera’ (Bell 1991: 6), an ‘illusion’ (Snell-Hornby 1995: 13-22), a ‘vexed notion’ (Hermans *ibid.*: 96), a ‘mirage concept’ (Abdul-Raof 2001b: 5-7), an issue that ‘has been marginalized by some translation studies scholars’ (Munday 2001/2008: 49) and something that ‘can be a confusing concept even for teachers of translation, let alone their students’ (Dickins *et al.* 2002: 18). True, there is a fuzziness about the whole idea of equivalence between an original source text (ST) and a target text (TT) which has – perhaps inevitably – given rise to as much dispute as those earlier notions of ‘faithfulness’ in the translation process to which we referred in the previous chapter. Furthermore, as Dorothy Kenny (2009: 96) explains in her survey of the topic, citing Anthony Pym (1992: 37), definitions of equivalence have been criticized for being essentially circular: ‘equivalence is supposed to define translation, and translation, in turn, defines equivalence’. The same point has been made by Andrew Chesterman (1997: 10), who suggests that in the light of this apparent circularity ‘it would seem that we can dispense with the term altogether, and focus instead on the wide variety of relations that can exist between a translation and its source’. Starting from his borrowing of the sociobiological concept of ‘memes’, Chesterman posits five ‘translation supermemes’, which are ‘ideas of such pervasive influence that they come up again and again in the history of the subject, albeit sometimes in slightly different guises’ (*ibid.*: 7-8). One of these, the ‘equivalence supermeme’, is ‘the big bugbear of translation theory, more argued about than any other single idea’ - and an idea that has tended to be broken up into various subtypes, such as Eugene Nida’s (1964) apparently distinct but in fact not mutually exclusive concepts of ‘formal’ and ‘dynamic’ equivalence, or indeed into more complex classifications and hierarchies such as in Koller 1979 (Chesterman *ibid.*: 9). The pragmatic reality, according to Chesterman, is that ‘(*total*) equivalence is a red herring, in that it is virtually unattainable, and hence not a useful concept in translation theory’ (*ibid.*: my emphasis); and consequently, ‘despite its long dominance in the meme-pool, equivalence seems to be a supermeme in decline’ (*ibid.*: 10).

Yet, despite the negative slant of the selected epithets or comments cited above, overall the notion of equivalence lives on, continues to be used in writings on translation and has its occasional doughty defenders. Newmark, for example, rejects the views of Snell-Hornby

and Hermans (that is, on the desirability of dropping or sidelining the term ‘equivalence’), arguing that ‘a general or hold-all word may have a general meaning but can be used pertinently if explicitly modified and narrowed in certain contexts’ (Newmark 1998). An authoritative and fairly recent coursebook on translation (Hatim and Munday 2004) provides in its glossary (ibid: 339) positive-sounding definitions of ‘equivalence’ (‘a central term in linguistics-based Translation Studies relating to the relationship of similarity between ST and TT segments’) and ‘equivalent’ (‘a TT segment or even full text which functions as an equivalent of the ST segment’); this is hardly surprising, since discussion of various forms of equivalence occurs throughout the book. A more recent essay on the notion of ‘translation equivalence’, founded on that of ‘linguistic competence’, is that of M.K.C. Uwajeh (2007). Uwajeh’s approach is unusual at this point in time, given that he is at pains to assert and demonstrate – with echoes of Catford (1965) – that translation ‘is a **linguistic** operation – whatever fascination its supposed non-linguistic aspects may hold for some Translatologists’ (Uwajeh 2007: 231). For several of the latter, he maintains, ‘Linguistics is at best only of marginal relevance to translation studies and practice’ (ibid: 232-233). He sees equivalence as ‘assuredly the most important criterion for translations typification’ and goes on to propose his own four ‘standard types of equivalence applicable to SL-TL translations’, which are: (i) **conceptual** (‘sameness of concept units’); (ii) **propositional** (‘sameness of thought patterns’); (iii) **thematic** (‘sameness of subjects-matter’); and (iv) **contextual** (‘sameness of context variables’) (ibid: 55-57). This typology becomes part of Uwajeh’s larger ‘Four-Level Model of Translation’: a model which is not strengthened by the fact that almost all his examples are based solely on the language pair of English and the Nigerian language Igbo.

Abdul-Raof (2004: 93) also acknowledges that equivalence is ‘still an important principle in translation studies’; while a recent translation textbook produced in the Arab world, and apparently aimed mainly at Arab translation students and trainees, defines translation equivalence straightforwardly as ‘the degree of similarity in message and effect between the source text and its translation’ (Gaber 2005: 66).

This last-mentioned definition implies that translation equivalence between languages is, in fact, a matter of degree, and that no total correspondence can reasonably be expected. In

Chapter One we saw how a preoccupation with equivalence is reflected in the writings of linguists such as Jakobson and Catford, while the cultural angle highlighted by Casagrande as early as 1954 attracted increasing attention towards the end of the twentieth century. It came to be increasingly recognized that the business of translating religious, literary or other similarly challenging varieties of text is in fact an immensely complex activity, calling not only for considerable linguistic skills in both ST and TT languages but also for other vital attributes such as cultural awareness and sensitivity coupled with creativity and stylistic judgment. Furthermore, as the volume of commercial translation worldwide increased dramatically in the last few decades of the twentieth century, it came to be understood in that domain also that unthinking literal translation (even between the languages of Europe) frequently failed to do the job and indeed produced cultural ‘howlers’. An article on translation and marketing that appeared in Britain’s *Daily Telegraph* newspaper in 1999 describes the legal and cultural minefield awaiting UK and American companies seeking to market their products in Europe and Japan, and the head of a specialist marketing agency explains the nature of the problem:

...Mr Calder says: “When a business finds an overseas market beginning to open up, the first response is usually translation. But translation is not enough. In many cases communication only happens after further creative research to discover ‘dynamic equivalencies’, local concepts that carry the sense of a message better than any literal translation can ever do.”

One might be forgiven [the author of the article comments] for expecting such creative input to be part of any decent translation service. “No way,” Mr Calder says. “Your average translator is using primarily logical/grammatical skills and is often very nervous about overstepping the brief and coming back to you with alternative concept suggestions.” (From ‘*Marketing that loses a little in translation*’ by Mark Anstead, *The Daily Telegraph* Business File, 19 August 1999.)

What Mr Calder is drawing attention to here is the need for *localization*, defined as “making a product linguistically and culturally appropriate to the target country and language” (Hatim and Munday 2004: 113, 344). This is a concept which Hatim and Munday suggest may now be replacing that of traditional translation in the commercial world (ibid: 113).

The phrase ‘alternative concept suggestions’ in the *Daily Telegraph* article, however, serves to highlight the core of the long-standing debate about the nature of equivalence. How much ‘creative input’ is permissible if the TT is to be considered a translation rather

than an adaptation of the ST? For Naji (1998: 39), concerned with ‘functional equivalence’ in literary translation, equivalence ‘is the core of translation, the absence of which results in a product in the target language (TL) which is but an adaptation or paraphrase of the source language (SL).’ No less a figure than Eugene Nida, on the other hand, has argued the opposite case, namely that paraphrase is what helps to make translation possible:

Insisting on a sharp distinction between translation and paraphrase may be the primary stumbling block to satisfactory interlingual communication. All translating involves varying degrees of paraphrase... A literal transfer of a text into another language is not only language mayhem, but it inevitably introduces serious errors and distortions (Nida 1994: 147).

What is surely agreed upon nowadays by most scholars, and by most practitioners of translation, is that there is no such thing as the perfect or definitive translation of any text, whether sacred, literary or non-literary. As Baker (1992: 7) puts it, ‘every translation has points of strength and points of weakness and every translation is open to improvement’. She regards equivalence as a convenient working concept ‘rather than because it has any theoretical status’ and uses the term in her coursebook ‘with the proviso that although equivalence can usually be obtained to some extent, it is influenced by a variety of linguistic and cultural factors and is therefore always relative’ (ibid: 6). Hatim and Mason (1990: 8) had in fact already warned that the term was ‘usually intended in a relative sense – that of closest possible approximation to ST meaning...’; and this notion of translation as ‘approximation’ is taken up by Abdul-Raof (2001b: 6,47,183, and 2004: 95) with particular reference to Qur’ān translation. The problems and impediments presented by cultural factors to any attempt at translating a foreign sacred text – specifically the Arabic of the Qur’ān – have also been explained systematically by the same scholar (Abdul-Raof 2005: 162 – 172). The Qur’ān is indeed a special case, and Hassan Mustapha emphasizes that ‘it has been the question of the very translatability of the Qur’ān that has mostly dominated debates over this unique text and particular translation context’ (Mustapha 2009: 229).

The concepts of translatability and untranslatability have also (as we observed in Chapter One) been a major preoccupation of translation theorists over the past century in particular. It was during the 1960’s and 1970’s that they – along with the nature of equivalence – became issues central to translation research (Hatim and Munday 2004: 7). Jakobson

(1959) is seen as being essentially in favour of translatability, positing a dynamic view of it that admits paraphrase as legitimate and sees natural languages ‘as evolving entities: for Jakobson, “languages differ essentially in what they *must* convey, and not in what they *may* convey” (Pym and Turk 1998: 275) (original emphasis). Chesterman, commenting on the ‘supermeme’ of ‘untranslatability’, explains that the concept has been written about mainly with regard to the domains of literary and religious translation, with their special problems (Chesterman 1997: 10-12). He also makes the point that, linguistically speaking, the idea of untranslatability appears to be restricting language to the Saussurean concept of *langue* rather than including that of *parole*; whereas in reality, given that translation itself is a form of language use, everything ‘can be translated somehow’:

No communication is perfect, so why should translation be? Semiotically speaking, we could say that communication succeeds to the extent that the message decoded and interpreted by the receiver overlaps with that sent by the sender. Whereas the equivalence supermeme focuses on the overlap, the untranslatability supermeme focuses on the non-overlapping part of the message: each supermeme then assumes that the part it sees is actually the whole picture (ibid: 11-12).

Chesterman goes on to offer the useful observation that, considering the ‘actual fact of translation’ and its history as a ‘natural fact of life’ in many parts of the world (including parts of Europe), ‘perhaps only monolingually oriented cultures could have come up with such a meme [that of ‘untranslatability’] and allowed it to flourish’ (ibid: 12). At the same time, he concedes, it is empirically true that some texts are more easily translatable than others:

Texts tend to be easier to translate when source and target cultures are in close cultural contact or share a similar cultural history, when source and target languages are related, when the source text is already oriented towards the target readership (tourist brochures...), etc (ibid).

Catford’s (1965) final chapter offers a fairly useful contribution on ‘The Limits of Translatability’, in which the author distinguishes between *linguistic* and *cultural* aspects of untranslatability: the latter type, he states, ‘is usually less “absolute” than linguistic untranslatability’, and he then proceeds to discuss problems arising in the translation first of terms denoting material culture in Finnish and Japanese, and then of abstract lexical items in English such as ‘home’ and ‘democracy’ (ibid: 99-101). With Catford, we have of course to bear in mind that his book belongs to the period of optimism regarding the future possible scope of machine translation; at the same time, he deserves some credit – as Munday (2001/2008: 61) suggests - for observing that equivalence and translatability



depend not just on formal linguistic criteria but also on overall communicative phenomena such as function, relevance, context and cultural background.

The tension that will probably always exist in the minds of scrupulous translators of certain types of text regarding the possibility versus the impossibility of their task has been well expressed by several writers, from Ortega y Gasset (1937) through George Steiner (1975/1998) to Eugene Nida (1994). Steiner (1998: 264) dismisses as ‘facile’ the argument that translation is invalid if it fails to achieve perfection, stressing that the point that requires clarification for translators is ‘the *degree* of fidelity to be pursued in each case, the tolerance allowed as between different jobs of work’. Nida, at the end of his challenging discussion of how and why the translator’s task is both possible *and* impossible, suggests that good translation is like playing a game: certain rules have to be observed, but the choices that are made to use ‘creative tactics’ and ‘produce something unexpected’ are ‘the heart and soul of what produces an outstanding interlingual communication’ (Nida 1994: 162). Thus (he concludes): ‘The very tensions within translating bring out the best in those who instinctively learn to play the game’ (ibid).

Another important comment made by Nida serves to remind us of how the focus has shifted towards concern for what actually goes on in the minds of *receptors* – that is, the readers of translated texts. Such readers, he tells us (ibid: 160), can only derive meaning from such texts because they already have some knowledge of the content: ‘information is always a matter of accretion, and a translator is never able to know exactly what an audience already knows, especially if the translation must bridge wide cultural differences’(ibid). Hatim (2001: 114), explaining how for text linguists concerned with ‘text in context’ it is whole texts that constitute the minimal unit of communication or translation, makes a similar point about reading:

Reading provides an ideal testing ground for how texts are shaped and meaning constructed, not only by text producers but also by text receivers. The text receiver brings to the act of reading his or her own knowledge, belief and value systems – an activity which, if properly understood, is likely to shed some useful light on such issues as equivalence and translatability.

### 2.3 'Equivalence in difference': the case of English and Arabic

Snell-Hornby, in her well-known commentary on 'the illusion of equivalence', shows how the nature of the problem is in fact exemplified by the word itself. Dismissing the notion of an easy, straightforward symmetry between languages, she makes the point that the German *Äquivalenz* (as used by scholars such as Wilss, Kade and Reiss) is not identical in meaning to the English word:

...on closer investigation subtle but crucial differences emerge between the two terms, so that they should rather be considered as warning examples of the treacherous *illusion* of equivalence that typifies interlingual relationships (Snell-Hornby 1995: 16-17).

Where the German and English terms *are* 'semantically identical', she goes on to say, is in the domain of various exact sciences, including mathematics and formal logic: here they suggest a 'relationship of absolute symmetry and equality involving guaranteed reversibility'. Not surprisingly, the concept of a mathematical reversibility was very much to the fore during the phase of euphoria over machine translation in the mid-twentieth century; before long, however, came the recognition, 'since linguistic items rarely show a one-to-one correspondence outside the narrow field of standardized terminology, that for human translation the concept of *Äquivalenz* would have to be reconsidered' (ibid: 17-18). For Fawcett (1997: 53) too, the presentation of interlingual equivalence 'as a quasi-mathematical notion' makes it appear a dubious concept, as also does the tendency of theorists like Koller (1979) to produce a 'shopping list' of rather unrealistically systematic and prescriptive parameters for achieving such equivalence. Indeed, so many different *types* of equivalence have been postulated (e.g. linguistic, cultural, stylistic, semantic, functional, etc.) that the translator can easily feel at a loss as to which of several levels to aim for (Abdul-Raof 2001: 7-8). Dickins *et al.* (2002: 19), concerned not with theory but rather with the practicalities of pedagogy (i.e. translator-training), see definitions of equivalence as falling into two broad categories, descriptive and prescriptive. It is fair to say that ideas on the subject have, over the past half-century, generally moved from the latter in the direction of the former category.

It was Roman Jakobson's 1959 essay 'On linguistic aspects of translation' that sparked the massive amount of discussion and investigation into the nature of equivalence in the 1960's

and 1970's. Having postulated his famous three types of translation and stated that, in interlingual translation, 'there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units', Jakobson provides his well-known example of the English *cheese* not being equivalent to the Russian *syr*. This, as Munday (2001/2008: 37) explains, is one example of how languages, being different sign systems, 'partition reality differently'. When Jakobson then went on to write of 'equivalence in difference', he was using 'a profoundly paradoxical phrase expressing that dialectic tension which is a central problem of translation...' (Snell-Hornby *ibid*: 19). The phrase is still intriguing, but essentially it refers to the differences created by the varying grammatical and lexical forms that are part and parcel of different languages.

Even amongst European languages such differences are considerable. Jakobson gives the example of a Russian who has the task of translating the English 'I hired a worker' and, to do so properly, 'needs supplementary information, whether this action was completed or not, and whether the worker was a man or a woman...' – this being because of the phenomenon of aspect in Russian verb morphology plus the existence of masculine and feminine forms of the word for 'worker' (Jakobson 1959/2000: 115). Conversely, an English-speaking person can get away with saying, for example, 'I was staying in Paris last weekend with a friend' without being obliged (unless challenged directly!) to reveal the gender of the friend. Many, if not most other languages of the world – Arabic included – would have to reveal it because of their very nature, and it is easy to see how this sort of difference can cause problems for the would-be translator or interpreter. Munday (*ibid*: 38) gives further examples at the level of semantic fields: the German word *Geschwister* that needs to be explicated in English as *brothers and sisters*, and the Spanish *hijas* that would translate English *children* if both children being referred to were female. He also (*ibid*) mentions the case of the verb *to be*, in most European languages a single word, but in Spanish a concept broken down into two verbs (*ser* and *estar*). Russian is different in not needing to use such a verb 'explicitly in the present tense', and it shares this feature (that is, not requiring a 'copula' in simple relational statements) with Arabic.

Going beyond Europe, we find that in the case of Arabic there are other special linguistic features that also serve to exemplify the 'difference' referred to by Jakobson, even though

they may not always pose any major 'equivalence' problems for the translator. Below are some instances of this:

(i) **Dual number:** The existence of this in standard, formal Arabic (in both lexical and grammatical categories) is a feature that appears alien, or at least unusual, to most European learners of the language (even though the dual exists in Classical Greek and in some Slavonic languages), as in:

إن لغتنا تواجه خطرين في آن واحد

Our [Arabic] language faces two dangers at one and the same time.

This example does not constitute an equivalence problem. However, as Mona Baker shows, there will be occasions when the translator of an Arabic text into English will need to encode relevant and important information on number by lexical means, as in this example using an original Arabic source text:

عندما يراد تعيين ثلاثة محكمين، يختار كل طرف محكماً واحداً، ويختار المحكمان المعينان على هذا النحو المحكم الثالث وهو الذي يتولى رئاسة هيئة التحكيم.

Back-translation:

When the appointment of three arbitrators is required, each party chooses one arbitrator, and the arbitrators-dual appointed-dual in this way choose the third arbitrator and it is he who takes on the presidency of the arbitration authority.

English target text:

When the appointment of three arbitrators is required, each party selects one arbitrator, and the **two arbitrators** thus appointed select the third arbitrator who then heads the Arbitration Committee. (Baker 1992: 89-90.)

A problematic area between Arabic and English can also arise when duality is combined with uncertain adjectival attribution, as in this possible English item:

**I bought a poisonous snake and spider, and they are very nice.**

Here it is not clear whether both the snake and the spider are poisonous, or only the first mentioned noun.

(ii) **Plural nouns / Countability:** Another feature is the ability of Arabic to use in a plural form words for concepts that are normally only expressed in the singular, 'uncountable' form in English. An example is the word دم (**pl. دماء**), as in the expression اهراق الدماء = **shedding of blood, bloodshed**, or in Gamal Abdel Nasser's pledge to fellow Egyptians at the height of the 1956 Suez crisis (Nasser 1951-1961: 429)

وأنا أعاهدكم اني سأقاتل معكم من أجل حريتكم كما عاهدتكم من قبل لآخر قطرة من دماي.

[I give you my pledge that I will fight alongside you for your freedom – as I pledged to you before – to the last drop of my blood] (my underlining)

Other common instances of Arabic using the plural form of a word to refer to things or ideas that in English are considered 'uncountable', and thus expressed by a singular noun, are:

أخبار، معلومات، مُعدات، مفروشات

meaning, respectively, **news** (but not a single item of news), **information, equipment and furniture**.

(iii) **Tense and aspect:** As noted by Dickins *et al.* (2002: 99), the grammatical differences between Arabic and English are revealed especially in their widely divergent tense systems: whereas English has a system of verb tenses in which 'particular tenses relate fairly consistently to natural time', the Arabic system is one which combines tense and aspect. So, for example, the perfect tense in Arabic 'can indicate completion of the action as well as occurrence in the past... while the imperfect may indicate non-completion of the action regardless of whether it occurs in the past or the present...' (ibid). In fact, an examination of dependent subordinate clauses in Arabic, typically using an imperfect-tense verb when the main clause of the sentence has used a perfect, shows us how the time frame indicated by the imperfect verb depends on the context established at the outset. Similarly, a subordinated verb in the perfect will need to be rendered by the English past perfect. Let us consider this example from the newspaper *Al-Hayat* of 14 June 2007:

وأعلن العميد ناظم شريف، أمر حرس الحدود في مندلي (شرق محافظة ديالى)، ان "انتحارياً يرتدي حزاماً ناسفاً تمكن من دخول مركز الشرطة..."

Brig. Nāẓim Sharīf, the Commanding Officer of Border Guards in Mandalī (in the eastern Diyāla Governorate / Province) announced that a suicide bomber wearing an explosive belt had managed to get into the police station... (my underlining)

Clive Holes (2004:218-219) illustrates how, with the Perfect form of verbs, the idea of ‘pastness’ is not in fact central to its meaning since it is used ‘in a range of nonnarrative, nonpast contexts’. One example of this is its use in all sorts of conditional clauses, including ‘open’ or (in English terminology) ‘first conditional’ ones such as ‘If you buy a computer, I’ll buy one too’, and also in what Holes (*ibid*) calls ‘the related category of timeless quasiconditionals’, as in this example he provides:

هم امة واحدة مهما اختلفت اجناسهم

They (sc. the Arabs) are one nation, however different their (component) races are (my underlining).

Another common instance is the use of the Perfect as an optative form in traditional and conventional exhortations invoking Allāh on various occasions, e.g.

حيّاك (م) الله

May God keep you alive! (general greeting / leave-taking)

Generally speaking, the issue of tense and aspect will not cause the competent translator major problems; however, Dickins *et al.* (*ibid*: 100) note that ‘the flexibility of Arabic tense usage may sometimes raise difficulties particularly in translating from Arabic to English’ - especially in literary texts, where ‘the marked manipulation of grammatical structure is a common feature’.

(iv) **Voice:** The passive voice is much more a feature of English than of Arabic, and traditionally it has been considered incorrect style in Arabic to use a passive construction in which a human agent is mentioned. Dickins and Watson (1998: 78-80) explain and exemplify two types of active sentence in Arabic that are usually translated into English with a passive. One is the use of تم (= ‘happen’, ‘come about’, ‘be completed’) + verbal noun, as in:

تم الكشف عن كنيسة بيزنطية

A Byzantine church was discovered

The other is a sentence type employing a specific word order, in which the object precedes the subject, as in:

فهو أكبر من أن يحله عقل واحد

It is too large to be solved by one brain

Holes (2004: 317-320) also illustrates how the frequent deployment of *تم* + verbal noun has been part of the trend in 'media Arabic' (apparently under the influence of European syntactic norms) towards using such periphrastic passives and also passive structures which include the agent, and feature either *من قبل* or *من طرف* to mean 'by'. It is now very common to find in journalistic Arabic passive verbs which, as Holes puts it, are used 'to express depersonalized, unattributable, or otherwise "off-the-record" evaluative or background comment': for example, *يُستبعد...* meaning '...is ruled out'.

Finally, we should also note that the translation of an Arabic passive participle will not always be as a straightforward passive in English, given that the word *مقبول*, for example, usually means 'acceptable / satisfactory' rather than 'accepted'.

(v) **Specificity:** Yet another instance of difference is the phenomenon of two very different languages such as Arabic and English being semantically more or less specific in certain areas compared to the other, often for cultural or environmental reasons. At this point the example of the Arabic word *ملعب* will suffice: this word has the core meaning of 'a place where the act of playing [something] happens', and thus can be variously translated into English (according to the context and any further qualification or definition) as 'playground', 'athletic field', 'stadium', 'circus ring', 'pitch', 'court' etc. (Wehr 1974: 869). Conversely, the polysemous English word *time*, when used as a noun, is one of many that can be used with various meanings and in both a 'countable' and an 'uncountable' sense, for example in '**Time is a great healer**' and '**How many times do I have to tell you...?**' Any worthwhile dictionary will, of course, provide good examples of each particular usage, along with the wealth of idioms, compound expressions etc derived from this word. A good bilingual dictionary will also list all the foreign-language words

that are the equivalents, or near-equivalents of the different meanings and uses of time: thus the entry in the OUP *Oxford Wordpower* English-Arabic Dictionary (2003 ed.) includes the eight Arabic words **مرة، عصر، فترة، زمن، ساعة، وقت، موعد، توقيت**. It is worth making the point here that – alongside more specialized dictionaries – the translator needs a modern, example-rich type of general dictionary such as this one no less than does the foreign language learner.

We have already referred in Chapter One to the well-known distinction formulated by the Bible translator Eugene Nida in the 1960's between *formal* and *dynamic* equivalence. When considering this distinction nowadays we can easily find ourselves confused, because of the proliferation of terms, frames of reference etc that have subsequently been produced by other translation theorists. For example, 'structural correspondence' has been used to mean much the same as 'formal' equivalence; and so has Newmark's 'semantic translation' which he distinguishes from what he calls 'faithful translation' by saying that it is '...more flexible, admits the creative exception to 100% fidelity and allows for the translator's intuitive empathy with the original' (Newmark 1988: 46). Nida's 'dynamic' equivalence, based on his 'principle of equivalent effect' (which has been heavily criticized as a naive and essentially implausible notion by many writers, e.g. Dickins *et al.* 2002: 19), is likewise the basis for Newmark's 'communicative translation', which 'attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership' (Newmark *ibid.*: 47). Newmark offers the view (*ibid.*) that semantic translation is applicable mainly to what he terms 'expressive' texts (such as imaginative literature – poetry, the novel, etc), while communicative translation is used for 'informative' text types (e.g. reports, articles, textbooks) and 'vocative' ones (e.g. publicity, propaganda, instructions etc) – though he, like other scholars of text types such as Hatim and Mason, points out that texts in reality tend to be hybrid in nature (*ibid.*: 42). He also contrasts these two types of translation in a rather more helpful way:

Semantic translation is personal and individual, follows the thought processes of the author, tends to over-translate, pursues nuances of meaning, yet aims at concision in order to reproduce pragmatic impact. Communicative translation is social, concentrates on the message and the main force of the text, tends to



under-translate, to be simple, clear and brief, and is always written in a natural and resourceful style (ibid:47-48).

Later in the last century, as we have seen in Chapter One, interest shifted away from the ‘micro’ level of translation, concerned mainly with problems arising from words and shorter ‘units of translation’, to the ‘macro’ level (i.e. that of whole texts and their purposes and target receptors) as well as towards cultural studies. Thus, Nida’s ideas became transposed into the ‘functional equivalence’ of Reiss and Vermeer, the ‘overt’ and ‘covert’ translation strategies posited by Juliane House and the textlinguists’ quest for equivalence at the textual, pragmatic and semiotic levels. We have already referred in Chapter One (1.4) to the contributions of Baker (1992) and of Neubert and Shreve (1992) in the area of ‘textual equivalence’. We should note, however, that the term as used by these scholars differs considerably from the concept proposed much earlier by Catford, who defined a ‘textual equivalent’ as ‘any TL form which is observed to be the equivalent of a given SL form (text or portion of text)’ (Catford 1965: 27). Using French and English as a sample language pair, Catford observes that in the simple case of *Mon fils a six ans* = *My son is six* the words *Mon fils* and *My son* are textually equivalent. Kenny describes this early approach as ‘actual observable mappings between elements of real STs and TTs (at the level of *parole*)’ (Kenny 2009: 98) and notes that for Catford textual equivalence ‘is an empirical, probabilistic phenomenon’ (ibid: 99). Neubert and Shreve, in their discussion of the problems and disputes raging over the word ‘equivalence’, contend that ‘equivalence is not identity [at a linguistic or semantic level]’, but that a case can be made for *textual equivalence*:

Textual equivalence is not derived from textual identity but from the equivalent social and communicative roles played by different kinds of texts (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 142).

Nonetheless, they maintain, this textual equivalence is ‘a useful but quite general concept’ which ‘cannot function as a practical tool for the translator and translation scholar’ (ibid). By looking deeper into the translation process, they argue, it is possible to think in terms of something they call ‘communicative equivalence’, in which the target reader of a competently translated text accepts it ‘as a valid textual instance’ because ‘the text yields a communicative value derived from the translator’s proper connection of source text meaning with target culture prototype’ (ibid: 143). Thus communicative equivalence

amounts to ‘the net effect of communicatively equivalent structures acting together in a conventional prototypical framework’ (ibid: 144). Furthermore, they claim (citing van Dijk 1980), it is ‘a result of deliberately mediated intertextuality’ and ‘is clearly a central concept for an integrated and interdisciplinary approach to translation because it involves sociolinguistic, linguistic, psychological, critical, and textual issues’ (ibid: 145). We shall be returning to this notion of communicative equivalence later in Chapter Five, and examining its practical applicability to the translation of the material under discussion there.

An underlying problem with the ‘dynamic’ or ‘communicative’ approach to translating has been highlighted by Dickins *et al.* (2002: 19), namely that seeking this type of equivalence ‘especially for student translators with exceptional mother-tongue facility...might be seen as giving carte blanche for excessive freedom – that is, freedom to write more or less anything as long as it sounds good and does reflect, however tenuously, something of the ST message content’. Hatim and Munday (2004: 258) also refer to this problem (of which, surely, all experienced and scrupulous translators should instinctively be aware); however, they note that there are times when a translator simply has to use a strategy of *adjustment* (which they define as ‘techniques for producing correct equivalents and achieving dynamic equivalence in translation’) in order to produce a TT which is *comprehensible*. In other words, there are occasions when a formally-equivalent rendering will not do. As an example for practice purposes, they provide (ibid: 259) part of a text which is an in-house translation into English of an original Arabic magazine editorial marking the United Arab Emirates National Day:

[This country], a unique federation and a unique experiment. An unparalleled experiment not known by the human society with compatible motives and constituents, where most political systems are proclaiming non-existence of such federation to that of [our country] through the history.

(Editorial in *Al-Jumrukī*, in-house publication of the  
Customs Department, Sharjah, UAE, 1999)

Hatim and Munday comment (ibid): ‘In the particular case of the above English TT editorial, minimal modification of the translation would be simply unacceptable not only in terms of the kind of writing customary in English for this kind of text but also from the standpoint of general cohesion and coherence’. Therefore they invite the reader to ‘edit the

example to highlight the argument more succinctly and in keeping with what is customary for this kind of text in English'. The present writer did in fact produce a translation of this text (from the Arabic original, that is) while on a training course, and below is the whole of the first paragraph:

Amongst all the political federations that this world has seen there has been nothing quite like that of the United Arab Emirates. Human society has not witnessed any federal experiment with the same fundamentals and the same forces driving it as the UAE. Indeed, in all the literature on political systems we find no claim that the UAE – even though it is classed as a unitary state of the “federal” type – is on the same model as, say, the United States of America or the Swiss Confederation or the former Soviet Union or any other federal system.

The published English version contains several weaknesses, from the general stylistic inadequacy to the obscurity of '*compatible motives and constituents*' and the typical error in the use of the definite article with 'human society' and 'history'. The native-speaker translation given above has no doubt been influenced overall by a copious exposure to both academic style and standard editorial style in English, and consequently the text has – for the English reader – certain elements that make it at once more comprehensible and more familiar in style: a much stronger opening, with the principle of 'end-weight' being applied in the sentences, more clarity (with 'fundamentals' and 'forces driving...' replacing 'constituents' and 'motives') and greater cohesion and coherence (at least thus far).

This example serves to illustrate, at least partly, how the challenge of translating a whole text, of whatever type, between Arabic and English entails decisions at both the 'micro' and the 'macro' levels. In other words, it is not only the rendering of particular lexical items that presents a problem, but also such matters as style, register, information flow, sentence structure, paragraphing and the use of punctuation that have to be carefully considered.

We shall be starting to examine the problems of trying to achieve such overall 'textual' equivalence towards the end of this chapter. In the meantime, let us briefly consider how the notions of formal equivalence / semantic translation on the one hand, and dynamic equivalence / communicative translation on the other might be applied to certain 'simple' signs, notices, salutations or 'phatic' expressions in Arabic. Take, for example, a common enough notice such as:

### ممنوع التدخين

A formal or semantic translation of this gives us 'Forbidden (is) the smoking'. But this violates the principle of naturalness: it is not the way we frame such utterances in English, which normally begin with 'No...' (Such a notice or warning may, of course, be framed differently, with '...is forbidden / prohibited' coming at the end; however, this tends to reduce the force of the warning.) So the dynamic or communicative translation here should be 'No smoking'. Dickins *et al.* (ibid: 19) refer to this difference as being between 'descriptive' and 'prescriptive' equivalents. Again, if we consider the leave-taking expression

### الى اللقاء

we find that it means, semantically, 'To the (next) meeting!', whereas communicatively it must be rendered 'See you (later)!'. Here – fairly typically – English naturally uses a verb while Arabic uses a noun. This is a phenomenon that we tend to observe in the English translations of Arabic notices, advertisements, leaflet-headings and the like. For example, a private hospital in Sharjah, UAE put out a bilingual leaflet for patients and visitors in which the main message in Arabic is:

اقتراحاتكم تساعدنا على تقديم الأفضل...

Formally, this can be translated without any particular awkwardness as 'YOUR SUGGESTIONS / COMMENTS HELP US TO PROVIDE / OFFER [SOMETHING] BETTER...' The English version simply says 'HELP US SERVE YOU BETTER...' This sounds quite a lot snappier, as would be expected by English-speakers in the context, and the idea of 'suggestions / comments' is not in fact lost or discarded since it comes up later within the English version of the leaflet.

With the leave-taking example given above there is at least (and perhaps unusually) no religious overtone of the sort that frequently poses a special 'equivalence problem' between these two languages, as we shall see later. A problem does, however, arise with the very common cultural expression

### الله كريم

with which we not only have the problem of whether to say or write 'Allāh' or 'God', but also need to translate appropriately according to the particular context, given that this is

an expression that may be used in a variety of situations, good or bad. Although the semantic translation is ‘Allāh (is) generous / kind’, the actual meaning to be conveyed can vary in English from ‘God is good / has been kind to us’ (in a benign situation) to something more like ‘Oh well, never mind – that’s life!’ (in one that is less happy for either the speaker or the listener(s) – or both parties). The latter version would in any case seem more natural to secularly-conditioned English speakers, and could be described as aiming for a ‘functional’ or a ‘pragmatic’ type of equivalence. The same would apply to another common Arabic expression used to wish an individual or a group good luck in any particular undertaking, with religious overtones:

موفق (ين) إن شاء الله

which can best be rendered functionally in English as ‘Good luck to you!’ or ‘All the best!’

Mohammad K. El-Yasin and Mahmud Husein Salih (1995) have examined the translatability of greeting expressions in Standard Arabic (SA) into English, seeing this as a previously neglected object of study (ibid: 141). Noting that the English greeting system is ‘rather impoverished in comparison with the intricate SA system’ (ibid: 147), they discuss among several examples of translation problems in this area the case of the formal SA greeting

السلام عليكم (ورحمة الله وبركاته)

which can be glossed as ‘The-peace [be] upon-you (pl.) (and-mercy-of-Allāh and-blessings-his)’ (ibid: 143-144). This is in fact a ritualized form of greeting that tends to be used at the opening of formal addresses; and the parentheses indicate that the latter part, or extended form, of the greeting can be optional. The problem here, according to El-Yasin and Salih, is that speakers do not actually think of the full meanings and connotations of the key words ‘peace’, ‘mercy’ and ‘blessings’ when they use this formula, whereas if translated directly into English these words ‘take on a more living signification than their Arabic originals’: in Arabic the expression ‘is so fossilized that it means little more than English “Hello!”’ (El-Yasin and Salih ibid: 143). However, the option of the longer form of the greeting allows for variation in the degree of formality or politeness required for the occasion. The English “Hello!” – or also, we may suggest, something like “Hello, and welcome!” - cannot perform the same function, since ‘it can neither carry any religious overtones nor provide a

chance for being more polite, more courteous (except, perhaps, through a little modification in suprasegmental phonemic features)'. Consequently:

Neither formal equivalence nor functional equivalence can do the job. In fact, to the best of our knowledge there is no naturally equivalent (Nida 1964: 166) translation in our case (ibid: 143-144).

We have seen, then, in this section how 'equivalence' is intrinsically a slippery term for the would-be translator because of the 'sameness' (or even mathematical reversibility) that it seems to imply. What is good for the domains of mathematics and logic cannot be straightforwardly applied to those of language and culture, since no instance of the latter domains can be classed as either identical to, or more or less 'logical' than any other. The problem is further compounded by the proliferation of largely overlapping terminology offered up by the translation theorists. The deeper we delve into the problems of equivalence, the more we should come to understand that they occur at so many levels: semantic, cultural, textual, stylistic, pragmatic, semiotic and so on. Thus 'approximation', as referred to earlier, may sometimes be the best we can hope to achieve. In any case it is probably most helpful to pursue our enquiry into the nature and extent of Arabic / English equivalence (or non-equivalence) in this chapter by considering mainly the difficulties at the level of words and phrases, and then previewing the types of problems which arise at the level of sentences, paragraphs and whole texts, and which we will need to examine in more detail later in our study.

#### **2.4 *Equivalence problems at the micro level***

We shall now review a representative sample of the types of linguistic and intercultural problem that face the translator between Arabic and English at the micro level, i.e. that of the word or phrase. These problems arise in every kind of text – transactional, commercial, journalistic, political and, most significantly, literary. We shall see how big obstacles often arise not just in grammar, stylistics and semantics, but also at the level of the cultural message. How, for example, is the English idea of 'privacy' (Baker 1992: 21) adequately conveyed to the Arab world? Or how can such an Anglo-Saxon (or Nordic) concept as 'the great outdoors' be rendered into Arabic? Here the Gulf leisure industry's advertising of **عالم الرحلات** (= 'the world of trips/expeditions') is surely too bland and, on its own,

involves too much loss. The crux of the problem tends to be the transfer of real meaning. As one scholar (Shunnaq 1993: 58) concludes:

In most cases, we find that translation is not dealing with denotative meanings between two languages where a denotative meaning has to be replaced by another denotative meaning. Indeed, translation is rather dealing with connotative meaning. One criterion which marks the level of congruency in translation is to preserve the connotation of the original.

#### 2.4.1 *Word level*

Problems in dealing with the translation of single words or phrases are generally seen as the main bugbear besetting the would-be translator from any foreign language and culture. One source of difficulty is that, as Mona Baker explains, 'there is no one-to-one correspondence between orthographic words and elements of meaning within or across languages' (Baker 1992: 11). For example, an 'agglutinating' language such as Turkish can produce single orthographic words of formidable length (as a result of suffixation) to convey a unit of meaning that English requires several words to express.

This is a purely linguistic form of non-equivalence, and is often encountered between Arabic and English in the area of word-building and derivation. English has an extensive repertoire of affixes at its disposal (mostly taken from Latin and Greek), and this facilitates the production of new lexical items in general, and scientific, technical and jargon items in particular. Arabic, by contrast, lacks this particular feature, with the result that paraphrase or explication is required:

**ومن خفة حركته ومن الصواريخ التي يحملها جعلته من أخطر الاسلحة البحرية.**

Its [a naval missile launch's] **manoeuvrability** and the missiles which it carries have made it one of the most dangerous of naval weapons.

(Daykin 1972: 114-115)

Here a single English word covers the two in the original Arabic, which mean literally 'agility / nimbleness of movement'. This is a relatively simple case; but Holes (2004) explains how Arabic continues to have a major problem in 'building a standardized and internally coherent technical and scientific vocabulary', with the preferred option of paraphrase sometimes producing lengthy noun phrases in which the component morphemes

of the source word are rearranged, as in the concept of ‘indivisibility’ being signified by the three words **عدم القابلية للتجزئة** (= lack (of) the-susceptibility to the-division) (Holes ibid: 312). Conversely, however, certain grammatical forms in Arabic such as ‘derived’ forms of root verbs can – just as much as other verbs or nouns with a specific cultural content - express ideas that require several words in English. Thus **تكتب** (= to write to one another / exchange letters) and **تضامن** (= to show / feel solidarity with...) are both examples of the ‘derived form VI’, which generally denotes a reciprocal action or feeling.

The above are just some instances of **non-equivalence of linguistic form** at the word level. There are also many other instances of micro-level grammatical and stylistic problems that the experienced translator will be aware of and will seek to deal with intelligently and with due regard to TT expectations, often compensating as far as possible for any loss incurred. Overarching all of this is the **problem of meaning** in the ST: this embraces denotative vs. connotative meaning, emotive language, culture-bound words and expressions (arising from material culture, religion, politics etc), semantic ‘voids’ or gaps, collocations, metaphor and the whole difficult domain of idioms and proverbs. Another matter that needs to be considered is the presence in certain types of Arabic text of words or formulaic expressions that a good translator can and will normally omit.

#### **2.4.2 Grammatical level**

We have already referred to some aspects of non-equivalence between Arabic and English with respect to **nouns**, with the examples of **time** and **ملعب** (the superordinate meaning ‘where playing takes place’) and in touching upon the issue of derivation or word-building. We have also seen that some ‘derived-form’ verbs in Arabic cannot normally be rendered by a single word in English.

With **verbs** there are some problems other than those arising from the translation of a verb which happens to be semantically complex. One example is the fact that, as with nouns, so also many common verbs in English that have a general currency and not just a technical or



scientific one are made up of a root word plus one or more affix. In Arabic it is often more natural to convey the required meaning using a common verb plus a noun. Examples taken from a bilingual leaflet for a skin care product are the words ‘energize’ and ‘dehydrate’, which in the Arabic version become, respectively:

توفر الطاقة للبشرة ... = provides the-energy for the-skin ...  
 دون أن تسبب لها الجفاف = without causing for [the-skin] the-dryness

The important point here is that, when translating from an original Arabic ST, we need to be aware of this phenomenon that arises out of the contrasting verb morphologies of the two languages, and this will normally suggest the use of a single word, i.e. verb in English.

Another potentially problematic area for less experienced translators working in either direction is that of **phrasal verbs followed by prepositions**, which are a feature of both languages. Modern English is replete with multi-word verbs such as ‘put up with’, ‘miss out on’ etc which would normally be rendered into Arabic by a single verb, though possibly with a certain loss of force which should ideally be compensated for (especially in, say, an advertisement). A corresponding Arabic verb form may need to be translated in different ways according to the context and the judgement of the translator: the Lebanese newspaper *Al-Bayrak* of 10 June 2008 reported that a meeting of the Gulf Cooperation Council Foreign Ministers had agreed on the need, *inter alia*, for

... القضاء على جذور الفتنة الطائفية في العراق.

This could be translated as ‘eliminating / removing / doing away with the roots of the sectarian conflict / insurgency in Iraq’; but perhaps a more natural and forceful rendering might be ‘uprooting / eradicating the causes of ...’

With **adverbs** and adverbial expressions there is likewise no easy correspondence in the ways in which these are handled in the two languages. In English, of course, the regular formation of adverbs is with the suffix *-ly*; however, although Arabic appears to have a broadly similar arrangement (with the use of the *tanween* of the vowel *fatha*, as in **تماماً** = completely), this is in fact used less than the English suffix (Dickins *et al.* 2002: 98). In many instances a given stretch of Arabic text will convey an adverbial idea by other

grammatical means. Let us consider this example from an Arabic text dealing with the issue of safety in industrial and other contexts, with its published English translation:

ومما لا شك فيه ان معتادى الإهمال والتهور وعدم التفكير يكونون عرضة للحوادث أكثر من غيرهم...

There is no doubt that those who are habitually careless, reckless, and thoughtless are, more than others, exposed to accidents... (Daykin 1972: 100)

Here the translator, although generally endeavouring to 'keep as close to the Arabic text as possible' (ibid: 7), has been aware of the Arabic device (underlined) that uses another part of speech, namely a participle to express the idea which he rightly renders as 'habitually...'. The Arabic means, literally, 'those who are / have been accustomed [to] the-carelessness, etc' and employs the characteristic structure of **المضاف والمضاف إليه**, or grammatical annexation. It is also worth noting that at the opening of this sentence the translator could have opted for 'Undoubtedly...' or 'Without a doubt...', but evidently chose not to, either for stylistic reasons or to remain close to the original.

Arabic has other ways of expressing an adverbial idea, for example with a **جار ومجرور** structure, i.e. using a preposition + noun or a preposition + noun + adjective:

بدقة

= exactly, precisely ('with exactness'), and

بصورة جيدة

= well / properly / thoroughly ('in a good way')

Formal and journalistic Arabic indeed tends to favour more complex grammatical forms, and most frequently prepositional phrases, in order to convey what in most cases can be a single-word adverbial in English:

على المستوى الدولي

= internationally ('on the international level')

At the same time it is by no means uncommon to encounter in today's journalistic Arabic single-word adverbial forms that cannot be translated into English other than by an adverbial phrase. An editorial in the UAE newspaper *Al-Khaleej* of 23 October 2005 discussed the political fall-out of the initial report of the international investigation into the

assassination of the former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq al-Ḥarīrī, and maintained that the turbulent effects could be alleviated only if they were dealt with

بحكمة ومسؤولية، لبنانياً وسورياً...

This is probably best translated as ‘...sensibly and responsibly, on the part of both Lebanon and Syria...’ (lit. ‘Lebanon-wise and Syria-wise’). Similarly, a collection of writings published in Beirut in 2004 by مركز دراسات الوحدة العربية [Centre for Arab Unity Studies] has the title احتلال العراق وتداعياته عربياً وإقليمياً ودولياً which contains three adverbial forms and could be translated naturally as ‘The Occupation of Iraq: Repercussions for the Arabs, the Middle East Region and the World’.

The main point here is that translators usually need to decide upon the right single word, or sometimes an appropriate adverbial phrase (which may sometimes be idiomatic), to fit the context. The same applies when the Arabic text uses the characteristic ‘absolute object’ construction:

نجح ماجد نجاحاً باهراً في الإمتحانات

Mājid passed his exams with flying colours (lit. ‘He succeeded a brilliant success in the exams’).

Before closing this section we should mention briefly an interesting study made by Abdul-Fattah Abu-ssaydeh (2006) of possible English equivalents for what he terms the ‘Arabic intensifiers’ جداً and تماماً. Concerned for the development of better lexicography to serve translators from Arabic into English, he observes that, while English has abundant possible equivalents for the two words in question, Arab translators and language students tend to overuse *very* and *completely*, make lesser use of other synonyms such as *profoundly*, *deeply*, *totally* and *fully*, and overlook or misuse ‘other possible intensification tools’ (Abu-ssaydeh 2006: 11). The latter include intensifiers listed as apparent synonyms in thesauri, dictionaries and online corpora, but which present a complex picture since they tend to operate under semantic and collocational distinctions and restrictions. Expressions available to translators may be in the form of single words, for example adverbs of the kind mentioned above, or in the form of similes or idioms (ibid). A few of the examples of this provided by Abu-ssaydeh at the end of his study (ibid: 34) are as follows:

اعرفها تماماً = *know like the back of his hand; know very well; know full well*

إختفى تماماً = *disappear completely / without a trace; vanish into thin air*

سهل جداً = *very easy; easy as ABC / falling off a log / pie; dead easy*

مريض جداً = *very sick; sick as a dog / a parrot / a pig*

### 2.4.3 Stylistic level

A significant element of Arabic style that needs to be considered is that of ‘semantic repetition’, in which two synonyms or near-synonyms (from any of the major parts of speech) are used (Dickins *et al.* 2002: 59). This does happen to an extent in English, but generally only in stock phrases (‘these are the terms and conditions’, ‘in this day and age’, ‘for your safety and security’, ‘with my thanks and appreciation’, etc.) or in political rhetoric (‘those who love freedom and liberty..’, etc.). A straightforward example from Arabic is **وزارة التربية والتعليم** which can normally be translated as ‘Ministry of Education’, i.e. using a single word to cover the general meaning of the two Arabic words for ‘bringing up / raising’ and ‘educating / instructing’ – which are closely-related but not identical semantically. Another frequently-occurring instance is the pairing **تحقيقات وتحريرات** (lit. ‘investigations/checks and inquiries’), which can usually be translated simply as ‘investigations’ (e.g., by the police). Semantic repetition often occurs in contexts like this where there is no particular need for emphasis, with the result that the two Arabic words (most often nouns) can be safely ‘merged’ into a single English one, or otherwise transposed into a near-equivalent for communicative (or ‘domesticating’) purposes, as in this closure to a bilingual customer notice from the Emirates Telecommunications Corporation:

**وتقبلوا فائق الشكر والتقدير** = Yours faithfully

(= lit. ‘So accept the surpassing thanks and appreciation’)

However, as Dickins *et al.* explain (*ibid.*: 61), there are occasions when the translator needs to retain the semantic repetition in English, for example in order to preserve the emotive force of the original or to reproduce formulaic religious or legal language. Later, in Chapter Five, we encounter examples of semantic repetition and parallelism for rhetorical effect in the political speech-making of Saddam Hussein and Gamal Abdel Nasser. Saddam, while discussing the lessons of history early on in an anniversary speech in August 2002, uses the

phrase ... *والدهور السابقة* ... , which might be translated as 'in all past ages and epochs' or, by 'merging', simply as 'in all ages past'. In general, though, semantic repetition may be handled by the 'merging' technique, by some form of grammatical transposition or by a 'semantic distancing' technique that avoids creating 'the stylistic oddity in English of having two words with virtually the same meaning conjoined with one another' (ibid: 60).

Another feature of Arabic style is one that generally calls for 'translation by omission' (Baker 1992: 40 – 42, Dickins *et al.* ibid: 23 - 24). This involves elements of Arabic culture, cohesive devices and other forms of signalling to the ST readers which the experienced translator into English will normally omit since – although entailing some translation loss – their omission does not affect the meaning to be conveyed and makes for a less awkward and more natural TT rendering. One example is the use of the formal salutation *تحية طيبة و بعد* (= lit. 'good greeting and so following...') at the beginning of letters, notices and circulars such as the one referred to earlier from the Emirates Telecommunications Corporation, which omits it from its English version. Another is the expression *ومن الجدير بالذكر* ( lit. 'and from the worthy of mention') and its variants used at the start of some newspaper paragraphs to signal information that is background to the main narrative or argument, whereas in English news reporting (both print and broadcast) the fact that such information is of a background nature is normally signalled simply by its being relegated to a separate paragraph, sentence or utterance at the end of the report. Again, in a news report of an official visit we see how the Arabic verb (underlined) referring to the duration of the visit is omitted (or rather, grammatically transposed) to suit modern English style:

وصل إلى بيروت ليلة أمس الرئيس الفرنسي جاك شيراك في زيارته رسمية تستغرق يومين ...

French President Jacques Chirac arrived in Beirut last night on a two-day official visit...

In general such omissions or transpositions are due to the contrasting nature of Arabic and English, the former favouring explicitation and the latter tending towards a more implicative or elliptical style (Hatim 1997: xiv; Emery 1987: 64). Eirlys Davies (2007) has recently provided a very useful survey of the various justifications for the reasoned use of

omission in translation. Frequently, she observes (ibid: 56), it seems to have been implied in discussions of translation quality that ‘an omission is inevitably a flaw’, with omissions in the translation of religiously or politically sensitive texts, in particular, continuing to cause protest and outrage. Nevertheless, she argues that there are several sets of circumstances in which omission may be regarded as a perfectly valid, useful and intelligent solution to a translation problem.

One of these is in the area of untranslatability (for linguistic and/or cultural reasons), including often obscure and problematic cases such as intertextual allusions (which we discuss in Chapter Three, 3.3.1) (ibid: 58-63). Another set of cases involves ‘material which the translator feels will be offensive or unacceptable to the target audience’ (ibid: 63): here omission may well be justified, since if the target readers are offended, irritated or embarrassed by the content of a translation

they may quite simply decide not to continue reading it; and a faithful translation which remains unread may be considered more of a communication failure than an adapted translation which is accepted by the target audience (Davies ibid: 63).

In this connection, Bahaa-Eddin Mazid (Mazid 2007: 106-110) gives examples of how some of his own student translators from English into Arabic in the UAE have, for essentially face-saving reasons, made omissions (or mistranslations) and thus ‘euphemized’ certain English ST’s apparently containing unacceptable political viewpoints, ‘foul’ language or sexual references.

A third set of circumstances arises from certain types of non-equivalence, including that of politeness formulas as illustrated in El-Yasin and Salih (1995), mentioned above. An instance of such non-equivalence, certainly common enough in the context of Arabic-English translation and relevant to our study, is ‘where elements present in the source text are perceived by the readers of this as banal, predictable elements whose presence is required yet not obtrusive’ (Davies ibid: 67): they are there because they accord with the norms of communication in the source culture and thus go virtually unnoticed, as in the case of formulaic utterances such as the one cited and analysed by El-Yasin and Salih (1995: 143-144) or the Arabic words always used after mentioning the name of the Prophet Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). When translated, however, ‘such expressions may appear,

not banal, but highly incongruous' (Davies: *ibid*). This applies not just to the last-mentioned case of the words used out of respect for the Prophet – which are usually rendered in English as 'Peace be upon him' or even simply 'pbuh' – but also to formulas used when referring to a ruler or other VIP, such as **حفظه الله** ('May Allah preserve him!'). (This particular formula of blessing, according to Ofra Bengio (1998: 85) in her study of political discourse in Iraq under Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist regime, came to be added from the early 1980's onwards 'to each and every mention of [Saddam]' – especially in times of crisis such as the Gulf War and its immediate aftermath, or when Saddam seemed to be in danger, 'or else when the user of the phrase felt threatened'. We may add that it would presumably not have been wise for an Iraqi translator to have omitted the formula if called upon to render a text containing it into English.) As Davies explains (*ibid*: 67-68), the inclusion of a series of such (usually religious) formulas in a fairly complete or 'literal' translation may mean, at worst, that

they may be judged tedious, irritating or even mildly amusing, and indeed may even be considered to reinforce Orientalist stereotypes of the Arab as over-effusive, subject to quaint conventions and wasting more time on words than on deeds.

In other words, they will, overall, have an effect on the target audience significantly different from that intended and expected by the source text producer, and that effect will probably be one of 'exoticism instead of familiarity, or one of obscurity instead of banality' (*ibid*: 76).

The final category in Davies's analysis is that of items that can reasonably be omitted on the grounds that they would be seen as unnecessary or redundant by the target audience, and she gives as an example of this the stylistic fondness in Arabic for using hendiadys, or pairs of words similar in meaning (*ibid*: 72-73). We have in fact already mentioned this (under the heading of 'semantic repetition') at the beginning of this section. As for certain other acts of omission by the translator that may arise principally for reasons of cultural difference, for example in the area of titles or honorifics preceding names, these will be covered briefly in the next section.

#### 2.4.4 Cultural level

Culture, notes Peter Newmark, 'is always the main obstacle to translation' (Newmark 2006: 30). Concerned principally with European languages, he explains how some well-known foreign words such as the Italian *pizzeria* are usually simply transferred into English, while other less familiar ones (e.g. the German *Konditorei*) may need to be glossed to suit the expected cultural knowledge of the target readership or audience. He also maintains that 'an approximate translation is always possible' because of certain language universals and the fact that most languages have intercultural words, 'sharing the culture due to invasions, migrations, etc.' (ibid: 31). He might have added that colonialism and – especially in recent years – people's exposure to the news media have played a major part in this process.

Below are details of unique culture-specific equivalence problems between Arabic and English:

(i) **media expressions:** Let us consider the case of western media coverage of the Arab and Islamic worlds over the past three or four decades. We can trace the gradually increasing introduction to the target receptors of a range of alien concepts and vocabulary: from 'fedayeen' [fidā'iyyīn] (Palestinian 'guerillas'/'freedom fighters') to **jihād** [jihād] and **mujahideen** [mujāhidīn] (first in the context of 1980s Afghanistan) and on to **ayatollah** ['āyatallāh], **Ramadan** [Ramaḍān], **fatwa** [fatwā], **intifada** [intifāḍah], etc. Often such words become mispronounced and/or glossed inadequately or tendentiously by the news media; but perhaps the main effect of their adoption is to reinforce an essentially stereotyped, exoticising and sometimes frightened outlook on an alien culture and religious world. We will consider the translation of some of them a little later.

(ii) **multi-functional words:** In the case of Arabic, we can mention the characteristic multi-functional word **تفضل** (= lit. 'Be so good as to...') which - like its close counterparts in Turkish, Persian, Greek and other languages - has to be translated in many different ways according to the context in English (e.g. 'Come in!', 'Go ahead!', 'Help yourself!', 'Can I help?' etc.). Likewise **مبروك** (= lit. 'Blessed') can be used for congratulations on many



different occasions, and consequently may be translated in various ways. Indeed, despite that somewhat negative aspect of our adoption of some foreign words into English mentioned above, the desire to translate them and to understand them as best we may is surely a positive and very human phenomenon. Susan Bassnett, one of the protagonists of the ‘cultural turn’ in Translation Studies, favours what she calls the ‘optimistic approach’ to translation:

If language reflects social reality, and social realities differ [as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis argues], this means that any act of translation that takes place is a triumph over incomprehension. If nothing is translatable, then each time any of us translates, we are affirming our abilities to cross cultural boundaries. Hence my belief that to believe in the impossibility of translation and still to go on doing it, is a statement of optimism (Bassnett 1997: 38).

She cites two examples from Italian that illustrate the problem of cultural equivalence and translatability. The expression *Buon giorno* ‘is not the equivalent, in semantic terms, of “Good morning”, though we could argue that it is the equivalent in functional terms, i.e. both are basic polite forms of greeting’ (ibid). The additional problem, however, is that the English expression is only valid until noon, whereas in Italy one can say *Buon giorno* throughout the day. Likewise, *Buon appetito* is translatable semantically as ‘Good appetite’; but in English there is no single equivalent expression, and instead a range of locutions that will depend on context and the vagaries of fashion, from the bland ‘Enjoy [your meal]!’ to ‘Get stuck in!’ and the like.

(iii) **material culture words:** Words pertaining to material culture (the things people wear, eat or otherwise use in their daily lives) regularly offer a challenge to translators. This is especially so between such languages as English and Arabic which have developed in very divergent cultural, religious and physical environments. Abdul-Raof (2005: 163) mentions the word ‘farm’, translated superficially into Arabic according to the dictionary as *مزرعة*, and makes the point that the two words really have differing denotative meanings for obvious cultural and environmental reasons. One could add that ‘farm’ will mean different things to both farmers and the general public in different parts of the British Isles, North America, Australia, etc. So the translator between Arabic and English may need to gloss or to find a way of conveying a more specific idea or image. Of course there are some words from Arab and Muslim culture that have become familiar in English transliteration, for

example **حجاب** (the ḥijāb) which Wehr (1974) translates *inter alia* as ‘woman’s veil’ – hardly an adequate rendering of a word that means more than just a face-covering. Dickins *et al.* (2002: 32) refer to the use of transliteration, generally in italics, to transfer a culturally-specific ST term into the TT (‘without further explanation’) as cultural borrowing, and the word **فوطه** (fūṭah) (in the Iraqi usage to mean a woman’s wrap-around garment) is offered as an example of this. However, one could add that in Yemen the same word means a garment wrapped around the waist by men; so translators need to have sufficient awareness and experience of the particular ST cultural setting, and perhaps to clarify the meaning of the foreign word, not by lengthy explanation but by adding something to their translation by way of compensation. The same might apply in the case of a word like **دلة** (dallah), which Wehr (*ibid*) explains as ‘pot with long curved spout and handle used for making coffee (among Syrian nomads and in some parts of Saudi Arabia)’. This is clearly not a standard European-style coffee pot / maker, but does have some features in common, so is not so very exotic; probably ‘Bedouin coffee pot’ is adequate – perhaps enhanced if appropriate in the TT by references to its curved spout or its metal glinting in the desert sun, etc. As cultural borrowing Dickins *et al.* (*ibid*: 33) also cite the example of certain Middle East-specific musical instruments: they contrast the acceptable rendering of **كمان** (kamān) as ‘violin’ (since it is exactly the same instrument) with the need to transliterate (and perhaps to partially explain) words like **ناي، عود، قاتون** (nāy, ‘ūd and qānūn respectively) which are not quite identical to their close relatives in European music.

Problems of this sort will clearly arise regularly for the translator of literary and academic (e.g. sociological, anthropological) texts in particular. But it is an even more formidable obstacle for would-be translators of religious texts, especially the Qur’ān. Abdul-Raof (2005: 169 – 170) mentions two items of material culture from Qur’ānic verses that are resistant to effective domestication by translators and therefore exemplify very well ‘the limits of cultural translatability in Qur’ānic discourse’. The first is the plural word **خمر** (khumur = women’s head-coverings) in Q24:31, which has been inadequately rendered as ‘veil’ by some of the major translators of the Qur’ān into English. The other is the expression **العشار** (al-‘ishār) in Q81:4 referring to a valuable item of Arab property then and

now, namely a pregnant she-camel, which will be left untended on the Day of Judgement; this can really only be translated literally, but at the cost of losing the impact that the image would no doubt have had on the early Arab listeners to the Qur'ān.

(iv) **connotative overtones:** The essential problem is that words and expressions are 'culture-bound'. Additionally there is the problem of the difference between **denotative** and **connotative** meanings of words, which is a difficult area for the translator and one in which dictionaries (especially the older variety) are often not very helpful. Even with what one might consider a relatively straightforward area, that of denotative (or 'propositional') meaning, there are pitfalls and decisions that have to be made. Dickins *et al.* (2002: 54-55) make the point that 'full synonymy is exceptional, both intralingually and interlingually', and give the example of the English 'uncle', which covers two words in Arabic, **عم** ('amm = paternal uncle) and **خال** (khāl = maternal uncle). Arabic is more specific than English in its kinship terms, and in linguistic terminology the two Arabic words may be considered 'hyponyms' of the English 'hyperonym' (or 'superordinate') uncle. Common techniques for translating the 'denotative' meanings of words, according to Dickins *et al.* (ibid: 56-57), are those of **particularization** and **generalization**: the former translates by adding particular or specific meaning to a ST word to suit the context, e.g. by translating **بلد** (balad) as 'village' when this is what it means, while the latter does so by omitting some specific denotative meaning in the ST and using a suitable 'hyperonym', e.g. by translating **جلابية** (jallābīyyah) as 'garment' – perhaps especially in the case of a readership that is already aware of an Egyptian context.

It is in the whole domain of **connotative** meaning, however, that translators need to be especially careful. Words are in the first place culturally-conditioned, and they can also acquire various degrees of emotive colouring which make them **collocate** naturally with a set of other words. Major problems in this area can arise between English and other European languages, and as the author of a letter to *The Linguist* journal (Vol 47 No 3 2008: 28) writes, hidden dangers can lie with 'those apparently simple and common words that do not seem to pose any particular problems'. The writer cites the example of the English word *suburb* and its (dictionary) equivalent in French *banlieue*; after reminding us

of the denotative meaning he explains how serious problems arise when we start to examine the contrasting connotations of the two words:

Ask an English person for words associated with “suburb” and you’ll hear “middle-class”, “leafy” and “green”. Do the same with a Parisian and you’ll get “inter-ethnic tension”, “drugs”, “violence” and “delinquency”. The problem with translating “suburb” by *banlieue* is that the words describe two diametrically opposite social realities. *Banlieue* is almost a dirty word (ibid).

Thinking beyond Europe, we may add here that the city of Beirut offers an interesting instance of the same phenomenon, involving the very same words plus an Arabic ‘equivalent’. Anyone driving towards, or close to, the southern ‘suburb’ area of Beirut, with its somewhat sinister reputation as ‘Hizbollah-land’, will at some point see road signs for الضاحية (al-ḍāḥīyah) – an Arabic word pregnant with connotation in the Beirut / Lebanon context – accompanied helpfully by the French and English translations ‘banlieue’ and ‘suburb’.

(v) **emotive words:** We find no shortage of Arabic examples to illustrate the difficulties translators into English face in seeking to cope not merely with connotative meaning but indeed with the whole overarching problem of **emotiveness** in language. This is something which has been increasingly the subject of research by translation scholars, including Arab researchers such as Abdul-Raof (2001, 2004, 2005), Aziz (1995), Hatim (1997, 2001) and Shunnaq (1993), all of whom have provided a wealth of useful and interesting examples – far too wide a range, in fact, to do justice to here. Let us consider just a few. A topical enough starting point is the Arabic جهاد (jihād), which has come to acquire distinctly negative connotations of ‘holy war’, violence, intolerance etc. in the non-Muslim world but whose denotative meaning, according to Shunnaq (writing several years ago), ‘is packed with positive connotations’ (Shunnaq 1993: 47). The positive semantic components of the Arabic word, he explains, suggest a lot more than physical fighting, linking the implied inner struggle with (Muslim) faith; and ‘there is no word or expression in English which actually represents the emotive overtones of the original’ (ibid). Hatim (2001: 33 – 34) also comments interestingly on the use of this word (for its effect upon an Arab audience) in the political rhetoric of Yasser Arafat, and its tendency to be dangerously misrendered in news media translations as ‘holy war’. He explains that the term has evolved ‘and its original meaning is now all but defunct in current political discourse’. In accordance with a

‘context-sensitive’ translation model that aims for ‘dynamic’ textual equivalence, suggests Hatim, the use of this word by Arafat could better be translated by ‘make concerted efforts’ or even ‘bend over backwards’. An embattled Saddam Hussein, however, made copious use of the word in his later speeches as part of a rallying strategy aimed at Iraqis, the rest of the Arab world and other Muslims, as for example in a speech in August 2002 when he is warning ‘evildoers’ not to attack Iraq, especially, since it is **عراق الجهاد والراية والموقف**, which we translate later in Chapter Five as *‘Iraq the land of Jihad, the land that stands [firm and] resolute under the banner of Islam’*. He presumably meant people (at home and abroad) to understand that Iraq was a country that defended its rights. What ‘perlocutionary effect’ his use of the word had on his audience is much less clear. Conversely, we may add in this connection, the translation into Arabic of highly emotive, loose and subjective political discourse from Western politicians poses a major problem for conscientious translators in the Arab world: a word like ‘crusade’ is easily (and unthinkingly) used in a positive (and usually completely secular) sense in English, but has distinctly negative connotations in the Middle East; while a literal rendering of phrases characteristic of George W. Bush’s time as U.S. President such as ‘war on terror’ and ‘...those who love freedom / liberty’ is of little benefit without some sort of glossing.

Naturally religious expressions in Arabic – just like in English and other languages – carry a heavy weight of emotiveness and connotation, as also do the names of political parties or movements, e.g. ‘the Tories’, ‘the Neo-Cons’, **حزب الله** (Ḥizb Allāh, or ‘Party of God’). The main problem for the translator is that what appear on the surface to be natural translations are in fact inadequate and incongruent, involving a loss which somehow needs to be compensated for. Thus to translate **حج** (ḥajj) simply as ‘pilgrimage’ is not good enough, since the Muslim concept of a pilgrimage to one particular place is not congruent with the Christian (or indeed western secular) uses of this English word; and emotive overtones will be lost ‘unless the translator either introduces a footnote to explain them or makes some adjustment in the text itself’ (Shunnaq *ibid*: 45). The same applies to the ninth month of the Muslim year, **رمضان** (Ramaḍān), which is now fairly well-known as ‘the Muslim month of fasting’ but which – as both Shunnaq (*ibid*: 57 – 58) and Dickins *et al.* (2002: 69) point out – has broader and more positive connotations of spirituality combined with celebration for

Muslims, or indeed for others who have experienced living in Muslim societies: often more akin to Christmas than to Lent, in fact.

Another interesting case of emotiveness is that of the word **شهيد** (shahīd) , which clearly has a degree of overlap with the English concept of ‘martyr’, but does not usually imply death as a consequence of refusal to renounce one’s faith (or version of faith) and overall has more positive connotations (Shunnaq ibid: 45). The word is often used emotively in the Arabic press after someone well-known has been murdered: an example is the reference in many Lebanese newspapers and TV broadcasts to **الرئيس الشهيد رفيق الحريري** (my emphasis) following Rafīq al-Ḥarīrī’s assassination in February 2005. We cannot naturally translate this formula as ‘the martyred (ex-) Prime Minister R.H.’; we can choose between being a bit emotive and writing ‘the late Prime Minister Hariri’ or being completely neutral and opting for plain ‘Mr Hariri’ (as did the English-language *Gulf News* at the time in question). Interestingly, in contrast to the Lebanese media, the more distant Arabic-language newspapers in the Gulf (for example in the *Al-Khaleej* editorial of 23 October 2005 referred to earlier) chose to refer to Mr Hariri simply as **رئيس الوزراء اللبناني الأسبق** (i.e. ‘former Lebanese PM...’). Finally, the related verb **استشهد** in its passive form means literally ‘to be martyred / die a martyr’s death’, but in most cases needs to be toned down and rendered simply as ‘to die / be killed’; if appropriate in TT terms it could perhaps become something like ‘make the supreme sacrifice’ or ‘give one’s life’. It is worth noting at this point that both these forms of the word in question were heavily used in the rhetoric of Saddam Hussein, two examples of whose later speeches we study in Chapter Five. Typically enough, Saddam salutes not only his fellow Iraqis but also others in the Arab world, and especially the Palestinians, at the close of his address in August 2002 which we have referred to above, and to the Palestinians he says:

سلاماً شعب فلسطين، رجالاً وماجدات .. أحياء وشهداء

[‘Greetings to the Palestinian people, to their glorious men and women – to those living and those who have given their lives!’]

In this and other similar examples, the use of the emotive **شهداء** rather than the merely denotative **أموات** is significant in that it connotes the idea that the dead of Palestine have died for their country, their rights and so on and are actually living in another, better place.

Ofra Bengio, who has made a special study of Saddam's discourse and his (and his Ba'ath Party's) 'manipulation of Islam', states (Bengio 1998: 156) that the word in question was originally used for those Muslim fighters who died fighting the infidels, but later on 'came to include people who had fallen for the sake of their people, their homeland, or their regime' (ibid). Based on an interpretation of the Qur'ānic verse Q3: 169, it was believed that those who had died in this way had gained their place in Paradise (ibid). Bengio also illustrates (ibid: 156-158) how Saddam's regime ruthlessly exploited the notion of *istishhād* especially during the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980's.

(vi) **honorary titles:** At this point we should return briefly to the reference we made at the end of the previous section regarding the frequent, culturally driven need to **omit** certain items, including titles and honorifics, from an Arabic ST. For example, in the Lebanese context it is not only Rafīq al-Ḥarīrī whose former title is referred to out of respect; other, still living former Presidents and Prime Ministers such as Amīn al-Jumayyil and Salīm al-Ḥuṣṣ are always accorded the title **الرئيس** (al-ra'īs), which may perhaps need to be translated as 'former President / Prime Minister' at the first mention for the benefit of the TT readers, but should normally be dropped thereafter. We need to remember that contemporary Arabic language and Arab society is generally much more respectful and deferential than its English-speaking counterparts, and this is just one aspect of cultural incongruence. Shehdeh Fareh (2006: 104) mentions as a translation problem the tendency in some parts of the Arab world to use a long series of honorific terms (main titles and also subsidiary ones) when mentioning the name of a VIP:

This exaggeration in stating all the titles of a person renders the subject of the sentence very long and the main verb of the sentence far from its direct subject.

In such cases where a whole sentence becomes 'long and thus awkward and vague', he suggests (ibid: 105), it might be sufficient 'to mention the name of the person and the title relevant to the activity he is involved in'. This would certainly fit in better with the cultural norms and expectations of at least most of the English-speaking world.

Even outside the sphere of politics the name of a professional qualification such as **المحامي**, **المهندس** (al-muḥāmī = Lawyer, al-muhandis = Engineer) may precede someone's name – as it can also do in European countries such as Italy. However, in English it would not be normal to write or say 'Engineer Aḥmad', for example, although Aḥmad's job or

profession may be specified in other ways more acceptable in English ('This morning I met Mr Ahmad, the engineer in charge of the site...' etc.). Peter Emery observes that English 'is chary of using titles' (Emery 2004: 158), and he provides a good instance of the incongruity between Arabic and English in this regard from a promotional booklet accompanying a photographic exhibition in Oman. The passage begins with these words:

فإنسان هو اللغة الأولى التي تبرز من خلال عدسة المصور الفنان خميس المحاربي...

Back-translated into English, this becomes 'Man is the first language which appears through the lens of the photographer the artist Khamis al Muharbi...' (I have underlined the problem area in both the Arabic and English.) By contrast, the printed English translation reads: 'Humanity is both the medium and the inspiration for Khamis Al-Muharbi's photographic talent as he records...' As Emery points out, one of the various adjustments that needed to be made in translating the whole of the passage in question into a (supposed) natural English style was the elimination of a type of collocation ('the photographer the artist') that is unacceptable in English (Emery *ibid*: 157-158).

(vii) **collocation**: Closely bound up with the phenomenon of connotation in language that we discussed earlier is indeed that of collocation (as mentioned immediately above). This is all about the company that words keep, and there is unfortunately *no close correspondence* (to give an example which we have already used earlier) between pairs of languages such as English and Arabic in this area. This fact of course is a frequent source of errors in language learning, and as part of lexical competence is in fact as big an obstacle for learners as grammatical competence. Collocations are a powerful part of language, both written and spoken, and perhaps this accounts for the frequent use of adjective + noun combinations in film titles such as *Brief Encounter*, *Lethal Weapon* and *Fatal Attraction*. They also represent a complex phenomenon even within one language. We cannot now speak of a 'short encounter'; nor can we say that the Chairman 'opened the meeting with some short remarks' – though we can say that the company's Annual Report contained a short (or brief) introduction on senior staff appointments. Thus in English we can take the adjectives 'brief' and 'short' and find that, even though they apparently have the same meaning, they are restricted in that each one can only be 'mated' with certain nouns.



Not surprisingly, then, ‘collocational clashes’ occur between English and Arabic, and sometimes there are cultural factors lurking behind the linguistic problems. An instance of this is in the differing attitudes to colours. Abdul-Raof (2001: 29) provides the example of how in English the noun ‘envy’ collocates with the colour green, while the equivalent noun in Arabic, **حقد**, collocates with the colour black, so that if we encounter the phrase **وجوه ملينة بالحقد الأسود** we should translate it as ‘faces green with envy’. According to Aziz (1995: 86), Arabic uses certain colours, especially the colours black and white, ‘to convey pejorative and favourable emotive meaning, respectively’. So of course does English to a certain extent, but not in quite the same way. Aziz gives the examples (from Egyptian Arabic specifically) of **خبر أسود** (khabar ‘aswad = ‘black news’) meaning bad news and **خبر أبيض** (khabar ‘abyaḍ = ‘white news’) meaning good news. In the same vein Shunnaq (1993: 37) informs us that the expression **ثورة بيضاء** (thawrah bayḍā = ‘white revolution’) uses the colour white connotatively and means ‘peaceful, bloodless revolution’.

However, not all collocational problems that arise for the translator working between Arabic and English can be ascribed to any clearly defined cultural disparity. Translators need plenty of both linguistic and cultural awareness to deal with them, and have not only to recognize collocational meanings in the original ST but also to carefully avoid producing clashes in their TT: Dickins *et al.* (2002: 71-72) give as an example the phrase

**الأيام الماضية بكل دفتها الدموي الشديد الحرارة...**

This can be literally rendered as ‘the past with all its extremely hot bloodshed’; but since ‘hot bloodshed’ is not an accepted collocation in English (and in any case clashes with the notion of ‘hot-blooded’), it is better to use the standard collocation ‘terrible bloodshed’ to deal with this translation problem.

(viii) **semantic voids:** We now move on to consider the question of ‘voids’ and the challenge they present to the translation enterprise. An example of a semantic void for English is the Arabic word **مختار** (mukhtār), which means a village headman in some countries of the eastern Arab world. For Arabic, a corresponding semantic void is represented by the English word ‘Whip’ (when used to mean a political party official responsible for party discipline), along with other problematic terms which Leon Barkho

(1987: 143) has identified as being peculiar to British politics. Conversely, Barkho (ibid: 144-146) draws attention to the difficulties posed for British observers, journalists and others by Arabic political vocabulary and nomenclature used specifically in Iraq at the time of writing. Examples he gives include unfamiliar entities such as **مجلس قيادة الثورة** (generally translated as ‘Revolutionary Command Council’) and problematic adjectives - laden with specific and often emotive meanings in the source political culture – such as **قطري، قومي، وطني**, which raise the question whether they should be translated as ‘national’, ‘Pan-Arab’, ‘regional’, etc. The problem of semantic voids is one that has been discussed and illustrated by Menachem Dagut (1978, 1987) with reference to Hebrew and English, and by Abdul-Raof (2001, 2004, 2005) with special reference to Qur’ān translation. We have already seen how many religious and other terms tend to be translation-resistant, and in the Qur’ānic text particularly there is a major problem of lexical and semantic voids. According to Abdul-Raof (2004: 93), would-be translators have to tackle such voids by using componential analysis to unpack the ‘lexical compression’ and the ‘Qur’ān-specific emotive overtones’ that they involve, and this means adopting a ‘periphrastic translation approach’. Thus the expression **تيمم** (tayammum) found in Q4:43 needs to be explained as (in abbreviated form) ‘a kind of ablution that is adopted when someone is spiritually unclean and there is no water’ (ibid). Another interesting case provided by Abdul-Raof (ibid: 95 – 96) is that of the nuanced Qur’ānic discourse expressing semantic subtleties by using two lexical items that would appear to be synonyms ‘but whose componential features are drastically distinct’. In Q10:5 the word **ضياء** (ḍiyyā) is used referring to the sun while the word **نورا** (nūr) is used referring to the moon, and here a really good and effective translation somehow needs to capture the distinction between the former word (signifying the radiation of heat as well as light) and the latter, which signifies the emission of light only.

(ix) **rhetorical and cultural voids:** We also have culture-bound rhetorical voids in Arabic, especially in Qur’ānic discourse. The Qur’ān is characterised in its discourse by structural, stylistic and rhetorical voids, which combine to set severe limitations to its overall translatability (Abdul-Raof 2001: 1, 2004: 105). In a sense all of these are ‘cultural’ voids, but there are also some special expressions for which special cultural knowledge is

required in order to explain them or to transpose them adequately into English. A culture-specific reference that comes under this category is *...كانهم خشبٌ مسندةٌ...* in Q63: 4, meaning the ‘hypocrites’ who are the subject of this Sūra. This is rendered by Ali (2003: 586-7) as ‘they are as worthless as hollow pieces of timber propped up, (unable to stand on their own)’, while al-Hilali and Khan (2002: 653) simply have ‘they are as blocks of wood propped up’. Clearly these translations are of little help to those readers (or hearers) who lack the cultural background information, which is supplied by Abdul-Raof (2004: 105): Culturally, the Arabs used to put planks of timber against the wall at the back of their houses when they were not needed, and as such the planks of wood were useless most of the time. Thus, explains Abdul-Raof (ibid), this expression in the Qur’ān represents a **metonymy** for people who are ‘useless and worthless in the community’.

Metonymy is in fact a rhetorical mode of discourse that is deeply rooted in Arabic culture (Abdul-Raof 2006: 233). Consequently the translator into English will need both cultural knowledge and often linguistic resourcefulness when encountering it – as would be the case, of course, with other languages. Abdul-Raof (ibid) explains metonymy as a figure of speech that ‘signifies the allusion to someone or something without specifically referring to his or her or its identity’, and he gives an example from classical Arabic that illustrates how the device of metonymy signifies an intrinsic, non-allegorical meaning: *زيد كثير الرماد*

This means literally ‘Zayd has got a lot of ashes’; but because ashes are the result of all the cooking for guests that has been going on in Zayd’s house, the real meaning is that ‘Zayd’s a generous / welcoming fellow’. Before such a cultural expression can be domesticated by the translator, componential analysis of its lexical elements is required. In modern standard Arabic, however, metonymy tends to designate an allegorical meaning; and thus it can be used pragmatically (and on occasions ambiguously) by writers of both literary and political texts to praise or criticize someone or something when there is a fear of persecution (ibid: 234).

At a relatively simple level metonymy expressions occur regularly in contemporary Arabic writing, and most are likely to be familiar to those with knowledge and experience of the

Arab world. Examples are: لغة الضاد = the Arabic language, سفينة الصحراء = the camel, حارس الحرمين الشريفين = the King of Saudi Arabia, ثالث الحرمين = Jerusalem, عاصمة الرشيد = Baghdad, and بلاد الرافدين = Iraq. As for translators working from English into Arabic, they would naturally need the same kind of knowledge. Rendering 'the White House' literally is adequate for the majority of Arab readers (assuming the context is clear); but in the U.K.-specific cases of , for example, 'Downing Street responded swiftly...' or 'All eyes are on Threadneedle Street this morning...' some explication would probably be necessary.

(x) **metaphor:** This, as Katie Wales explains (Wales 2001: 250), is a very common 'trope' in rhetoric, and what happens when words are used with metaphoric senses is that 'one field or domain of reference is carried over or mapped onto another on the basis of some perceived similarity between the two fields'. It is a device much used in poetic language in order to reconceptualise human experience through expressing the familiar by the unfamiliar, and as such has also been enthusiastically adopted and exploited, both linguistically and visually, by advertisers: 'cornflakes associated with sunshine, etc.' (ibid: 251). Metaphors can be in the form of verbs as well as of nouns, and indeed metaphors have become such a familiar part of everyday language that their producers and receivers 'have in many cases ceased to be aware that figurative meaning is involved (*the pound recovers; the war against inflation; black hole*)' (ibid). Another more recent example, with a powerful but at the same time thought-deadening effect, is *the war on terror*.

As Newmark (1988: 104) points out, the translation of metaphor is a problem second only to the more general problem of choosing the most suitable method for translating a text. Dagut had some time earlier drawn attention to what he found the surprising neglect of the study of metaphor by translation theorists (Dagut 1976: 21):

For here is a phenomenon which is both central to all forms of language use (and particularly to creative writing, whether in verse or prose), and at the same time also one of the main points in which interlingual incongruence manifests itself... (ibid)

This incongruence, and the resulting difficulty for translators, is true of any language pair, and will always be especially true in literary translation. Between Arabic and English, however, the problem is greater than usual on account of both the cultural incongruence

and the special degree of emotiveness in Arabic (Dickins et al. 2002: 146, 158; Aziz 1995: 87; Shunnaq 1993: 41–2). Furthermore, metaphors may appear in the form of single words or, as Newmark (ibid) puts it, “‘extended” (a collocation, an idiom, a sentence, a proverb, an allegory, a complete imaginative text)’.

We cannot cover the problems of metaphor translation in detail here, but will reproduce a few examples to illustrate the challenges involved. Abdul-Raof (2004: 103) shows how, because of non-correspondence between metaphors in different languages, both ‘equivalent effect’ and rhetorical texture are compromised in Qur’ān translation:

ولما سكت عن موسى الغضب...

Q7: 154 When Moses’ anger had subsided... (Irving 1985: 84)

Here the Arabic word I have underlined, meaning literally ‘to be silent’, is used metaphorically, but has been rendered by the translator Irving using the non-metaphorical word ‘subside’; likewise al-Hilali and Khan (2002: 186) have ‘calmed down’, while Ali (2003: 167) has ‘was appeased’. It seems surprising that none of these translators opted for ‘abated’, which surely would have a slightly better effect as a result of both alliteration and the power of natural collocation in English. As an example of successful matching of the ST and TT metaphors, thus achieving ‘effective rhetorical texture’, Abdul-Raof (2001: 121) cites the word بكت from Q44: 29:

فما بكت عليهم السماء والارض

which Ali translates as ‘And neither heaven nor earth shed a tear over them...’ Finally, Dickins *et al.* (2002: 158-160) exemplify the frequent need for ‘metaphor downtoning’ at times when Arabic ST metaphors ‘appear too strong or too dense for equivalent forms of English writing’. Part of a newspaper article by an Egyptian journalist contains an extended and complex metaphor:

كل حزب يقف إلى جانب الشعب يقف الشعب إلى جانبه يحيط به عندما تُوجّه إلى ظهره الخناجر وإلى صدره المدافع والسيوف

The suggested TT English translation (ibid: 159) severely reduces both the parallelism and the metaphorical elements of this ST: ‘Any party which supports and defends the people will find that it is supported and defended by the people’. Perhaps another version could be:

'...will find that, in time of trouble, it in turn is supported and defended by the people'. In any case, Dickins *et al.* (ibid) make the point that this kind of metaphorical downtoning 'reflects a general tendency for English to use less strongly emotive language than Arabic, particularly in texts which argue a strongly held belief'. Further instances of the 'metaphorical exuberance' often exhibited by Arabic texts, and the consequent need for downtoning in English TT's, are discussed in Dickens 2005 (256-264). In Chapter Five of this study we will see how Saddam Hussein uses extremely vivid, almost macabre animal metaphors in a speech shortly before the 2003 invasion of Iraq to suggest that his country is once again being preyed upon by evil forces that are enemies of civilization. There are images of ravens pecking out the bright eyes of Baghdad, of hissing snakes and of crocodiles from distant seas coming to join in the despoliation of Iraq. The density and extravagance of this kind of extended metaphor usage, in effect amounting to allegory, obviously poses a major translation problem.

**(xi) Proverbs:** These, like other idiomatic expressions in any language, can also be an interesting challenge to the translator. Often, however, they display a close similarity with proverbial expressions in another culture, and can be translated straightforwardly using some form of grammatical transposition, as with these examples in Abdul-Raof 2001: 42:

No pain, no gain

More haste, less speed

من جد وجد

في التآني السلامة وفي العجلة الندامة

One can say that there is a good degree of equivalence (of effect as well as of meaning) in both of these pairs because of the elements of rhyme and antithesis. A more problematic sort of proverb would be the colloquial one cited by Shunnaq (1993: 53):

أنا وخوي على ابن عمي وأنا و ابن عمي عالغريب

Lit. I and my brother against my cousin, and I and my cousin against the non-relative.

As Shunnaq explains, this proverb is deeply cultural (i.e. as opposed to expressing a more universal idea or experience), being to do with family cohesion and hierarchical loyalties

(in a certain setting, presumably), with ‘no equivalence in English’. A translator would have to use imagination and judgement according to the context in this case; perhaps ‘Blood is thicker than water’ or ‘Family comes first’ would be approximate renderings.

## ***2.5 Equivalence problems at the macro level***

We now move on to consider the main types of equivalence problem that arise at the level of sentences and longer stretches of text. These problems include (but are not limited to) the questions of punctuation, information flow, foregrounding and backgrounding, compensation, text genre, rhetorical content and markedness. We shall first look at a few examples of Arabic sentences of differing types and their published or suggested translations into English. Then, by way of an introduction to the very large and complex area of ‘textual equivalence’ (with its various components such as text type, discourse, cohesion and coherence, pragmatics, ideology, intertextuality etc.), we shall consider the translation of an Arabic editorial with fairly pronounced ‘cultural’ content in its message, together with other challenging features.

### ***2.5.1. Sentence level***

Anyone with a reading knowledge of Arabic is aware of certain major and obvious differences between orthographic sentences (that is, those separated by full stops unless initial) in Arabic and English, whether the Arabic text in question is Classical or Modern Arabic. What follows is an account of the major equivalence problems at the sentence level:

- (i) **Length:** A typical Arabic sentence is often much longer than its counterpart in English, and Dickins *et al.* (2002: 115-6) point out that Arabic sentences, unlike English ones, often do not correspond to a single spoken sentence. Consequently the translator into English frequently needs to make decisions about suitable sentence breaks in the TT.
- (ii) **Punctuation:** This represents a difference which is of course related to that of length. Traditionally lacking in Arabic, even nowadays it has conventions that are

‘far less standardized than those of English’ (ibid). Faiq (1995: 146-7) also refers to ‘the scarcity and inconsistency of punctuation in Arabic written texts’ which poses an acute problem when we are dealing with translation from Arabic into other languages, particularly English ‘where punctuation plays a vital role in the structure of information in texts’. We shall consider this issue of punctuation again in Chapter Three (3.2.5).

- (iii) **Conjunctions:** In Arabic, there are both intra- and inter-sentential conjunctions. As a result of the differences displayed by sentence length and punctuation above, and the basic incongruity they reveal between the stylistic structures of the two languages, it becomes rather artificial to consider individual sentences alone. Frequently the translator into English will be faced with a sizeable and altogether forbidding ‘chunk’ of Arabic text in which the ideas are linked by the common primary conjunctions **و** and **ف** or by secondary ones such as **حيث**, and will therefore have to decide not only where one sentence should end and another begin (in order to satisfy TT reader expectations), but also on suitable paragraph breaks.
- (iv) **Foregrounding and backgrounding:** Abdul-Raof (2006: 121-2) describes these as semantically-oriented syntactic processes used in Arabic for rhetorical effects, with ‘fundamental value to argumentative and legal discourses’, and thus they constitute a further issue that the translator will need to take into account. He goes on to exemplify eight pragmatic, ‘affirmation’ functions of the foregrounding of **المسند إليه** (loosely speaking, the ‘subject’ in English sentences) by using nominal rather than verb-initial word order, as in:

تدعي الحكومة أنها تحارب الفساد، وابن الرئيس يشتري البيوت في أوروبا

Here the function is to challenge a claim made by someone you are opposed to, and the above sentence is translated as: ‘The government claims that it is fighting against corruption while the President’s son has been buying houses in Europe’ (ibid. 147). Likewise, **المسند إليه** may be backgrounded to achieve certain pragmatic functions, for example specificity, as in:

للمدير القرار النهائي

The final decision is for the manager / The manager has the last word



Dickins *et al.* (ibid: 119-120) also show how in a typical English text it is the main clauses that convey the foregrounded information, or in other words the main storyline or argument, while subordinate clauses will carry the background information.

In contemporary Arabic, there are some text types which appear to have been produced according to English 'rules', and this is often because they have been written by Arabs with experience of living and operating in an English-speaking environment or because they are conceived as one part of a bilingual communication task. Let us consider this example from a bilingual leaflet and questionnaire put out by a private hospital in Sharjah, UAE (including only the first sentence of the Arabic version):

إن هدفنا الأول هو توفير أفضل الخدمات لضمان راحتكم وسلامتكم، ومع ذلك قد لا يتناسب بعض من أوجه خدماتنا مع تطلعاتكم.

It is our constant endeavour to provide the best possible facilities for your comfort and well-being. There may, however, be some facets of our service which do not meet with your expectations.

One problem here is that we do not know which version was conceived first, the Arabic or the English. However, what we can say is that the English version certainly meets normal reader expectations, breaking up the first of the Arabic sentences (all of which - in what follows - are in fact uncharacteristically 'short and to the point') into two sentences using '...however...' and maintaining the foregrounding of "It is our constant endeavour..." This does not represent much of a translation challenge. However, another bilingual letter or notice, this time from the Emirates Telecommunications Corporation ('Etisalat') and dated 20 August 2000, does suggest the need for - and indeed receives - some re-ordering of information in the English version of its opening paragraph:

...في إطار جهودنا المتواصلة للارتقاء بجودة خدماتنا للمشاركين، يسرنا أن نحيطكم علماً بأن "اتصالات" واعتباراً من شهر سبتمبر 2000 ستقوم بتطبيق نظام الفواترة الدورية في كافة أنحاء الدولة. ومن شأن هذه الخطوة تمكين موظفينا من تقديم خدمات عالية الجودة لعملائنا الكرام.

*We are pleased to inform you that Etisalat will, from September 2000, implement Cycle Billing throughout the UAE. The move will enable our staff to continue to provide you, our valued customer, with Superior Quality Customer Service (my italics).*

Here again English-speaking reader expectations are met through a crisp, businesslike translation that foregrounds the essential message and places it at the start of the first of the two sentences it uses. The translation also omits the redundant element in the references to higher quality customer services (which may be perfectly acceptable to and expected by the Arab readership) but – quite cleverly, we suggest – compensates by transferring the notion of *continuing / constant efforts to improve* to the second sentence.

It is, however, in the attempt to translate Arabic texts such as news reports, editorials and other genres, whether of the ‘evaluative’ or non-evaluative’ type, that we encounter the greatest difficulties. For these texts have not been constructed for the benefit of the English reader, and one paragraph of Arabic (which may or may not correspond to the English idea of a paragraph) may well consist of a single ‘sentence’ broken up by commas followed by various connectives. The **cohesion** will be of a different type, and reproducing it in English may turn out to be something of a challenge.

### 2.5.2 Text level

Introducing his practical guide for translation between Arabic and English across a range of text types, Hatim (1997: 12) maintains that with the more complex, ‘evaluative’ text types such as argumentation we may need to modify the traditional procedures that take the word and the phrase as the ‘unit of translation’:

In argumentation, we often find that we must opt for larger stretches of text than, say, the phrase and for freer modes of translation as a general strategy.

Since we are dealing here with a very large and complex area of equivalence that will be exemplified and analysed more closely in Chapter Five of our study, let us consider now the translation of an Arabic editorial which was certainly not written with English readers in mind (despite having an ‘official’ translation within a bilingual magazine) and which contains some challenging linguistic and cultural features. The editorial is from **الجمركي** (*Al-Jumruki*), the in-house magazine of the Customs Department, Emirate of Sharjah, UAE (1999) and is by Rāshid Al-Hājri:

## صفقات و صفعات

الصفقة و الصفعة كلمتان في اللغة تعنيان الضرب، ولكن شتان ما بين ضرب و آخر، فضرب الصفقة هو ضرب اليد على اليد في البيع، و ضرب الصفعة هو ضرب القفا او البدن بكف مبسوطة. ويحلو للبعض ان يحيل الصفقة الى صفعة فيتحول الامان والانتمان الى غدر وبهتان. هذا البعض الذي يفخر بانه (تاجر شاطر) وهو في الحقيقة بعيد كل البعد عن (الشطارة) يحاول ان يلبس الحق بالباطل او بالاحرى يلبس الباطل بالحق، فيربفي الخداع والمناورة، والمراوغة احياناً، فناً لا بد وان يجيد أداءه حتى يفوز بالصفقة فخوراً بانه وجه لعميله صفعة، وكان هذا العميل هو العدو الذي يجب عليه ان يوجه اليه الضربات أينما وجده. هذا النموذج من اصحاب (التجارة) يعيش بيننا واضعا اصبعيه في أدنيه كي لا يسمع نصيحة صديق او عظة واعظ او حكمة حكيم دون ان يعلم أن العدالة الالهية المحتومة سوف تأخذ مجراها وتتبدل عليه الاحوال فتتحول صفقاته الى صفعات يتلقاها ذات اليمين وذات الشمال، و مادام قد أبى الامتثال للنصائح وكلمات الوعظ والارشاد فعليه في غمرة انشغاله بصفقاته الصافعة ان يترقب يوماً قريباً تبيض فيه وجوه وتسود فيه وجوه، ووقتئذ لن تنفعه حسرات ولن تفيده عبرات. إن التجارة حرفة عظيمة، بل ولا أبالغ اذا قلت انها في مقدمة الحرف كلها، لأنها الحرفة التي اختارها رسولنا صلى الله عليه وسلم، وعلينا ان نستن بسنته صلى الله عليه وسلم وقد اعطى اروع الامثال في الامانة والشرف حتى ان ام المؤمنين خديجة رضی الله عنها اختارته زوجاً لها لما رأت منه صلى الله عليه وسلم من الامانة وحسن الخلق.

I have translated this piece (as part of a translation training course project in May 2000) as follows:

**DEALERS AND DODGERS**

We can strike a deal with someone, or we can deal them a blow. These two expressions, though perhaps both to be found on the same page of the dictionary, are properly taken to mean two quite distinct actions. The one suggests a friendly shaking of hands over a

business deal, while the other definitely smacks of aggression, with hands this time delivering blows to some or other part of the body.

There are those, however, who enjoy deliberately confusing the two ideas. So where there should be honour and trust we find instead that these have been turned into lies and deceit. It is these people who boast of being “shrewd businessmen” (a claim in reality about as far from the truth as it possibly could be) and who seek to dress up the truth as falsehood – or rather perhaps, the other way round. These artful dodgers of the business world see their *underhand methods*, and sometimes indeed their blatant lies, simply as a skill that they must hone and perfect in order to be able to close the deal and then go on to boast that they have in fact dealt their client a body blow – as though that client is an enemy to be struck down wherever he may be found!

Such “business” hitmen are here, living amongst us and turning a deaf ear to friendly advice, to the words of the wise and to moral and religious precepts. Blissfully unaware – for now – that there is justice from above that will inevitably take its course, they are going to find that one day the tables will be turned on them. Their “deals” will boomerang back on them, and when that happens they will certainly not know what hit them. So long as they fail to heed sound advice and warnings based on the principles of morality and religion they should expect that day to come – as come it will, and in the midst of their dirty dealings – when people will be exposed for what they are. Then it will be too late for regrets; weeping and gnashing of teeth will be of no avail.

Trade is a great and noble calling. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that it is the greatest of all callings or professions, since it was the one chosen by the Prophet. And why was it that Khadījah chose him for her husband, if not because of the integrity and good character that she observed in him? It is the principles and practices that he laid down that we must follow, and it is his shining example of honesty and trustworthiness in business dealing that we, in our turn, should seek to emulate.

---

At the macro, i.e. textual, level, the published, in-house English version of this editorial (which I have not reproduced) opts for an ‘overt’ translation strategy, but is more in the nature of a summary than a full translation. It attempts to provide an English equivalent of the word play that is a feature of the ST, but is not very successful in this because of the translator’s inadequate knowledge of the possibilities (and of how ‘strike’ and ‘stricken’ are actually used in English). On a purely mechanical level, it is mostly competent and readable. However, the treatment of the concluding part of the original ST – that is, the overtly Islamic element – abbreviates and slightly tones down the ST, but also manages to make an unacceptably weak and abrupt ending to the TT.

I found this a challenging text, and the following comments are intended to show something of how I approached the various equivalence and translatability problems that it throws up and tried to deal with them, hoping to improve on the published version: they are as much about the *process* as about the *end-product*.

After reading and re-reading the ST carefully I realised that it was quite clearly a text directed at addressees belonging to the source culture, and that an ‘overt’ type of translation aiming broadly at ‘dynamic equivalence’ was called for. I also observed that there were two tricky elements to contend with in the ST, namely that of word play and then the (specifically Islamic) religious and moral element. I decided I needed to reproduce the former in as intelligent and natural a way as possible, and to try to tone down the latter (for the sake of my hypothetical target readership) while still preserving the moralistic sentiment of the text as a whole. There was also the question of presentation: how many paragraphs to use for the TT? I decided that four would be right (the shorter published version used three).

The next challenge was to come up with a suitably snappy title that would reflect and do justice to the rather clever one used in the original Arabic. I settled upon ‘*Dealers and Dodgers*’ (which seemed slightly better than ‘*Dodgy Dealers*’) as this, I felt, would convey the same general ideas with perhaps the same sort of connotations as the Arabic. Later, in the course of the translation itself, I deliberately wove in an intertextual allusion to

Dickens' character (in *Oliver Twist*) with the words '*These artful dodgers of the business world...*'

After considering my strategy for producing a translation of this fairly challenging text that would seem reasonably natural, I decided that three things were important. These were: 1) to provide a sufficiently strong and interesting opening that would somehow mirror the word play in the ST; 2) to pay attention to using appropriate diction and maintaining lexical cohesion; and 3) to tone down the religious element at the end, but at the same time to have a strong ending, such as a TT readership would normally expect to find at the conclusion of a moralizing editorial.

My solution to the problem of the word play was to use the expressions '*strike a deal*' and '*deal a blow*' (plus the extra little bit of word play contained in '*...smacks of aggression*') in order to set the scene in a fairly free opening paragraph. I then sought to maintain the images created with my subsequent choice of lexicon (e.g. '*struck down*' in para. 2, '*business hitmen*', '*boomerang back*'... and '*will certainly not know what hit them*' in para. 3).

The conclusion presented a challenge in that I felt I needed to: 1) tone down the Islamic element somewhat; and 2) re-order the ideas expressed in the ST so as to end on a clear and positive, if rather 'sermonizing' note. For these reasons I decided to bring forward the reference to the Prophet's wife Khadijah (turning it into a question for greater rhetorical effect) and then to employ the technique of the cleft sentence so as to give markedness to the final sentence: '*It is the principles and practice...*', '*...it is his shining example...*'

Clearly there are some elements of 'manipulation' present in my translation of this text, and this is an aspect of translation processes that we will be considering later in Chapters Four and Five.

## **2.6 Conclusion**

This chapter has presented a survey of the main ideas regarding translation equivalence and has attempted to examine and exemplify their application in the case of Arabic and English. There are several conclusions that we can draw from it:

- (i) the term ‘equivalence’ is an unfortunate and unsatisfactory one in that it is essentially a mathematical and scientific one (as any quick online search will indicate) and suggests a straightforward reversibility, or identity, between two items that cannot in the main be applied to languages and cultures; yet it appears to be one of those terms that, for practical purposes, we have come to be ‘stuck’ with (as with the term ‘the West’ in political and economic parlance), and the notion behind the word – with all its possible scholarly subdivisions - remains an important consideration in the mind of the conscientious translator, who will normally seek to achieve it *as far as possible* at both ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ levels, and with due regard for the linguistic and cultural expectations and conditioning of the target readership in the forms that we will be examining in subsequent chapters;
- (ii) there exist many points of contrast between Arabic and English, and the translator needs not only sound linguistic and cultural knowledge but also resourcefulness and a spirit of adventure when tackling certain text types;
- (iii) cultural ‘non-equivalence’ extends beyond matters of material culture, physical environment and religion and into such areas as emotiveness, rhetoric, textual norms and intertextual features;
- (iv) translators working between such an incongruent pair of languages need to develop good strategic skills (enabling them to view a source text through the eyes and mind of their intended target readership) and the translation decision-making skills that enable them to use grammatical / cultural transposition and compensation techniques to good effect;
- (v) translating across cultural barriers will always be a challenging undertaking, but those who seek to translate in either direction between these two languages, while being aware of both the ‘possible’ and ‘impossible’ elements of their task, should always face that challenge in a spirit of optimism.

In the next chapter, we pursue our exploration of this general concept of equivalence and translatability by examining **textual norms**, the idea of **textuality**, the various manifestations of **intertextuality** and the challenges that all of these present to translators.



## CHAPTER THREE

### TEXT, INTERTEXT AND THE TRANSLATOR

#### 3.1 *Introduction*

In Chapter One we surveyed the main stages by which thinking about the nature and purposes of translation, and about the scope of its concerns, evolved into the modern 'interdiscipline' of translation studies. We also saw how translation from and into Arabic has become established as an object of attention and research, generating a considerable literature in the form of books, articles and conference papers. Then in Chapter Two we considered the established but also much-debated notion of equivalence in translation and went on to exemplify the linguistic and cultural problems encountered in the quest to achieve adequate equivalence between Arabic and English. After a preliminary discussion of the special challenges faced when seeking such equivalence beyond the micro level of translation, we concluded *inter alia* that linguistic and cultural non-equivalence should be seen as a phenomenon arising most importantly in the domains of rhetoric, emotiveness and textual norms. The aim of this chapter is to delve further into the textual areas of equivalence and translatability, and thus to provide part of the necessary bridge between the foundation laid so far and the core of our study to be addressed in Chapter Five. It will therefore continue to set out the theoretical basis, the methodology and the key conceptual tools to be used as our framework of reference in the main textual analysis, assessment of translation problems and suggestions for improved translator training that will be presented in the final chapter. This will involve discussing a number of important and relevant textual and stylistic issues in both languages in the pair under discussion, and especially examining the phenomenon of intertextuality in various types of text and how this affects the task of translators. Our study will then be continued in Chapter Four as we go on to examine the concept and the role of ideology in language generally (including as a 'carrier' of intertextuality) and as it affects the processes of translation.

### 3.2 *Text, textuality and reader expectations*

Our first concern is the nature of ‘text’ itself and of normal reader expectations in both Arabic and English. What constitutes a text and makes it recognizable and acceptable as such to readers or listeners?

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 1), the term is used in linguistics ‘to refer to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole’ – rather than being ‘just a collection of unrelated sentences’. Furthermore, a text is ‘best regarded as a semantic unit: a unit not of form but of meaning’ (ibid: 2). These notions can apply both to ‘minimal’ texts, or micro-texts, believed to make sense to readers or listeners (‘Push’, ‘No parking’, ‘Mind the gap’, ‘Shame of Leeds 999 hoaxer’, etc.) and to macro-texts - much longer and more demanding instances of language encountered in daily life as well as in literature (contracts, newspaper articles, political speeches and manifestoes, scriptures such as the Bible and the Qur’an, Shakespeare plays, James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, etc.). As regards the length of texts, Halliday and Hasan (ibid: 294) stress that a text is ‘not tied to the sentence as its lower limit’, neither does it have any upper limit. David Crystal (2003a: 461-462) informs us that, as a phenomenon with central theoretical status in textlinguistics, texts ‘are seen as language units which have a definable communicative function, characterized by such principles as cohesion, coherence and informativeness, which can be used to provide a formal definition of what constitutes their identifying textuality or texture’. Baker (1992: 111), following Halliday and Hasan (ibid: 1), makes the important point that text is ‘an instance of language in use rather than language as an abstract system of meanings and relations’. In other words, it has a real-life communicative purpose, whether at a simple or a complex level, and should therefore make sense to readers or listeners. It cannot be, as Abdul-Raof (2001a: 59) notes, ‘just a random collection of sentences, neither can the sentences be just a random collection of lexical items’:

The text should be a unified whole whose units – words and sentences - are connected together in a cohesive manner through cohesive devices that make the text hang together and create its unique texture and total unity (ibid).

Let us consider as examples of this two extracts from academic writing, the first in English and the second in Arabic:

1) The Near East is a term which serves the historian well until the end of the First World War. Coined in the late nineteenth century it was employed as a convenient shorthand for the Ottoman Empire and its successor states. The Near East was therefore the region west of the Iranian frontier and could be distinguished from the Far East, composed of China and Japan, and the Middle East, comprising the area which intervened between the Near and the Far East. After the First World War the Near East became gradually engulfed in the Middle East as the latter term began to be used to include the Arab states which emerged from the Ottoman Empire (Yapp 1991: 1).

2) غُنيت هذه الدراسة باستجلاء ثلاث مشكلات تتصلّ باللغة العربية في عصر العولمة الثقافية، المشكلة الأولى هي الكشف عن التحدي الذي يواجه العربية في ظلّ الظروف الجديدة، وأما الثانية؛ فهي بيان الدور الذي تؤديه العربية في الحفاظ على الهوية الثقافية للأمة، وأما الثالثة؛ فهي إثبات أنّ العربية قادرة على أن تكون أداة فعالة في مجال التقنية الحديثة بما في ذلك شبكة المعلومات العالمية (الانترنت) ، مع بيان أهمية تعريب المعلوماتية في نشر اللغة العربية والاسلام، وفي الحفاظ على الهوية الثقافية.

(Bettaher 2001: 7)

One thing we notice about these two passages is that whereas the English one consists of four sentences that are not especially long, the Arabic one is all one sentence (albeit relieved by the conventional 'western' use of commas and semicolons). In both of them 'cohesive devices' typical of the languages in question are employed so as to provide continuity of sense, and at the same time 'texture' is achieved through lexical and other stylistic choices so as to convey a message effectively.

For Hatim (1997b: 12), text is 'the ultimate unit of effective communication'. The term 'text' is, however, nowadays often assigned a much broader meaning than the traditional linguistic and/or pedagogic ones described above. Daniel Chandler (2007: 2-3), explaining how the multi-disciplinary study of **semiotics** 'is concerned with meaning-making and representation in many forms', offers a rather different definition of text as a message (which may have both verbal and non-verbal elements) existing in a recorded form such as writing or audio- / video-recording and thus 'physically independent of its sender or receiver'. It is 'an assemblage of signs (such as words, images, sounds and/or gestures) constructed (and interpreted) with reference to the conventions associated with a genre and in a particular medium of communication'.

### 3.2.1 *Cohesion and coherence*

We have encountered in the above discussion the term **'texture'** and will be explaining it in more detail a little later (in 3.2.3). Before that we need to be clear about the distinction between **cohesion** and **coherence**, the first two of Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) now well-established **'standards of textuality'** (see 3.2.3), and ones which supremely contribute to the achievement of **texture**.

These two essential attributes of a text (that is, a text of any reasonable length) are in fact an outcome of the fact that the Latin origin of the word ('textus') suggests the act of weaving words together to form a stylistic and semantic artefact that is complete in itself, has a particular useful purpose and exhibits varying degrees of skill and patterning in its design and manufacture. The word is, in fact, cognate with 'textile'. Just as a garment consists usually of different parts serving the same overall purpose, has more or less obvious patterns and furthermore has a characteristic 'feel' and 'look' to it, so also a text (written or spoken) is expected to meet the expectations of its receivers as to form, delivery of message and also membership of a certain genre or 'text type'.

Above all, though, a text is expected to 'hang together'. This is where cohesion and coherence come in. In their groundbreaking and extensive study and analysis of cohesion as it is realized in English, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4) state at the outset that the concept of cohesion is a semantic one, referring to 'relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text'. Like all components of the semantic system, they go on to say (ibid: 6), 'it is realized through the lexico-grammatical system': in other words, certain forms of cohesion are realized through the grammar of a language (for example, reference, substitution and ellipsis), while others use vocabulary, with the use of conjunctions standing on the borderline of the two. In the portion of academic text in English which we used above in 3.2, we can see that, amongst other devices, the use of 'therefore' in the second sentence and the repetition of 'term' in the fourth contribute to the cohesion of the passage.

As for cohesion (التماسك النصي) in Arabic, Abdul-Raof (2001a: 59-83) has provided an analytical and fully-exemplified account of the same cohesive devices as used by this language. Again, if we look back to the Arabic academic text that we cited in 3.2 above, we can see certain cohesive devices being used. There is 'endophoric reference' (الإشارة) (ضمن النص), for example, in ... المشكلة الأولى هي ... , and nominal ellipsis (الحذف الاسمي) in ... وأما الثانية...

Cohesive devices on the surface are not, however, sufficient to make a text satisfactory in the sense of showing meaning and meeting expectations. As Crystal (1987: 119) explains:

A text plainly has to be *coherent* as well as cohesive, in that the concepts and relationships expressed should be relevant to each other, thus enabling us to make plausible inferences about the underlying meaning.

Many other scholars have offered definitions of these two aspects of the discourse level of language which have added to our understanding of the distinction between them. For example, Baker (1992: 218) explains that they are both devices for making connections: but that whereas through cohesion 'stretches of language are connected to each other by virtue of lexical and grammatical dependencies', through coherence 'they are connected by virtue of conceptual or meaning dependencies as perceived by language users'. Thus the former may be apprehended or even measured objectively, while the latter is a much more subjective affair. For Dickins *et al.* (2002: 128) the contrast lies essentially in the presence or absence of explicit markers. Cohesion is 'the transparent linking of sentences (and larger sections of text) by explicit discourse connectives like "then", "so", "however", and so on'. Coherence, however, is something quite different:

Coherence is a more difficult matter than cohesion, because, by definition, it is *not explicitly marked* in a text: it is a *tacit, but discernible, thematic or emotional development* running through the text (ibid: my italics).

It also involves, according to Fawcett (1997: 98), 'knowledge of such things as subject matter and how the world works'. Consequently:

A good text producer will make sure there is a network of meaning relations both within the text and between the text and the real world to act as the Ariadne's thread for the reader (ibid).

If we refer once again to our academic texts in 3.2 above, we can observe that the English text exhibits coherence largely through its steady development of the concept of

the 'Near East' as a term used by historians, with its relationship to the terms 'Middle East' and 'Far East'; while the Arabic one does so through its development of the theme of problems or challenges relating to the Arabic language, the suggested incongruence between *عصر العولمة الثقافية* and *الهوية الثقافية للأمة*, the concrete reference to a well-known external reality (the internet) and indeed though the undoubted emotional appeal to an anticipated readership of such expressions as *اللغة العربية* and *الحفاظ على الهوية الثقافية للأمة*.

Many languages use much the same battery of cohesive devices to ensure the surface cohesion of a text, namely reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, lexical cohesion and thematic structure (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 298-338; Abdul-Raof 2001a: 59-85). Later in this chapter, in our discussion of intertextuality, and then in Chapter Four, where we consider the role of ideology, we will be examining some of the main features that make for the coherence of macro-texts - a problematic area given that this, as Baker puts it, 'is a result of the interaction between knowledge presented in the text and the reader's own knowledge and experience of the world, the latter being influenced by a variety of factors such as age, sex, race, nationality, education, occupation, and political and religious affiliations' (1992: 219).

### 3.2.2 *Text, non-text and text type*

Since texts are expected to hang together and make sense, it follows that the absence of cohesion and coherence (or at least the latter) can produce the phenomenon of 'non-text'. Let us consider this example:

The Pennines have been called the backbone of England. By Wednesday we expect heavy snowfall over the northern Pennines, while milder conditions will persist further south. Some people who live in the south don't know much about the north. In Yorkshire they say that someone from Lancashire was born 'the wrong side of the Pennines'.

Here there appears to be some semblance of lexical cohesion, suggesting that we are reading or hearing a text about the Pennines as a geographical feature of northern England. However, there is no coherence, no unity of theme or purpose, and no expectations are satisfied because of the apparently inconsequential mixing of genres (from geography text to weather forecast to folklore). In the case of Arabic, Shehdeh Fareh notes that problems can arise for translators from Arabic into English because some writers frequently misuse sentence connectors, which as part of discourse 'play a

vital role in creating cohesion and coherence' (Fareh 2006: 110), and he provides an example of what he calls (following Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 84) a 'nonsensical text' since it fails to maintain continuity of sense:

وهذا الإسهام يمثل أولاً وقبل كل شيء فهماً أصيلاً للقيم العزيزة الواردة في تراثنا وتقاليدنا العريقة. لأنه سبحانه وتعالى طلب من الإنسان أن ينظر ويتفكر ويتعلم لكي يصل إلى أسباب العافية ووسائل الشفاء.

(This contribution, first of all and before anything else, represents a sound understanding of the dear values in our heritage and old traditions. Because, He May be glorified, urged man to look, think, and learn in order to arrive at the causes of good health and means of recovery.) (ibid).

As Fareh explains, the problem here is that the topic introduced in the first sentence (the 'contribution') sets up the need for an explanation of how this contribution represents the said values. However, the second sentence begins with the connector لأن (= 'because') which signals an apparently causal connection between the two sentences rather than having an explanatory function. The coherence of the text therefore becomes distorted, and the literal translation into English then adds to the loss of meaning.

There is, then, a general expectation that any text – written or spoken – should make sense, be comprehensible and serve some useful function. In any language, we normally want such an expectation to be fulfilled straightforwardly; in some situations, though, we may be prepared to make concessions. Nida and Taber (2003: 7), in describing their 'new concept' of translating the Bible, refer to the tendency by many people not to expect to understand such a sacred text (or, at least, a particular translation of it), apparently in the belief that it was not written to be clearly understood. Likewise, in the case of secular literature in English, text receivers have become used (perhaps especially over the past century) to having their normal expectations strained, manipulated and even sometimes defied for artistic reasons by experimental poets, novelists and dramatists. The same can be said of the world of advertising. All this should, however, be seen alongside the fact that the vast majority of what is read in English belongs to much more predictable text types, for example in public notices, newspapers and magazines and a range of transactional, expository material. Different text types or genres (along with their expected registers) have become well established in English, with the result that reader expectations have also become well established – probably more so than in the Arab world at present. Examples of genres in the literary field are, of course, poetry, drama and prose fiction (with such sub-genres as the sonnet, the limerick, the stage comedy, the novel, the short story), while in everyday life we see

such argumentative genres as editorials, letters and opinion features in newspapers, and news programmes, documentaries, quiz or talent shows and the like on television.

The meaning and nature of the term ‘text’ is, however, less settled nowadays. Traditionally the term has often been applied to a book, a play, a speech or sermon, etc, and has not been thought of as including visual material. But, as Ira Torresi, arguing the case for full intersemiotic translation of advertising material, points out, ‘No text can be said to be exclusively verbal. Moreover, new text genres are emerging that rely on a high level of multimodality’ (Torresi 2008: 71). In fact, most modern text forms are hybrid in nature; however, the integration of both written texts (not only in a single language) and visual material to convey a message is by no means a modern phenomenon. In Chapter One (1.2) we cited the example of the trilingual rock inscription at Behistun in Iran. We may also note that in the case of two relatively new, but also established, text types – the email and the text message – users tend to employ a casual, spoken style of communication and have therefore (in order to aid the delivery and interpretation of messages as intended) developed a number of devices often needed to compensate for the lack of various non-verbal and paralinguistic features that would accompany actual speech. These include ‘emoticons’ and the use of capital letters (Gregoriou 2009: 138).

### **3.2.3 *Textuality, texture, and text structure***

In addition to the core qualities of cohesion and coherence as described in 3.2.1 above, a text is also expected to embody certain other features in order to qualify as a fully functional text and thus to exhibit **textuality**. The well-known and influential ‘seven standards of textuality’ were proposed and elaborated by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), and after **cohesion** and **coherence**, which we have discussed above in 3.2.1, include: **intentionality** (having a specific communicative goal or purpose), **acceptability** (having some use or relevance for the receiver), **informativity** (having, or not having, new or unexpected information), **situationality** (having relevance to a ‘situation of occurrence’) and finally **intertextuality** (having an interdependent connection with one or more previously encountered texts). Satisfaction of all these criteria is, according to Beaugrande and Dressler, what makes a text a genuine ‘communicative occurrence’ (ibid: 3-12). Henry Widdowson, however, is not happy



with their use of the term ‘occurrence’. He argues (Widdowson 1984: 125) that the dynamism of any text – and indeed its actual ‘meaning’ - is not something immanent, but rather needs to be activated by human agency: ‘It does not itself communicate but provides the means whereby communication can be achieved’. He notes that Beaugrande and Dressler themselves point out that the last five of their seven standards or conditions of textual communication ‘are user centred and have to do not with the text itself but with its use in interaction’. He goes on:

Texts, I would suggest then, do not communicate: people communicate by using texts as a device for mediating a discourse process. It is this process which is the communicative occurrence. Texts as such are simply a static configuration of linguistic signs which have to be interpreted in a particular way if they are to serve their mediating purpose (ibid).

These seven standards or criteria will all be held in mind and applied in Chapter Five as we study and analyze certain Arabic texts; and the last one – **intertextuality** – will be examined more closely in the next section of this chapter.

Another important concept that needs to be introduced at this point is that of **texture**. The word naturally makes us think of carpets, rugs, items of clothing, etc, since it refers to the inner composition – and therefore the exterior ‘feel’ – of any fabric. In linguistics it refers to the variety of devices that not only make a given text cohesive and coherent, but also distinguish it and help it to achieve its rhetorical purpose through the use of idiom and diction, **theme – rheme** (that is, information flow) **organization**, **marked** and **unmarked** structures, the use of **anaphoric/cataphoric reference** and other such stylistic choices. Halliday and Hasan (ibid: 324) state that ‘in the most general terms’ the creation of texture involves two other components in addition to the cohesive relations that we have described earlier:

One is the textual structure that is internal to the sentence: the organization of the sentence and its parts in a way which relates it to its environment. The other is the ‘macrostructure’ of the text, that establishes it as a text of a particular kind – conversation, narrative, lyric, commercial correspondence and so on.

At this point we should pause to explain certain of the features that we mentioned above. The first that requires our attention is that of information flow, involving the notions of theme and rheme. This is a very large area of linguistic investigation and debate, with a divergence between the Hallidayan approach and that of the Prague School linguists (notably Jan Firbas), with their concept of Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP). The details are beyond the scope of our brief overview, but it is

worth mentioning Baker's (1992: 140-141) comment on the Hallidayan model, that it has the disadvantage of not taking into account typically VSO languages such as Arabic. FSP is a theoretical framework for analyzing utterances in terms of the information they contain and the semantic contribution they make to a whole text, and the concepts of theme and rheme form part of the general notion of 'communicative dynamism' (Crystal 2003a: 193). The theme is, accordingly, 'the part of a sentence which adds least to the advancing process of communication', in contrast to the rheme, which 'carries the highest degree of communicative dynamism' (ibid: 463). A simple example of this can be seen in our English academic text in 3.2 above, in which the words 'The Near East' at the start of the second sentence constitute the theme, with the remainder of that sentence constituting the rheme. Abdul-Raof (2001a: 83-85) describes the elements of 'thematic structure' in Arabic, in which the theme (المُحَدَّث عنه) may be marked or unmarked. In a typical and normal sentence with a transitive or intransitive verb being used initially, the theme is unmarked, as at the beginning of our Arabic academic text above; whereas a theme may be marked when it consists, for example, of a sentence-initial noun phrase, as at the beginning of the next paragraph of the same Arabic text: إن علاقة اللغة العربية بالحضارة العربية الإسلامية هي...

As for anaphora and cataphora, these are referential devices for achieving **co-reference** between items within the same sentence or in adjacent sentences. Co-reference links elements of a **co-text** (see 3.2.4 below) and thus provides 'structural and semantic continuity' (Wales 2001: 86). **Anaphora** refers backwards to someone or something already mentioned. For example, in our English academic text in 3.2 above, the pronoun 'it' early in the second sentence refers back to the term 'Near East' in the first sentence, while 'its' a little later refers to the much closer 'Ottoman Empire'. In our Arabic text, likewise, the words in the co-text ...وأما الثانية...، وأما الثالثة... refer back to the ثلاث near the beginning. **Cataphora**, by contrast, refers forward, to an item not yet specified, and can thus be manipulated to delay the imparting of information and thereby arouse interest and/or create an element of suspense. Hatim (1997b: 89) notes the difference, from a contrastive linguistics point of view, between languages that are inherently more 'explicative' [such as Arabic] and those that are more 'implicative' and capable of being more opaque in their texture [such as English]. Cataphora is not a normal and recommended stylistic choice in Arabic (Hatim ibid: 98; Abdul-Raof 2001a:

64), but is becoming more common particularly in journalistic prose, no doubt under the influence of English structures. The following example is the beginning of a new paragraph within a news report in the newspaper *Al-Quds Al-'Arabi* (25 November 2009, p.2), in which almost all the other paragraphs begin in the expected manner with a verb:

بدوره، شدد وزير الشؤون الإسلامية والأوقاف والدعوة والإرشاد الشيخ...

In English, the device is very commonly employed in journalism, to the extent that it is now a clichéd form which causes little surprise. However, the distance separating the pro-form from its co-referring item may vary considerably. In common, everyday examples such as 'In **his** statement to the Commons this afternoon, **the Prime Minister** stressed...' and '**Here** is a reminder of **the headlines**...' the distance is minimal, but in the following example (from a leader in *The Guardian* newspaper of 3 March 2009, p.30) it is much longer (though not unusually so in the context of journalistic reporting and comment):

It is the runt of the months, the most dismal and dreary, deservedly shorn of its full length because its days are so prone to be unremittingly grim. Doctors associate **February** with depression, statisticians fail to find anything superlative about it [my emphasis here and in the examples above].

The above examples give some indication of how a number of devices are used to create the compositional plan, or structure, of any text, and to meet - or sometimes to manipulate - the expectations of readers or listeners. For Katie Wales (2001: 391), it is these stylistic choices that distinguish one particular text from another; and she points out that the difference between textuality and texture is therefore that 'whereas textuality is a characteristic property of all texts, texture is a property of individual texts.'

#### 3.2.4 *Context and co-text*

**Context** and **co-text** are additional terms that need to be introduced at this point. The former has been used widely over several decades in linguistics and literary criticism, and has acquired a number of modifiers which have now come to be subsumed in the expression 'context of situation' (Wales 2001: 81-82). This refers to the extra-textual environment which gives rise to any spoken or written text, and is therefore of course an indispensable element of language acquisition and teaching. From the standpoint of text linguistics, Hatim (1997: 176-7) further refines this concept by distinguishing three

domains or 'dimensions' within it: 1) the communicative domain (including such aspects as register membership); 2) the pragmatic domain (covering the intentionality of the text); and 3) the semiotic domain which accounts for intertextual features. The term co-text, by contrast, is used to refer to the immediate verbal or linguistic context of any item within a text, and in the case of speech can mean sounds as well as words or phrases. As Wales (ibid: 88) points out, co-text is linguistically significant in that 'the co-text of an item helps to determine its form and meaning'. Thus, subjects are followed by appropriate verb forms, cohesive devices such as anaphoric and cataphoric reference link different elements in the text (as exemplified in 3.2.3 above), ellipsis can be readily understood and, not least, the particular meaning of a lexical item becomes clear (often through collocation).

### ***3.2.5 Punctuation and sentence length***

We mentioned briefly towards the end of Chapter Two (2.5.1) the fundamental difference between English and Arabic in the **length of sentences** and the **role of punctuation**, and before we conclude this discussion of the nature of text and of reader expectations it is worth noting some additional points and illustrating them from both languages. First, punctuation in written English is often a vitally important component of overall meaning, though frequently idiosyncratic or merely sloppy (for example, with facts or ideas connected only by commas). Halliday and Hasan (1976: 325) observe that, in written English,

punctuation can be used to show information structure, although it cannot express it fully, and most punctuation practice is a kind of compromise between information structure (punctuating according to the intonation) and sentence structure (punctuating according to the grammar).

Crystal (2003b: 278) distinguishes four important functions of punctuation in the modern English writing system. The primary one is to facilitate coherent reading by displaying **grammatical structure**; then, there is often the need to indicate **prosodic features**, enabling the text to be read out loud; and finally, punctuation may serve to show the **rhetorical structure** of a complex sentence (for example, by the use of colons or semi-colons) or to add a **semantic nuance** by such devices as quotation marks, italics or capital letters. Thus, readers of English still expect a text of any length to contain punctuation; instances in which punctuation can be legitimately omitted - though often still causing surprise or amusement - are wills (the omission being justified by lawyers

for their own reasons), short road signs such as SLOW CHILDREN CROSSING and certain now established and accepted literary forms such as the type of interior monologue that concludes James Joyce's *Ulysses*, or some poems by e. e. cummings.

In Arabic, as we have seen, the situation is different. Holes (2004: 251) explains how a good deal of modern standard Arabic writing still manages to do without 'the European division of written texts into self-contained meaning groups ("sentences") that are divisible into constituents ("phrases" and "clauses"), marked off by the devices of punctuation': even today, there is no real standardization of punctuation, which in literary writing especially 'can be highly variable and idiosyncratic'. Nonetheless:

This does not in fact matter: whether punctuation is used or not, it functions alongside the native system of textual chunking, which relies on coordinating and subordinating conjunctions that perform the dual role of signalling formally the beginnings and endings of sense groups and indicating the nature of the logical or functional relationships between them (ibid).

Hatim (1997: 125) reminds us of the 'intrinsic "orality/aurality" of Arabic', in contrast to the more 'visual' nature of English or European texts with their battery of punctuation marks, quotation marks, upper and lower cases, italics etc. He goes on to make the point that, despite the efforts of 'those intent on imposing a Europeanized system of punctuation on [Arabic]', well-formed examples of Arabic text do not in fact require punctuation marks to achieve cohesion and other 'standards of textuality':

In the final analysis, the test of a cohesive text in Arabic is that it should display continuity of sense (coherence) when heard as well as when seen (ibid: 136).

Hasan Ghazala, however, appears to take a different view, specifically from the perspective of translation problems (Ghazala 2004: 230-245). Punctuation marks in English, he states (ibid: 230), 'are used to achieve organisation, clarity, ease of reading and of comprehension, and to avoid possible ambiguity of structure and meaning'; while in Arabic, he argues, they are often ignored, and punctuation itself 'is considered as an ornamentation, neither more nor less, and is therefore disregarded, sometimes completely'. There are two comments on Ghazala's strictures thus far that we can make from our own observation: the first is that in contemporary written English punctuation is often not used as competently as his remarks would suggest, and can indeed often lead to bad structure and even ambiguity; the second is that most modern Arabic prose – whether academic as in the case of the text by Bettaher 2001 cited in 3.2 above, or rhetorical as in the case of the material we shall be examining in Chapter Five – does at least employ commas. In any case, Ghazala goes on to provide an example of

'marginalized' punctuation in Arabic appearing in a book about Arabic traditional poetry. The book reproduces the following paragraph (containing one single full stop in the middle) taken from al-Jurjānī's أسرار البلاغة (*Mysteries of Rhetoric*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1983:33):

"وأما الحالة الأخرى التي قلنا إن الاسم فيها يكون استعارة من غير خلاف فهي حالة إذا وقع الاسم فيها لم يكن الاسم مجتلباً لإثبات معناه للشيء ولا الكلام موضوعاً لذلك لأن هذا حكم لا يكون إلا إذا كان الاسم في منزلة الخبر من المبتدأ. فإما إذا لم يكن كذلك وكان مبتدأ بنفسه أو فاعلاً أو مفعولاً أو مضافاً إليه فانت واضع كلامك لإثبات أمر آخر غير ما هو معنى الاسم"

("The other case in which the name can unarguably be a metaphor is when it does not serve to affirm the meaning of something and nor is that the speaker's intent which can only be so if the noun is functioning as the predicate/comment of a subject/topic in a nominal clause. If it is not so and instead it is the subject/topic itself of a nominal clause or the subject or object of a verb or the governed noun in a genitive construction then what you are saying is intended to affirm something other than the meaning of the noun") (ibid: 231)

Ghazala suggests that 'regardless of the translation of this paragraph into English' it would be more readily understandable – and free of any possible ambiguity or confusion - in both Arabic and English versions if a certain number of commas were inserted into the text and a full stop added at the end (ibid: 231-232).

In modern Arabic readers are well accustomed to fairly lengthy paragraphs or other stretches of text (for example, journalistic and academic) in which facts or ideas are expounded using just a series of commas and a full stop at the end. Within the body of a legal document such as a Power of Attorney (توكيل), there will usually be no punctuation; the cohesion will rather be maintained by the use of the coordinating conjunction و (in most such cases translatable as 'and'). In contemporary English, however, most readers do not expect to have to make sense of lengthy stretches of text. In books no less than in newspapers and magazines, a variety of devices such as headings, subheadings and illustrations provides visual relief as well as signposting. Sentences are generally (that is, in texts other than those of the literary, legal or 'serious academic' variety) expected to be short, clear and even 'snappy'. Let us consider this beginning of a BBC News item (in fact a commentary by the BBC's World Affairs Editor John Simpson) published on the Internet on 23 December 2005, some two months after the trial of the deposed Iraqi dictator had begun

[[http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/45562](http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/45562) – retrieved 17 January 2006]:

#### **Saddam's trial is not a farce**

**It was never going to be easy to put a man as imperious and wily as Saddam Hussein on trial.**

The chief judge has been remarkably lenient to Saddam and his half-brother, Barzan al-Tikriti, and they have taken advantage of this.

But does this mean, as some people in the Western media are starting to say, that the trial is descending into farce?

Simply because Saddam Hussein's trial is different from the court practices of, say, Britain or France, that does not make it farcical...

Simpson's argument is clear and well-constructed, continuing in the same vein with short 'paragraphs' that consist mostly of one or two sentences – very much in the manner of a tabloid newspaper editorial, though with a higher level of language and argument. The opening sentence is given in bold, and then the whole piece is divided into three parts, with the words 'Leniency' and 'Sign of success' serving somewhat arbitrarily as subheadings following the opening. This style of writing is an increasingly common one, presumably intended to make life easier for readers by 'exploding' what would have been conventional paragraphs into their component 'topic' and 'supporting' sentences.

This completes our introduction to the notion of text and the characteristics that are believed to define it, together with the normal expectations and conditioning of text receivers in our contrasting pair of languages. We now need to move on to an examination of certain deeper and all-encompassing features of text – especially of what we have called macro-texts - that are of special importance for our study.

### **3.3 Intertextuality: 'a world of others' words'**

The last of Beaugrande and Dressler's 'standards of textuality' is the phenomenon that has become in recent decades a familiar (if often confusing) topic of interest especially to literary critics and text linguists: **intertextuality** (in Arabic **التناصن**). For Neubert and Shreve (1992: 117) it 'may be the most important aspect of textuality for the translator'. Although this term was first coined in French and introduced to the world of

poststructuralist literary theory by Julia Kristeva in the late 1960's, what it expresses is in fact something with which all writers and speakers, readers and listeners – all 'producers and consumers' of language – are aware of and implicated in, albeit perhaps at differing levels of consciousness. Intertextuality is indeed all around us, not only in works of literature but also in ephemeral forms of writing such as newspaper articles and editorials and, as Wales (2001: 221) points out, in diverse forms of non-literary discourse such as advertising and of non-verbal media such as film, music, painting and photography. The legend on the side of a supermarket lorry "You shop, we drop" can be said to be intertextual, being a clever reworking of the well-known expression "Shop until you drop". Anyone who watches Alfred Hitchcock's film version of *The Thirty-Nine Steps* and then the more recent American film *The Fugitive* should pick up at least some of the borrowings that the latter film has undoubtedly taken from the former, perhaps as a way of paying tribute to it. The music of Brahms has echoes of Beethoven, while Picasso's 1937 'Weeping Woman' recalls the familiar image of the tearful Virgin Mary, the *Mater Dolorosa* of so much earlier painting.

Intertextuality, then, reminds us of something we have encountered before. It is thus a product of the cultural and historical baggage that we all progressively acquire. Unhappily, though, any survey of the literature on the subject is likely to leave us at least somewhat confused, if not intimidated by a concept that clearly goes deeper than the apparently straightforward observation that all texts (or other cultural objects) are involved in some sort of relationship with previously encountered ones. In applying intertextuality to media studies, Ulrike Meinhof and Jonathan Smith (2000: 1) see it as a 'fuzzy yet powerful term' which can inform a mode of analysis that replaces the simplistic 'definition' mentioned above 'with a much more complex conception of the interactions between texts, producers of texts and their readers' lifeworlds' (ibid: 3). Kristeva acknowledged the insights of the Russian Formalist Mikhail Bakhtin earlier in the twentieth century (and especially his concept of a 'linguistic dialogue') when she first proposed her own notion of 'intertextuality', according to which 'any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another...' (Kristeva 1980: 66). Given that this new term was inevitably going to be misunderstood and oversimplified, she later adopted the terms 'transposition' and 'semiotic polyvalence' (Kristeva 1984: 59-60). Since then, however, the original term 'intertextuality' has become established as an analytical and critical tool (though with



differing emphases and interpretations) across a range of academic disciplines, from literary, media and translation studies to scriptural commentary and to linguistic and cultural anthropology. Indeed, the folklorist Richard Bauman borrows Bakhtin's observation 'I live in a world of others' words' (Bakhtin 1986: 143) to provide the title of his collection of essays on intertextuality as cross-cultural communicative practice (Bauman 2004: 1).

In a recent paper to which we will refer again later, Farzaneh Farahzad (2008: 126) suggests that the idea of an interrelationship between texts began in the 1930's. In fact, as Bauman (*ibid*) points out, this 'has been an abiding concern of literary theorists since classical antiquity', and he cites passages in Aristotle's *Poetics* as an example. Worton and Still (1990) also survey the ideas of such major writers and thinkers of classical antiquity as Plato, Cicero and Quintilian to show how the phenomenon 'in some form, is at least as old as recorded human society. Unsurprisingly, therefore, we can find theories of intertextuality wherever there has been discourse about texts...' (*ibid*: 2). Thus, we can safely claim that an awareness of both the mutual dependence of texts and the evolution of text types or genres – another aspect of intertextuality, as we shall see later – is as old as the critical reflections on translating that we considered in Chapter One. In the domain of European literature, classical scholars – Latinists especially – have been as involved as others in both investigating intertextuality and debating its validity as a 'master term' as compared with the more traditional notion of 'intended authorial allusion' (Fowler 2000: 111-112; Hinds 1998: xi-xii). One commentator even describes intertextuality as 'the holy grail of Classical studies' (Kaleigh 19 at <http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/exchange/node/414>), considering as an 'intertextual moment' or an 'intertext' not only an occasion when readers identify an intended allusion to another piece of literature, but also an occasion when they are reminded of something which they have previously encountered, regardless of whether the author they are reading alludes to it specifically or indeed is even aware of it as a prior text. The same writer goes on to argue that intertextuality 'informs literary evolution', suggesting a survival-of-the-fittest process in which texts that are 'viable' and enjoy 'a wide and long-lasting readership' do so successfully because they represent 'an advantageous combination of intertexts from the literary genome' (*ibid*).

Don Fowler, a Latinist concerned with ‘intertextualities’, is emphatic that ‘intertextuality is a property of language – and of semiotic systems in general – not simply of literature’ (Fowler 2000: 119), and he sees it as essentially a product of active reading:

Intertextuality, like all aspects of literary reception, is ultimately located in reading practice, not in a textual system: meaning is realized at the point of reception, and what counts as an intertext and what one does with it depends on the reader (ibid: 127).

Stephen Hinds, however, had earlier made a plea for the idea of recovering (in the study of Roman poetry) ‘some space for the study of allusion – as a project of continuing vitality – within an excitingly enlarged universe of intertexts’ (ibid: xii), and had warned against ‘an intertextualist fundamentalism’ which ‘privileges readerly reception so single-mindedly as to wish the alluding author out of existence altogether’ (ibid: 48).

The notion of intertextuality has also been applied to studies of Arabic literature and of the Holy Qur’ān and its connection with prior Jewish and Christian scriptures. Asma’ Abu Bakr Ahmad, for example, has studied the use of intertextuality as a critical tool for examining modernist Arabic poetry, and after first providing the basic definition of the term as **التداخل بين النصوص** (Ahmad 2005: 7) she goes on to subdivide it into a number of discrete manifestations or dimensions such as historical, religious and literary. As an example of how a modern poet can make use of religious texts to enrich his or her own text and invest it with a multiplicity of signs (**متعدد الدلالات**), Ahmad (ibid: 46-47) quotes these words from the collection **إلى النهار الماضي** by the poet Rifa‘at Salām:

وحش هائل له عشرة آلاف سنة وعشرين ألف عين مشتتة وعشرين ألف قبضة مشهورة، كل  
قبضة ألف صرخة، كل صرخة شجرة منشوره بالتين والزيتون حتى طور سنين

in which the main intertextual reference is clearly to the opening of Q95 (**سورة التين**).

Paul Starkey, in his recent survey of modern Arabic literature, comments on the increasing tendency of Egyptian writers from the 1960s onwards to use ‘intertextuality’ (his quotation marks) as a means of developing a fictional narrative and often of circumventing censorship, by incorporating newspaper extracts and official documents and by using literary styles and characters from the past as a metaphor for current political conditions (Starkey 2006: 143-145). Another study (Deheuvelds *et al.* 2006), focusing on modern Arabic prose fiction, takes as its starting point the idea that, in the

words of Roger Allen who introduces it, one of the primary features of intertextuality 'is cultural contextualisation and thus inevitably retrospect' (Allen 2006: 1). Like Starkey, he sees the difficult and disturbed period since 1967 as one in which Arab writers have used an 'intertextual frame of reference ... that reflected a totally different attitude towards and utilisation of the relationship of present to past' (ibid: 5) : as an example of how modern Arab writers suffering restrictions on their freedom of expression can invoke a past historical period and use historical texts and pastiches of them to make a point about problems in the present, he discusses the 1997 novel *Al-'Allaama* by the Moroccan Ben Sālim Himmīsh, which has as its principal character the philosopher Ibn Khaldūn (ibid: 9). Allen also notes, without surprise, that 'the founding figures of the intertextual approach seem to have grounded their theories in a generally unicultural or at least Eurocentric context', and that therefore the literature of the Arab world potentially offers fruitful opportunities for the application of intertextual studies because of 'the sheer richness of the patterns of trans-regional and trans-cultural influence' that continue to characterise it (ibid: 12). Other contributors to this collection of studies consider aspects and complexities of intertextuality in the modern literature of the Arab Gulf states. Gail Ramsay discusses a number of novels and short stories in which she identifies among the 'hypotexts', or prior texts drawn upon by the authors under discussion, not only the Arab literary heritage but also well-known 'Western' products ranging from *Wuthering Heights* and *Little Red Riding Hood* to *The Godfather* (Ramsay 2006). She shows (ibid: 180-181) how, for example, the Qatari writer Huda al-Na'imī has carried out a rewriting of the traditional and well-known story of Little Red Riding Hood by updating it to the setting of a globalized, consumer-oriented Gulf city. Her short story *أنا ليلي وأنا* (from her 2001 collection under the title *أباطيل*) tells how the protagonist meets with various distractions on the way to visit her grandmother and encounters a character called *حسيب*, to whom she says on learning his name

أنت "حسيب" الذي تكرهه أمي وتدعو عليه جدي بالانقراض!

and gets the reply

لا يا حلوتي، فالانقراض ليس لأمثالي ولن يصيبني في مقتل، فأنا كائن عولمي، وجدت لأبقي  
وأسقي الصغار من ينبوع الألفية الوليدة ...

Barbara Michalak-Pikulska also observes that modern Gulf writers tend to make their writing intertextual deliberately, so as to enrich both the informative and the artistic aspects of their work, 'adding to its interpretational dimension' (Michalak-Pikulska

2006: 188). Thus the Omani writer Muḥammad ibn Sayf al-Raḥbī uses deliberately as ‘intertexts’ in one of his stories the names of Shahrazād and Shahriyār, well-known characters from the canonical *Thousand and One Nights*, and in doing so offers ‘an updated vision of everyday life in an Arab country’ (ibid: 189). Michalak-Pikulska shows how this writer plays ‘a kind of intertextual game with the reader’ by reversing the familiar roles and mutual dependencies associated with these two characters, thereby introducing an element of paradox and opening up a huge range of interpretative possibilities (ibid: 190-191).

Explaining the notion of consonance (المناسبة) in Qur’ānic studies, Abdul-Raof (2005: 24) describes intertextuality as having a dual manifestation: it ‘is the network of relations with other texts and is the consonance within a given text’. He illustrates (from Q2 and elsewhere) how text processing for the reader or listener becomes more straightforward because of the ‘conceptual and intertextual chaining’ that has been deliberately created in the Qur’ānic text as a whole through the use of ‘textual, grammatical, stylistic and lexical subtleties’ (ibid: 33). In his explicated analysis of stylistic variation in the Qur’ānic genre (Abdul-Raof 2004), he shows how certain key notions or recurring leitmotifs are upheld through intertextuality, which can occur either: (i) within one and the same chapter (e.g. linked concepts such as monotheism vs. polytheism in Q28); or, at the ‘macro textual level’, in consecutive chapters such as Q82 and Q83; or in different, indeed widely separated, chapters such as Q1 and Q114, both of which contain the concept of lordship [that is, by using such language as **رب العالمين**، **رب الناس**، **ملك الناس**] (ibid: 38). However, in addition to its self-referentiality, the Qur’ān of course refers to prior scriptural texts, and therefore its relationship with the Bible in particular has long been a subject of interest – in more recent times tending, thankfully, away from polemic to the domain of more objective scholarly study and appraisal (see, for example, Reeves ed. 2003; Neuwirth 2008). Reuven Firestone (2003: 2) observes that the Qur’ān exhibits the tensions typical of the polemical relationship existing between a new religion and the older, ‘establishment religion(s) out of which it, directly or indirectly, evolved’, with the result that ‘it contains so many parallels with the Hebrew Bible and New Testament that it could not possibly exist without its scriptural predecessors as subtexts’ (ibid: 2-3).

Scriptural intertextuality between the Qur'ān and Bible consequently represents a fascinating but huge field of study; we may content ourselves with looking briefly at one interesting example. Angelika Neuwirth (2008) examines the connection between the early sūras of the Qur'ān and the Psalms (الزبور), seeing as 'psalm intertexts' both the similarities in the liturgical-type language used and the presence in the Qur'ān of rural images such as grass and fruit-bearing trees employed as metaphors that are familiar features of the Psalms (ibid: 2). In Q55 (*Sūrat Al-Raḥmān / The Most Gracious*) – a text traditionally considered difficult, but 'one of the most poetic texts in the Qur'ān' (ibid: 9) - she sees a special relationship with Psalm 136. Both texts have in common the striking use of a refrain: in the psalm it is generally translated from the Hebrew as 'for His kindness endures forever', or similar; while in Q55 we have the frequently recurring address to both men and jinns **فبأي آلاء ربكما تكذبان** (= So which of your Lord's bounties do you both deny?). Neuwirth interprets the sūra not just as abounding in references to Psalm 136, but as a deliberate 're-reading' or 'countertext', marking a significant shift in theological and thematic emphasis from Jewish history to Islamic eschatology (ibid: 3,15). She also points out, with reference to the latter part of Q55 with its images of Paradise, that the Qur'ān should at the same time be read in the context of a literary precursor other than the Bible, namely ancient Arabic poetry, 'the medium of the pre-Islamic master-narrative of the hero's confrontation with a world devoid of meaning' (ibid: 16). Thus she sees the relationship between the sūra and the psalm in question as an example of how the Qur'ān is 'in conversation with two cultural traditions; the options put forward in both being debated and finally rejected and replaced' (ibid: 1-2).

Finally, there is also, of course, the special relationship between the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth of the Prophet, and R.A. Megrab (1997: 231) notes the difficulties involved in translating the 'contextually bound' meanings of the latter with both sensitivity and accuracy. Seeking to apply Beaugrande and Dressler's 'seven standards of textuality' to attempts to render the Ḥadīth into English, he cites the main intertext for Ḥadīth items as the Qur'ān itself, but offers only a disappointingly brief and unreferenced example based on the idea of **الكلمة الطيبة صدقة** (= It is a charitable act to utter a good word). An important point he does make, however, is that it is inevitable that a translation '*establishes new intertextual relationships at the TL level which are usually perceived*

*by the foreign reader without any reference to the ST* [my emphasis], thus making it even more necessary that the translator 'should have a satisfactory knowledge of the theology preferably of both source and target languages' [that is, of Islam and Christianity in this case] (ibid: 236-237).

The above introductory survey should have made it clear that, far from being merely the last member of Beaugrande and Dressler's gang of seven, intertextuality is in fact a dauntingly huge area of study. In the domain of communication and semiotics it rather resembles a broad Amazon, with several hardly less substantial tributaries inviting further exploration. In the age of the internet most of us who have already been conditioned by traditional reading skills and habits have become well used to the computer-based phenomenon of 'hypertextuality', in which one text can transport us directly and more or less instantly to several other texts. This is a contemporary manifestation of intertextuality that, as Chandler puts it, 'disrupts the conventional "linearity" of texts' (Chandler 2007: 204). We could add that this electronic interconnectedness inevitably facilitates and increases the incidence of plagiarism (in Arabic سرقة) - both conscious and unconscious, a matter taken much more seriously in our own age than in ages past. One major problem that we face with intertextuality, as with the earlier notion of equivalence already discussed, is the proliferation of categories, subtypes and new terminology with no standardisation that seems to be an inevitable consequence of the academic treatment of the subject: so the concept of 'textuality' can be refined by the addition of a raft of readily available prefixes (not just inter-, but also para-, meta-, hypo-, hyper-, etc). Another is to do with the multi-dimensional nature of intertextuality. As Chandler states, we are not dealing with something on a continuum of a single dimension, and there appears to be no consensus as to what or how many dimensions we are actually looking for. One thing we can be certain of, he goes on to explain (ibid: 204-205), is that intertextuality is as much a feature of the implied 'contract' between text producer(s) and consumer(s) as it is of the text itself. Therefore we need to analyse a text in terms of how *marked* its use of intertextuality is: how reflexive (or self-conscious) is it, how explicit and how widescale are the references / allusions it makes, how critical is their recognition and comprehension to the overall reception of the message, and to what extent are there

factors beyond the control of the text producer (e.g. because of constraints, expectations or an ‘unboundedness’ arising out of a particular genre)?

A term that we have occasionally used above (following its abundant use in the literature, but generally without sufficient clarity or definition) is **intertext**. At this point, before we go on to consider and exemplify different aspects or dimensions of intertextuality, it seems right to make clear how we understand and propose to use this term. As we see it, the term can refer to any one or a combination of the following phenomena. First, and most simply, it can refer to a name that carries with it a baggage of associations and connotations. We have mentioned above the ‘updating’ exploitation of the names Shahriyar and Shahrazad; we can also cite James Joyce’s use of the name Ulysses to provide a framework of meaning for his great experimental novel. As we shall see in Chapter Five, Saddam Hussein in his later speeches invokes the name of Hulagu, the Mongol destroyer of Abbasid Baghdad, to attack (and assume moral superiority over) the leadership of the ‘coalition’ ranged against him. Another meaning is that of the ‘intertextual moment’ referred to above (Kaleigh 19), when a reader either recognizes or is vaguely aware of an allusion or ‘echo’ linking the immediate text with another, whether the text producer intended it or not. This is also Fowler’s (2000) concept of an intertext cited above. Finally, there is the commonly expressed view that each text is itself an intertext: in other words, the much larger notion of a relationship or interdependence between texts, both synchronically and diachronically. One literary example of the latter type might be the thematic link between Homer’s *Odyssey*, Dante’s *Inferno*, Tennyson’s poem *Ulysses* and James Joyce’s novel *Ulysses*. The influential theorist of literary intertextuality Michael Riffaterre has defined intertext as follows:

An intertext is one or more texts which the reader must know in order to understand a work of literature in terms of its overall significance (as opposed to the discrete meanings of its successive words, phrases, and sentences) (Riffaterre 1990: 56).

He goes on to distinguish between intertext and intertextuality by describing the latter as ‘the web of functions that constitutes and regulates the relationships between text and intertext’ (ibid: 57). An example of how Riffaterre’s definition of intertext in particular may be applied to the examination of a possible ‘intertextual relationship’ linking certain texts belonging to the present day with certain texts from the past can be seen in Netton (1996). As part of his overall study of three works (Mahfūz’s *Awlād Hāratinā*,

Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*, and Kazantzakis' *The Last Temptation of Christ*) which have in common that they have all been accused of undermining a previous and sacred text, Ian Richard Netton assesses the nature and extent of the intertext under the headings of *Structure, Semiotics and Symbols* and *Myth* (ibid: 115-130). Having established from his analysis that such an intertext can indeed be identified, he adds that its overarching element, common to all three works – what he terms *the heart of the intertext* - is the allegation of blasphemy and consequently the air of controversy and 'arena of suffering' affecting both the writers and their readership (ibid: 128).

Before closing this section with a discussion of the challenges and problems that intertextuality poses for translators, we need to consider and exemplify its two main categories or dimensions as generally recognized in the literature. The first is that of straightforward **citation** and the less straightforward area of **quotation, allusion and parody**. The second is that of **genre membership** and of **the evolution of text types**. As usual, we face here the problem of competing and unstable terminologies. Hatim (1997c: 30) follows Bakhtin's (1986) use of the term 'horizontal' for the former category and 'vertical' for the latter (broadly speaking), whilst also acknowledging Norman Fairclough's (1989) essentially similar distinction between 'manifest' and 'constitutive' types of intertextuality. However, Hatim and Munday (2004: 86-88) explain the 'horizontal / vertical' distinction somewhat differently. The 'horizontal' type of intertextuality involves 'concrete reference to, or straight quotation from, other texts...'; the 'vertical' manifestation includes allusions and, more significantly, traces or echoes of a genre with which text receivers may be familiar, along with its associated type of discourse. Farahzad (2008: 127) fails to acknowledge any previous classifications, but simply presents her own, apparently influenced by terms familiar from translation studies: 'overt, in which the intertext bears direct quotations and citations from other intertexts'; and 'covert, in which the intertext relates to and depends on other intertexts not only in terms of genre and discourse, but also, and basically, in terms of concepts'. She does, however, acknowledge that there is no true dichotomy in operation here, given that intertextual references and dependencies tend to be both direct and indirect at the same time (ibid).



### 3.3.1 *Quotation, allusion and parody*

Intertextuality can be seen as a textual and semiotic phenomenon embracing a range of references and signs, from the very explicit to the very unexplicit. At the former end of the scale, in explicit citation, we find what James E. Porter calls its ‘most mundane manifestation’ (Porter 1986: 34). The previous sentence illustrates this, bowing to the rules of academic discourse and thus avoiding the charge of plagiarism.

**Quotation** is an all-too-familiar device employed in a wide variety of texts, for example literary, academic, journalistic and political. Much less explicit than scholarly citation, it is a form of borrowing that can be used to ‘frame’ a text and place it within a certain discourse, to make an appeal to some authority outside the text, or simply to evoke images consistent with and supportive of the text producer’s overall intentions and to summon up a suitable response from the ‘ideal’ text receiver. Saddam Hussein’s later speeches or other declarations, for example, typically begin with a Qur’ānic statement, presupposing a Muslim audience familiar with the context, as in this opening to a letter purportedly from Saddam to his followers in April 2003:

ولقد كانوا عاهدوا الله من قبل لا يولون الأديبار وكان عهد الله مسؤولاً

*And yet they [‘the hypocrites’] had already covenanted with Allah not to turn their backs, and a covenant with Allah must (surely) be answered for (Q33: 15; translation by ‘Abdullah Yūsuf ‘Alī).*

In certain forms of literature, especially experimental ones, quotations taken from a formidable range of other periods and languages may be used not just to deepen the overall message but to be an integral part of it, to be appreciated only by a certain kind of receiver: this is true of T.S. Eliot’s poem *The Wasteland*, with its ‘larger-scale insertions’ of other texts (Wales 2001: 221). Likewise, we expect journalistic writing at various levels to contain quotations. More often, as we will see shortly, this is in the form of allusion, convenient cliché, or parody. Sometimes, though, a journalistic text will incorporate at least part of a genuine quotation in order to serve its own ‘intentionality’, and the quotation may be either recognized by the reader or otherwise identified as a borrowing because of, for example, an unexpected word order or similar stylistic device. A leading article in *The Times* newspaper of 3 February 2009 made the case for regarding irregular heavy snowfall in Britain as an object of relatively

unfamiliar beauty rather than as a disruptive nuisance that the nation should insure itself against. At the end of the second paragraph (about the beauty and wonder of snow, especially for children) we read:

Dull would he be of soul who would not look out of his own window and note a scene touching in its majesty.

The first six words are a direct quotation from Wordsworth's well-known sonnet entitled 'Composed Upon Westminster Bridge, September 3, 1802', which describes an unexpectedly beautiful urban scene in the early morning, and begins with these lines:

Earth has not anything to show more fair:  
Dull would he be of soul who could pass by  
A sight so touching in its majesty:

This partial quotation was no doubt recognized by a substantial number of readers. So why was it used? Probably because it occurred at the time to the well-read leader writer as a convenient device for bolstering the image of a beautiful (and specifically English) scene, and thus further engaging the reader. Interestingly, the same piece ends with an explicit quotation, apparently serving to 'frame' the message that snow is something beautiful that we should –at least occasionally- enjoy and appreciate rather than complain about:

But John Ruskin, who disliked capitalism because he thought that it was so ugly, gets it right: "Sunshine is delicious, rain is refreshing, wind braces us up, snow is exhilarating; there is really no such thing as bad weather, only different kinds of good weather."

It is hard to find a very clear dividing line, however, between quotation and **allusion**. The latter is a very common feature of both written and spoken discourse, producing a kind of 'echo' effect, and is of course most readily comprehensible to those belonging to the culture in which the source of the allusion is situated. Ritva Leppihalme (1997) has shown in her empirical study of the translation of allusions how, even in the relatively short cultural distance separating Finnish readers from writers in Anglo-American culture, source-text allusions can be a real 'culture bump' – a challenge and a puzzle to translators and their target-text readers alike. She points out that the Latin etymology of the word 'allude' suggests the idea of 'playing' (ibid: 5-6), and indeed the practice (and the expectation) of 'playing with words' is surely a normal part of discourse in any human culture. Humour is one of the functions of allusion; but it is also used to evoke or support a general theme, to make a new text seem richer and more

universal in meaning, to aid characterisation, to suggest authority through showing off knowledge and to give an 'afterlife' to some well-worn quotation or expression (as in the case of our earlier example of the advertising slogan 'You shop, we drop'). Allusion is regularly employed in the titles of books, plays, journalistic articles etc in ways that range from the highly creative to the desperately clichéd. Leppihalme (ibid: 8) cites as a good example of a 'macro-level' text as well as title that can 'play upon receivers' familiarity with another text' Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, which is 'a different play altogether for those who know *Hamlet* and for those who do not'. Likewise, we can claim that the titles of two books about, or set in, the Middle East, Julian Huxley's *From An Antique Land* (1954) and Amitav Ghosh's *In An Antique Land* (1992), make an effective and suitable allusive reference to the words in Shelley's well-known sonnet *Ozymandias*. However, a British newspaper article opening with the words 'Something is rotten in the state of Denmark' is simply using a convenient cliché as a framing device: the article is probably not about Denmark, possibly not even about politics, but instead the experienced reader in this particular culture is alerted from the outset to the likelihood that the article (whether a narrative, review or analysis) is going to be dealing with some manifestation of human moral decay or rottenness. (The same allusion can be effected in a rather more subtle way, as in this opening sentence to a *Guardian* leader of 17 November 2009: 'The archbishop, the lord mayor and top businessmen all declared yesterday that something was rotten in the state of finance.' A few lines later it becomes clear that the subject-matter is 'the bankrupt culture of banking'.) Again, a travel feature that includes the sentence 'A year is a long time in aviation' is simply using a well-worn, off-the-peg allusion to Harold Wilson's remark half a century ago that 'A week is a long time in politics': an allusion that is likely to be lost on a generation of British readers who were not alive at that time, let alone on any putative readers from another nationality and culture. There are also instances in which a 'quality' newspaper's apparently clever use of allusion seems to be either inappropriate or just too-clever-by-half. The *Times* leading article about snow mentioned above has the title *The Iceman Cometh*; but it is hard to see how this reference to Eugene O'Neill's dark 1939 drama with that title can be a suitable summary of the content of the leader. Is it rather a case of find-a-headline-before-the-deadline, with off-the-peg solutions being shouted across a busy newsroom? Or has this reader simply missed something?

A journalistic headline or title that works better is that of a *Guardian* leader of 15 July 2005. The leader commented on ceremonies in Britain one week after the London bombings of 7 July that year, contrasting the prominent local press coverage of them with that of the latest suicide bombing in a poor Shi'a district of Baghdad, resulting in the death of a large number of children. It has the title *Massacre of the Innocents*. This alludes to the Christian story (based on a few verses early in the Gospel of St Matthew) of the killing of a number of very young male children by King Herod of Judea, a story later depicted and often used to make contemporary statements by several painters, notably Rubens. Even though the victims in that story lived their short lives in the faraway 'Middle East', their story has become mainly a 'western' one. As for its use by *The Guardian*, it is hard to be sure whether it was chosen simply as a convenient ready-made title with emotive pulling power, or as a device to emphasize the link between human beings in different cultures and locations, to bolster the leader's thesis that 'home and abroad can no longer be easily separated'.

Adrian Beard (2007: 27) and William McGregor (2009: 74) both provide a good and interesting example of the use –sometimes clever, sometimes merely hackneyed and irritating – of the use of allusion in Anglo-American political journalism. This derives from the 'Watergate' [building] scandal that broke in Washington in 1972, resulting in the ever-more-frequent use of the suffix '-gate' (as a bound morpheme) to refer to all sorts of subsequent political or quasi-political scandals, especially in the U.S. and Britain: in fact, to *signal* the very idea of a scandal. Thus a story involving President Carter's brother was dubbed 'Billygate', while the *Yorkshire Post* newspaper referred to a local government scandal in Doncaster as 'Donnygate'. (Much more recently, in late 2009, the suffix made a new and well-publicised appearance in 'climategate', a scandal surrounding the hacking of sensitive academic e-mails regarding the global warming debate.) During the Clinton Presidency, Beard goes on to point out (*ibid*), a newspaper produced a headline (*All the President's Women*) that was especially 'intertextually complex' in that it commented upon the sexual scandals involving the President by harking back to the famous film about the original Watergate scandal, *All the President's Men*. The latter title, we may add, presumably derived (consciously or otherwise) from the words 'all the King's men...' in the British nursery rhyme *Humpty Dumpty*.

Arabic newspapers also make effective use of allusions in their headlines, comment articles or leader titles. A Gulf newspaper leader in 2005 commenting on attempts to suppress the ‘insurgency’ in Iraq summed up its message by using the title **الف صدام وصادم**. Saddam’s own speeches and messages embody allusions (such as those to the Mongol Hulagu when he uses the words **هولاكو جديد** and **روح هولاكو** in a major speech on 17 January 2003), which were unlikely to mean much to many contemporary Arab readers or listeners, let alone to those outside the Arab world other than specialists. An interesting example of a probable allusion to Qur’ānic language is provided by Dickins *et al.* (2002: 71). The words of an oath sworn by members of the Muslim Brotherhood to their leader Ḥasan al-Bannā were:

**العسر واليسر والمنشط والمكره**

and this appears to owe something to Q94: 5-6, in which the words **مع العسر يسراً** are repeated. Modern Arabic poets, according to Salma Khadra Jayyusi (1977: 712-713), have used the power of allusion not just, like poets of the past, to show off their literary knowledge, but more importantly to arouse an emotional appeal in their readers or audience. This, she says, is especially true of ‘platform poetry’ written by poets who are committed to an ideology, as in this example of verses by Yūsuf al-Khaṭīb:

واتركوا الدار فهي ملك ذويها      ولقد أن ان يدق الباب  
هي هذي الزنود، اعلامنا الحمر، تعالت بمرورها فيها الشباب

which contain a clear allusion to a well-known verse by Aḥmad Shawqī:

وللحرية الحمراء بابٌ بكل يد مُضرجة يُدق.

This verse is also used by Abdul-Raof (2006: 63-64) to illustrate the achievement of effective imagery through the allusive and intertextual elements it contains, as for example the links between **مُضرجة** and **حمراء**, and between **يُدق** and **باب**.

Finally, **parody** is a form of creative intertextuality which finds expression across a range of media and outlets. The Oxford graffiti artist who sprayed ‘Deanz meanz fines’ was inspired by the contemporary Heinz commercial for beans; in the same way, tribute is paid to the rhetorical skills of Winston Churchill whenever anyone adapts his ‘Never in the field of human conflict...’ or ‘We shall fight them on the beaches...’ lines. Indeed, according to an article in the *Western Daily Press* (*‘Saddam Will Not Be A Pushover’*, 28 December 2002), Saddam Hussein told his latest biographer Con Coughlin in

September 2002, with regard to the threat of military intervention in Iraq: ‘We will fight them on the streets, from the rooftops, house to house. We will never surrender.’ Saddam was very probably thinking of some of the words used by Gamal ‘Abdel Nasser – also consciously or unconsciously recalling those of Winston Churchill - in one of his key addresses to the Egyptian people, namely the one he delivered on 1 November 1956 during the Suez emergency. In that address Nasser told his audience that they would fight on in every battle, from village to village and place to place, and would not surrender: the slogan was **أنا سنقاتل ولن نسلم** (Nasser 1951-1961: 429). Likewise, well-known poems such as Shelley’s *Ozymandias* or Longfellow’s *Song of Hiawatha* have invited and received parody versions (Wales 2001: 286). The characteristic style of Edward Fitzgerald’s 1859 version of the *Rubaiyāt* of Omar Khayyam was widely parodied in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, as in this stanza from the *Golfer’s Rubaiyat* of 1903:

The swinging BRASSIE strikes; and having struck

Moves on: nor all your Wit or future Luck

Shall lure it back to cancel half a Stroke,

Nor from the Card a single Seven pluck.

Furthermore, in Anglo-American culture not only are well-known Christmas carols such as *The Twelve Days of Christmas* often parodied at that time of year to comment on topical issues, but also even ‘religious’ or ‘Biblical’ language (which in English tends to mean the Authorized Version of the Bible) is regularly parodied, as in this example from the time of the 2008 U.S. Presidential election:

v.9 And the LORD said unto McCain, Why art thou doing unto thy brother as the soon-to-be-burning Bush once did unto thee? And where is thy brother Obama right now? And McCain said, I know not: Am I my brother’s keeper? ([www.jewcy.com/post/mccain\\_and\\_obama\\_genesis\\_iv](http://www.jewcy.com/post/mccain_and_obama_genesis_iv); accessed 20/11/2009.)

As Wales (*ibid*) explains, parody on the one hand ‘foregrounds and alienates, exposes and makes prominent, certain stylistic features of the original text or idiolect’ while at the same time ‘in its own freedom of subject matter, it promotes its own identity and exposes its difference’. Thus it takes a previous style and subject matter and recontextualizes it, and should definitely not be seen simply as ridiculing another text or artistic product.

### 3.3.2 *Genre and the evolution of text types*

The term **genre** nowadays is used to cover a variety of media, and whatever we can say about works of literature as belonging to this or that genre (or sub-genre) may also be applied to other forms of expression. As Wales (ibid: 177) points out, there is an intertextual 'system' which ensures that no work can properly be understood 'except in relation to its place in that system'. She also makes the equally important observation that any genre represents not just a model of production but also 'a model of expectation' for the receiver. We may add that this applies also to parodies. Thus, when reading the 'Biblical' commentary on the Obama/McCain electoral contest cited above, we are not surprised to find that each of the three sentences begins with the word 'and', simply because this is what we have become conditioned to expect; the same feature would not, however, be considered acceptable in, for example, an academic abstract.

The very fact that we can mention academic abstracts as a recognized genre says much about the evolution and the diversity of written genres. For the now well-established sub-genre that is the academic abstract is a member of a major modern category of genre or 'text type' that consists basically of empirical or objective writing on scientific, technological or other scholarly subjects. This is itself one of five 'broad categories of genre' identified by Dickins *et al.* (2002: 178-179) in the context of determining – from the standpoint of the would-be translator primarily – the intentionality of the text producer and the treatment of the subject matter. The first such category is that of literary genres, which in their manifold varieties and sub-genres that have evolved over a long period of time seek to express real-life experience 'in terms of a subjective internal world'. The second is for religious genres. Dickins *et al.* (ibid) see this category as less diversified than the others, but with more diversity of styles or language levels permitted nowadays in the Christian context (despite our parody example above) than in the Arabic and Islamic one, in which the use of **فصحي التراث** is dominant. The third category embraces genres for the setting forth of mathematical, metaphysical and other philosophical ideas, which do not allow very much freedom of treatment. Then there is the category we have already mentioned comprising empirical and academic writing, which 'goes on diversifying into new genres and sub-genres as new scientific and academic disciplines are created'. The fifth and final category is the very important and

well-diversified one of persuasive or argumentative genres, which 'aim at getting listeners or readers to behave in prescribed or suggested ways'. They cover everything from instruction manuals to advertisements, political speeches, electioneering leaflets, and editorials, opinion columns and letters in newspapers.

Intertextuality, say Neubert and Shreve (1992: 120), is related to this notion of text type, and 'intertextual distinctions are first-order text-typological distinctions'. Yet these are not always clear-cut, since they are 'regions of expectation and recognition with fuzzy edges'. Indeed, when we analyze many types of text, we observe a 'fuzziness' about them: in other words, they do not always appear to belong exclusively to just one genre or text type. Hatim and Mason (1990: 145-148) discuss this phenomenon of 'hybridization' (concluding that it is 'a fact of life') and point out that, even if a given text is multifunctional, it can have only one 'predominant rhetorical purpose' at any one time: this will be its 'dominant contextual focus'. Other purposes or functions that can be discerned within a text are subsidiary to this overall focus or purpose. Journalism provides copious examples of this genre hybridization: for example, when an editorial piece or opinion feature includes an element of narration, as do our two previous *Times* and *Guardian* leaders dealing, respectively, with snow in Britain and carnage in Baghdad; or when a news report includes an element of evaluation in the form of emotive language, as does the beginning of this report of the progress of the invasion of Iraq on the front page of the UAE newspaper *Al-Khaleej* of 10 April 2003:

انهار نظام صدام حسين أمس في ختام الأسبوع الثالث للعنوان الأمريكي - البريطاني الذي اجتاحت قواته الغازية معظم أرجاء عاصمة الرشيد من دون مقاومة تذكر...

Here the words which I have underlined serve to give an evaluative colouring to what is essentially a straightforward narrative report.

The phenomenon is by no means restricted, however, to journalism. A religious text such as the Qur'ān may well contain clear elements of argumentation, as for example in Q30 and Q36 (Abdul-Raof 2004: 35), while some political speeches contain 'echoes', at least, of a variety of other genres in order to support the main thesis. The last major speeches of Saddam Hussein are an example of the latter case, since they combine elements of religious discourse with history and densely ideological rhetoric.



What is of most concern to us here is the ‘vertically’ intertextual nature of genres and their particular type of discourse, inevitably bearing traces of previous written or spoken texts. ‘Vertical intertextuality’, according to Hatim and Munday (2004: 303), ‘is a powerful mechanism for the establishment and maintenance of genres, discourses and text types’. Porter (1986: 35-37) writes of the aspect of intertextuality that he calls ‘iterability’, meaning the repeatable nature within a given culture of ‘certain textual fragments’, which may include not only explicit quotations and allusions but also ‘unannounced sources and influences, clichés, phrases in the air, and traditions’. He provides an interesting example of this (ibid: 36-37) in the American Declaration of Independence, generally regarded as the work of Thomas Jefferson. Close analysis of the text of this Declaration, Porter tells us, has revealed that Jefferson was essentially ‘an effective borrower of traces’ (for example, from John Locke, previous declarations in North America, the English Bill of Rights of 1689 and clichés of the day such as ‘Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness’), and that, had Jefferson ‘submitted the Declaration for a college writing class as his own writing, he might well be charged with plagiarism’. Indeed, the emotional elements in Jefferson’s own style were edited or downtoned by others: his ‘few attempts at original expression were those least acceptable to Congress’.

Farahzad likewise offers a well-known example from Persian literature to illustrate her distinction between a ‘prototext’, meaning an ‘intertext’ existing in one language, and a ‘metatext’, meaning the ‘result of the act of translation’ [of that particular ‘prototext’] into one or more different languages (Farahzad 2008: 127). Such a ‘prototext’, she claims (ibid: 128), is made up partly of repetition ‘in that it repeats the form and content of other intertexts belonging to the same genre and discourse type’ in the same language, and partly of creation ‘in that it is distinct from any other intertext as an individual and new formulation of concepts’. It should not be described, she insists, as ‘the source’ or ‘the original’, given that it is itself ‘an intertext rooted in history, and made up of overt and covert intertextual references to other texts’ in the same language. Her example is the Persian poet Omar Khayyam’s *Rubaiyāt*, which she says are linked intertextually with Persian poetry in terms of genre, and ‘with all Persian writings in philosophy and sufism’ in terms of discourse and content. We will discuss the translation issues arising out of this example, and out of Farahzad’s own notion of translation ‘as an intertextual practice’, a little later.

### 3.3.3 *Intertextuality as a translation challenge*

Neubert and Shreve (1992: 117-123) argue the case for regarding translation as ‘mediated intertextuality’. This is based on their earlier definition of translation as ‘text-induced text production’ (ibid: 119), according to which a text is translated from one language into another and becomes a text treated by users of that second language ‘as if it were a naturally occurring instance of their communicative culture’. The body of tacit expectations that these language users bring to their reception of any new text is in fact ‘a product of *intertextuality*’ (ibid: 117) – and therefore, when those expectations are violated in some degree and the translated text does not seem ‘right’ or ‘normal’ this is essentially because the intertextual standards of the language or the text type have not been upheld. In fact, the translator is confronted by the task of dealing with a ‘double intertextuality’ (that is, both the relationships existing between the ST and other texts in the source language and the new relationships that the TT will have with other texts in the target language), and usually ‘must act in favour of the target language text world’ (ibid: 118). In order to achieve all of this, the translator has to ‘mediate’ effectively between the textual and communicative conventions of the ST and TT languages: this means, according to Neubert and Shreve (ibid: 123), that the intertextual properties of both the ST and the TT have to be explicitly recognized and understood, thus making the translation undertaking ‘an exercise in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic intertextuality’.

This is of course a tall order for most translators (and also interpreters), who are still a long way from being completely bilingual and bicultural. Many translators in various parts of the world are regularly engaged in translating into a second language, for example Australian citizens of Arab origin translating from Arabic into English (Campbell 1998). Consequently, there is a clear need for special training for those translators who are called upon to ‘mediate’ between linguistic and cultural systems that are far removed from one another, particularly in the case of texts that may be considered ‘sensitive’ for any reason. One area in which special understanding is required is that of genres, as we have discussed above, and the expectations that they engender. In her recent exploration of narratives and their impact on translation, Baker (2006a: 86) describes genre as a ‘conventionalized framework that guides our interpretation [of narratives] in a number of different ways’. A narrative that we can

identify with a specific genre will have its own type of cohesion, coherence and ‘sense of boundedness’, and will also arouse the expectation of certain qualities such as factuality versus fiction, seriousness versus humour, and so on. Baker (*ibid*) emphasizes that these expectations are culture-specific: her examples are of how some humorous content in academic discourse is acceptable in the English-speaking world but a lot less so in other cultural settings, and of how the content of poetic language is in some cultures always seen as fictional.

Even though a translator, working at whatever level of linguistic skill and bicultural understanding, will in practice have to cope with the ‘mediation’ of intertextual elements through several *ad hoc*, micro-level decisions, there is surely a need for an overall strategy. In the theoretically more leisurely conditions that we associate with translation, as compared with those for interpretation, the translator has first and foremost to be a skilled reader of texts, able to make informed initial judgements about such matters as context, genre (‘pure’ versus ‘hybrid’), intentionality, intertextual relationships affecting both the source and target texts, and stylistics. Given that the intertextual elements are ‘best viewed in terms of semiotic systems of signification’ (Hatim and Mason 1990: 123), a main task is to identify what types of knowledge and what belief systems outside the actual text are (or appear to be) activated within it. This naturally combines with an understanding of the ideology present in the text, an aspect that we shall discuss later. It constitutes what Hatim and Mason (*ibid*: 124) call ‘active’ intertextuality, contrasted with more ‘passive’ manifestations such as lexical threads or chains which ‘amount to little more than the basic requirement that texts be internally coherent (i.e. intelligible)’.

If we look back to the example (in section 2.5.2, towards the end of Chapter Two) of the Arabic editorial that we translated as *Dealers and Dodgers*, we see that the source text activated not only the concept of an editorial, with the argumentation and judgements that Arabic- and English-speaking readers alike normally associate with editorializing, but also the world of religious, specifically Islamic beliefs and values. On Hatim and Mason’s ‘passive’ level, it employed a lexical thread in the form of word play, partly for the sake of coherence but also perhaps with the motivation of ridiculing the objects of the writer’s displeasure – those guilty of ‘dirty dealing’. One problem in ‘mediating’ this piece intertextually arose out of the fact that it belonged essentially to the

interculturally-recognized genre of editorials, but also contained overtly religious and ‘sermonizing’ language of a kind that needed some modification or downtoning so as not to violate the expectations of a target readership that has become unaccustomed to such a blend of secular and religious argumentation. Bearing in mind the need to produce for target language readers an acceptable version that would read something like an ‘equivalent’ editorial in a ‘quality’ English-language newspaper or magazine, albeit with some overt Islamic content at the end, the translator has opted for the strategy of trying to activate in the mind of the target reader some of the characteristic features of an English-language editorial (including an element of word play), while probably remaining blissfully ignorant of many intertextual references or relationships that an Arab reader might be aware of in the source text. The decision to transpose the word play in the Arabic title *صفقات وصفعات* into *Dealers and Dodgers* arose from this strategy, imitating what might be expected in a target-language editorial and at the same time setting up an intertextual reference to the world of Dickens’ ‘artful dodger’- and also to the common notions of ‘dodgy’ businesses / businessmen and even ‘tax dodgers’. Newspaper headlines and editorial titles typically contain wordplay and allusion (as in *The Iceman Cometh*, *England Expects*, and the like). Later on, relatively mild allusions to a religious dimension are suggested by the words ‘there is justice from above that will inevitably take its course’ (for the Arabic *أن العدالة الإلهية* (المحتومة سوف تأخذ مجراها) and the Biblical-sounding ‘weeping and gnashing of teeth will be of no avail’ (for *لن تنفعه حسرات ولن تفيدته عبرات*). To sum up, then, this translation has probably missed many intertextual references in the original Arabic, but at least has established some intertextual links with familiar elements in the target language culture, namely the style of editorials, ‘religious language’ and a well-known literary character.

The above example indicates that, in addition to the generic considerations to which the translator must give importance, the rendering of individual words or phrases is also a very significant challenge if the right intertextual effect is to be created. This is clearly a still greater challenge for interpreters, given the ‘real-time’ constraints under which they have to operate. Hatim (1997c: 31) provides an interesting instance of this, when an interpreter for Saddam Hussein was called upon to render the Arabic word *مستضعفون* (which Hatim explains as ‘lit. “taken advantage of by someone more powerful”’) and

opted for ‘hopeless’ or ‘helpless’ rather than by more effectively linking it intertextually to ‘Western society and cultural values’ by using suitably emotive words such as ‘bullied’ or ‘victimized’. A similar situation for an interpreter or translator working in the opposite direction – from English into Arabic – could perhaps arise (in certain contexts, at least) if he or she had to deal with a word like ‘appease’ or ‘appeasement’, given the burden of ideological and intertextual connotation that this idea has for some time carried in English. These particular words were in fact used rhetorically by George W. Bush in his ‘war ultimatum’ speech delivered in mid-March 2003 with reference to the regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

As we noted at the end of 3.3.2 above, Farahzad (2008) posits a distinction between ‘prototext’ and ‘metatext’. She sees translation as ‘an intertextual practice’ (ibid: 127-130): this view is based on the idea that the ‘prototext’ – itself an intertext within its own cultural setting – ‘is detached from its own context, and is placed in a new socio-historical context’ when translated into another language, becoming then a new intertext which can go on to engender additional translations, or ‘metatexts’. The relationship between her ‘prototext’ and its subsequent ‘metatexts’ is ‘not one of equivalence, but may be explained through intertextuality’: the latter concept, she argues, makes the traditional ideas of ‘equivalence’, ‘source text’ and ‘target text’ invalid. Her only example is the contentious one of Edward Fitzgerald’s version of Khayyam’s *Rubaiyāt*, which she describes as ‘not *The Rubaiyat* reproduced in English, but a metatext which quotes from and refers to Khayyam’s *Rubaiyat* intertextually’. Fitzgerald’s version is, she explains, partly a repetition of the content, general meaning and poetic form of Khayyam’s writing, while another part of this translator’s enterprise is an individual, creative one. A manifestation of the first part was Fitzgerald’s imitation of the quatrain form and his introduction of it into English poetry, which could perhaps be viewed positively as one instance of what Susan Bassnett (2007: 141) calls ‘the role of translations in literary innovation and renewal’. The creative part is more controversial, with André Lefevere (1992: 8, 74) describing Fitzgerald’s work as ‘rewriting’.

Noting that translations into several other languages of Khayyam’s *Rubaiyāt* were done at the beginning of the twentieth century, thus adding to the web of intertextual links, Farahzad (ibid: 130) concludes:

The nature of the relation(ship) between a prototext and all its existing and possible metatexts, and between the metatexts themselves cannot be contained in the debatable term *equivalence*, which, based on the concept of meaning as stable and fixed, considers translation as *reproduction* and the source text as the *origin*.

There are, however, problems arising out of this view of translation ‘as an intertextual practice’ based solely on an example from the literary realm – itself a rather too traditional practice on the part of some translation theorists, given the quantity and importance of material in other domains being translated which also has intertextual properties. One problem is to do with the idea of meaning being, or not being, ‘stable and fixed’. If we are dealing with a ‘prototext’ in the political rather than the literary domain, the situation is surely different, since the repercussions of a ‘metatext’ that is an inaccurate or intertextually incompetent rendering could be severe and dangerous. For example, if we venture to update the Iranian context and consider a speech in 2005 by the newly-elected Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad apparently stating that he wanted to see the State of Israel ‘wiped off the map’, we can readily see that it matters a good deal in terms of international relations and politics whether he was merely expressing a political sentiment (and couching it in the rhetorical norms of Farsi), or actually setting forth a definite policy of his government. Whatever the truth in this case (to which we refer again later in 4.5 in the context of media translation practices), the fact is that translations of the speech read by those in power elsewhere led to them interpreting it (partly, perhaps, to suit their own prejudices and agendas) as a real ‘existential’ threat to the State of Israel. Likewise, in the realm of scriptures the way in which key statements are translated may have huge theological implications and exert great influence over religious belief and action in the world here and now. We can cite in this regard the statement by Jesus in the New Testament translated as ‘I am the Way, the Truth and the Life; no-one comes to the Father except through me’ (John’s Gospel 14: 6), and equally a number of passages in the Qur’ān that have to do with ﷻ, attitudes to non-believers, matters of punishment, etc. In such instances as these, meaning that is ‘fixed and stable’ does seem to matter. Another issue arising is that quite often ‘prototexts’ become ‘metatexts’ at the hands of translators belonging to the ‘source’ language and culture, who naturally bring their own ‘intertextual baggage’ - to borrow Eleonora Federici’s (2007) expression – to the task, but lack adequate knowledge of the target culture and its socio-historical web of linguistic, ideological and intertextual complexities.

Finally, then, the challenge of transferring intertextuality between languages and cultures is an extremely demanding one. Federici (ibid: 152) stresses that translators may be aware of some intertextual references while missing others, but in any case may decide that the ones they are aware of are not easily translatable. Sometimes there may be a case for using 'paratextual' elements such as footnotes or other explanations in order to give the target reader access to references that would otherwise be baffling:

In the case of culture-bound terms, idiomatic expressions and references to lesser-known social, historical and geographical facts, the translator can decide to add a glossary or to insert footnotes in order to highlight those intertextual references which are not so clear for the target reader (ibid: 153).

### 3.4 Conclusion

Our overall concern in this chapter has been to investigate the essential nature and the various components of 'text' as part of a broader consideration of the concepts of equivalence and translatability. We began by offering and analyzing instances of both **text** and 'non-text' in our pair of languages under consideration, and we also discussed related aspects of **textuality**: the vital ones of **cohesion** and **coherence**, without which texts are unacceptable, and then the ones such as **intentionality** and **intertextuality** which have more to do with the *interaction* between any text and its users. We then went on to look at some of the stylistic components of **texture**, at other features of texts such as **context** and **co-text**, and at the contrasting conventions of English and Arabic in the area of **sentence length** and **punctuation**. In all of this we have tried to emphasize the differing or contrasting expectations and types of conditioning that affect the 'consumers' of text in widely divergent cultural settings. Having thus established the notion of text and its basic defining characteristics, we proceeded to examine in more detail one of its most pervasive and fascinating features: **intertextuality**. This, as we demonstrated, has over recent decades come to be an object of research across a wide range of disciplines, and after introducing it as such we have tried to 'unpack' it by discussing and exemplifying its various manifestations in the more familiar form of **quotations, allusions and parodies** and in the rather less familiar and obvious one of **genres** and their evolution. This led us finally to a discussion of the ways in which intertextual elements in a 'source text' pose considerable **challenges to translators** as they seek to transfer subtleties of meaning effectively as well as acceptably into the mental world of the 'target' reader. In our next chapter we move on to examine the

nature of **ideology** as it reveals itself in language through the vehicle of **discourse** and serves as a carrier of intertextual references. We look at how this affects translation processes through the phenomena of **mediation** and of **manipulation** in the news media.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### IDEOLOGY, MEDIATION AND MANIPULATION

#### 4.1 *Introduction*

In the previous chapter we examined first the notions of text and textuality, and then the nature of intertextual features and the kinds of translation problems they present. We now need to consider another major feature of all language, and therefore of translation: **ideology**, a term and a concept as lacking in an agreed or fixed meaning as intertextuality, but which we will nevertheless shortly define (along with the related one of **discourse**) for the purposes of this study. In this chapter we will begin by exploring the role of ideology in language, using examples in both English and Arabic, and seeing how ideology can act as the carrier of a nation's culture (or that of a particular group or community) and therefore, inevitably, of various forms of intertextual references, which may undergo a process of 'recontextualization'. Then we will look into how ideology as a factor in language affects the work of translators and tends to result in varying degrees of '**mediation**', **intervention** and **manipulation**. Finally, as a necessary preparation for our study in the next chapter, we go on to consider a topic of growing interest and concern: the role of ideology, translation and manipulation in the contemporary international news media, and the difficulties faced by many translators in remaining 'neutral' in a world of ever-increasing ideological conflicts.

#### 4.2 *What is ideology?*

We now move on to examine what may be described as an overarching 'fact' about language in use which determines the presence of intertextuality as analyzed in our last chapter, and is therefore involved in the overall problem of 'equivalence' and translatability. This is **ideology**, and first we must be clear what the term is being used to signify in the analysis of language and the study of translation practice. The normal

use in English, especially in journalistic discourse, suggests some deviation ‘from a posited norm’, as Hatim and Mason (1997: 144) put it: thus communism, fascism, anarchism etc are seen as deviations from a norm such as liberal, parliamentary democracy. We can add that the same applies to certain belief systems, sets of values and their associated language (or ‘discourse’ – definitions of which will be presented shortly), for example sexism, feminism, racism, fundamentalism, creationism and so on. Hatim and Mason (ibid) point out that, for the linguist, a more objective and comprehensive account of the meaning of the term is needed, and they define ideology as ‘the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups’. Elsewhere (ibid: 218) they add the point that this body of assumptions and beliefs ‘ultimately finds expression in language’. This leads inevitably to their definition of the term ‘discourse’ as ‘institutionalized modes of speaking and writing which give expression to particular attitudes towards areas of socio-cultural activity’ (ibid: 144). Norman Fairclough, in his major study of the interaction of language and power relations in modern (especially British) society, likewise sees ideologies as having a close link with language ‘because using language is the commonest form of social behaviour, and the form of social behaviour where we rely most on “commonsense” assumptions’ (Fairclough 2001: 2). He goes on to observe:

Ideological power, the power to project one’s practices as universal and “common sense”, is a significant complement to economic and political power, and of particular significance here because it is exercised in discourse (ibid: 27).

According to Fairclough, those exercising power can get others to go along with their view of the world through either coercion or, preferably, consent (or a workable combination of the two), and thus ideology is ‘the key mechanism of rule by consent, and *because it is the favoured vehicle of ideology, discourse is of considerable social significance in this connection*’ (ibid: 27-28) (my emphasis).

In this chapter we will first discuss and exemplify how ideology affects language, becomes a carrier of intertextuality and gives rise to problems of translatability. Then we will go on to consider how translators both deal with these problems and also bring to the process of translation ideological choices of their own, or of their employing institutions.

### 4.3 Ideology in language

As we have indicated above, language both spoken and written is the commonest manifestation of social behaviour. According to Terry Eagleton (2007: 9), ideology ‘concerns the actual uses of language between particular human subjects for the production of specific effects’. Language is also what gives peoples and nations their sense of identity. Yasir Suleiman (2003) has investigated the interaction between the Arabic language and the development of nationalist ideology in the Arab Middle East, and he notes that in every kind of nationalist discourse the past ‘plays an authenticating and legitimizing role’, and thus:

It confers on the nation the appearance of vertical unity in diachronic time, thus enabling it to counterbalance the horizontal diversity of cultural and physical spaces in synchronic time (ibid: 38).

Furthermore, in the case of Arabic, it is the Qur’ān which has conferred upon this language its special status and prestige amongst its speakers as the medium of God’s final, universal revelation and which has thus set it apart from all other languages, as indicated in Q41:44 (ibid: 43):

ولو جعلناه قرآناً أعجمياً لقالوا لولا أنزلت آياته لأعجمي وعربي...

Consequently language becomes ‘the carrier of a nation’s culture, as this is expressed through its literature and other modes of linguistic production’ (ibid: 134). We have already referred in 4.2 above to Fairclough’s contributions to critical discourse analysis in English. We should also at this point mention the pioneering work in critical linguistics of Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress (1979/1993), which helped to clarify the connections between language and ideology in particular social situations. In reviewing their contribution, Mason (2007: 345) observes that one thing they did which is of direct relevance to translation studies was that they ‘pioneered the method of tracing the discursive history of (inter)textual use, a kind of discourse analytic archaeology that shows sequences of recontextualization of items in successive texts’. We shall be referring to this again briefly with regard to Hodge and Kress’s examination of the expression *mother of [all] battles* as used first by Saddam Hussein in 1991, and then in later English entextualizations, in the context of our study in the next chapter. Clearly, in the light of what we have already discussed in 3.3 above, any language also becomes

a carrier of a web of intertextual relationships, which are in fact inextricably bound up with the ideology and which operate both within and outside the spoken or written text. We can further investigate this proposition by discussing a few examples, first in English and then in Arabic.

Journalism, in every language but particularly in English at the present time, can generally be relied upon as a rich and inexhaustible quarry of material for the study of ideology and intertextuality in action. We have already noted this with some examples in the previous chapter. Moreover, its more critical and sophisticated consumers will be aware of a tension that often seems to exist between plain news reporting and comment on (or evaluation of) a given news story. Journalists and their editors often appear to be both ‘monitoring’ and ‘managing’ – to use Beaugrande and Dressler’s (1981) terminology – at the same time. The Dubai debt crisis of late November 2009 gave rise to much coverage in the British ‘quality press’ which combined reporting of the financial facts (and the opaque political realities behind them) with at least as much comment, both explicit and implicit, regarding Dubai as a celebrity ‘fallen icon’ and regarding the Arab world in general. One short article in *The Times* of 28 November 2009 (p.7) by its reporter Richard Kerbaj had the title *Ties to ‘Sheikh Mo’ run deep*, and began with this paragraph:

He’s the Facebook sheikh who presides over a desert kingdom that has become a beacon of modernity in the Arab world. But for “Sheikh Mo”, the hereditary ruler of Dubai, the dream is rapidly turning into a nightmare.

The article is essentially of the expository type, with the ostensible purpose of providing background information on the present Ruler of Dubai, his position and achievements there and his financial and other connections with Britain. Yet it also contains an element of evaluation in its conclusion, speculating that unless Abu Dhabi intervenes with the necessary support, ‘Sheikh Mohammed will have to soak up the pain of losing face, a monumental embarrassment in the Arab world’. The rhetorical aim of the opening short paragraph seems to be to set up some apparent contrasts or oppositions in the minds of readers and thus to prepare them for the possibility that the subject of the piece may soon become a ‘fallen icon’. It uses the common-enough device of cataphora to uphold the textual standard of ‘informativity’ (see 3.2.3 above) in a standard

journalistic fashion, but the choice of language is more than mere cliché: it indicates an outlook, an ideological stance as defined earlier which automatically invokes ‘intertexts’ (again, as we have explained above in 3.3). First of all, the words *sheikh*, *desert kingdom*, *Arab world* and *hereditary ruler* would seem to belong together in the minds of most target readers, with their suggestion of traditional autocracy in a bleak and stagnant environment. *Facebook* and *beacon of modernity*, however, belong on the other side of the lexical and connotative fence, and the writer cleverly begins by conjuring up the unexpected image of ‘the Facebook sheikh’ and (whether consciously or otherwise) reminds us of it later when he ends by suggesting the possibility of the same person ‘losing face’. Dubai is in fact called an ‘emirate’, not a kingdom; but the words *desert kingdom* (a well-established collocation in English) not only carry an allusion to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia but also (because of the prevailing cultural notion that deserts are uniform and empty places) serve to call up images of an essentially empty, barren world – the *Arab world* – which stands in particular need of *modernity*. The sequence of verb tenses used likewise seems to contribute to the sense of achievement followed by decline or disappointment: Dubai *has become* a beacon of modernity, but now ‘the dream’ *is rapidly turning into* a nightmare. ‘The dream’ has not actually been mentioned, let alone specified before in the text. We can consider it, perhaps, as a form of cataphoric device, referring forward to more information about Sheikh Mohammed’s role in developing Dubai in the following paragraph; but it also seems to be intertextual, given that the title of a separate article printed directly above it on the same page is *From desert dreams of Ozymandias, emirate awakes to reality of debt*. In fact, Ozymandias (a good example of an intertext in the form of a single proper name) raised his shattered visage more than once in the British ‘quality press’ during the week in question, but it is not clear why – apart from the clearly motivated foregrounding technique – the sub-editor on *The Times* chose to use these particular words when Shelley himself does not suggest that the former potentate had been a dreamer.

A translator tasked with rendering the above journalistic paragraph into Arabic would be faced with several problems. The first and main one would be deciding how to deal with the cataphora in the English and how (or indeed whether) to try to preserve the

informativity and rhetorical function of the source-text opening paragraph. This is a type of translation problem that has been discussed by Hatim (1997b: 94-98), especially in view of the fact that cataphora as a grammatical, stylistic and rhetorical device has traditionally been discouraged in Arabic, as we have noted above in 3.2.3. Then there would be the problem of the mildly emotive discourse in the English (*desert kingdom, hereditary ruler*, for example), the need to explicate or paraphrase as required (*the Facebook sheikh*) and the cultural requirement to show respect when naming persons in authority, hereditary or otherwise (the writer of the article nowhere tells us who exactly calls the Ruler of Dubai ‘Sheikh Mo’).

Religious discourse mixed with political commentary is generally not expected in ‘mainstream’ contemporary English texts. In recent years it has, however, come to be expected in the translated versions of ‘Islamist’ discourse, sometimes of an apocalyptic nature, emanating from the leaders of al-Qā’idah or other extremist groups. Yet historically English has over many centuries been a rich carrier of religious ideology – and therefore discourse – combined with political thought or commentary, and this tradition has continued into a new century, given new life by the power of the internet. This new, highly emotive religious ideology is alive and well in the hands of ‘fundamentalist’ or ‘evangelical’ Christians of a certain outlook, particularly those in the USA whose religious attitudes are aligned to the ‘neo-conservative’ world view of George W. Bush and his associates. Any good news its proponents have to offer is clearly not available to everyone. In an online ‘commentary’ for the Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN.com) on 13 October 2000, under the title *Times Are Scary in Israel, but Not for Israel*, the late Bob Slosser first mentions having visited Israel in 1975, and then writes [presumably in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations and the start of the second Palestinian intifadha in the autumn of that year]:

This is a scary time for Israel and the world, folks, but it’s a lot scarier for the Palestinians and the world. Israel knows where it’s [sic] future lies and with Whom. That doesn’t mean people won’t die, of course. There is always that risk, but God is in control. Israel *must* know that, by faith, just as Christians *must*. “Israel, behold your God.”

Many Americans are concerned understandably as to whether the United States will be among those standing with Israel during the world’s climactic confrontation in the times ahead when the Lord does battle for His People against the kingdoms of the world. The Washington, European, Asian, Arab and

other administrations have caused considerable concern to conservative Jewish, evangelical Christian, and Roman Catholic communities in recent years. Israel has been more and more isolated.

The ‘commentary’ continues in this vein until reaching its conclusion with a quotation from a Roman Catholic writer:

“Anyone, therefore, who disputes Israel’s right to the land of Canaan opposes God, His holy covenant with the patriarchs and His solemn utterances and promises.”

Perhaps the most salient feature of this extract is the primacy in the mind of the writer of ‘Israel’ as an idealized religious concept, rather than of the State of Israel as a reality affecting the lives of others. This provides the ‘Christian Zionist’ ideological coherence in writing that is not very strong on cohesion. There is ‘Biblical’ language, of course, alluding to the apocalyptic landscape of the Book of Revelation, *when the Lord does battle for His People against the kingdoms of the world*. Words also take on loaded and curious meanings, with ‘conservative’ folk apparently in a hurry to see the world they know end in a *climactic confrontation*.

It seems strange now to reflect that this type of discourse, with its folksy, blinkered millenarianism pre-dated the events of ‘9/11’. Whether or not its continuation into the new millennium reflects some disappointment that the world has not yet ended at Armageddon is a matter for conjecture. Yet even without ‘9/11’ the scene was clearly set for such discourse to continue in English as much as, if not more than in any other language in the new century, since the ideology was well-entrenched and the internet the perfect vehicle for it. The same Bob Slosser warmed again to his familiar theme for CBN.com on 8 June 2001 (by which time George W. Bush had become President), under the title *Remember Two Things as You Watch Bush and the Mideast*, opening as follows:

A majority of evangelical Christians roll their eyeballs and shake their heads, then yell in anger, when they read or hear that President Bush or Secretary of State Powell have called for a cease-fire and restraint after horrible bloodshed in Israel.

And there are a sizeable number of evangelicals in this and other fine countries of the world who shout, “Not again!” or, “When are you going to do something to stop that madman?”

They’re speaking of Yasser Arafat, chairman of the Palestinian [sic] Liberation Organization, whose rather shabby figure is seen almost daily around the world. Those who speak disdainfully of “the liberal

press” characterize the omnipresent Arab in similar fashion as the “darling of the liberals”, especially “the American liberals”. In person, I’ve never heard anyone speak warmly of the man. Either I move in narrow circles or the pollsters avoid my friends and neighbours. Keep the faith, beloved.

The writer then goes on to address the ‘beloved’ [‘conservative Christian’ readership] on the theological question of whether or not ‘Israel’ is still rightly to be regarded as ‘the special, treasured possession of God’ and also on the more immediate question of the new President Bush’s ‘beliefs about Israel and the end times’, as part of ‘a developing Bush Doctrine for the entire world’.

In this ‘commentary’ the prevailing ideological current so starkly evident is, again, ‘Christian Zionism’. However, racist discourse also makes an early appearance in the treatment of the late Yasser Arafat, who is not only a *rather shabby figure* but also an *omnipresent Arab* and *chairman of the Palestinian [sic] Liberation Organization* – a person not even an American ‘liberal’ would be likely to ‘speak warmly of’. As for *Keep the faith, beloved*, it comes across to the uninitiated as a sort of code: an ideological nod and a wink to upholders of a faith that could never reach out to include the likes of Yasser Arafat.

These online offerings to the ‘beloved’ from the desk of the late Bob Slosser are examples of obscurantist religious and racist discourse relating to the Middle Eastern scene around the turn of the millennium. A decade or so later, it can be said that the situation is quite a lot worse. The Internet has become an ‘information Wild West’, as exemplified by the gross distortions disseminated by websites such as *lastcrusade.org* (Geisweiller 2010).

Turning now to Arabic, we can find good examples of a more straightforward type of political ideology in the earlier speeches of Saddam Hussein. Some of these were published by the Government Printing House in Baghdad in 1972 under the title **خطب وتصريحات السيد صدام حسين نائب رئيس مجلس قيادة الثورة**. The speeches (to various conferences or other official gatherings) were delivered by Saddam – then only in his thirties – in his capacity as ‘Vice-Chairman of the [Ba’ath Party] Revolutionary



Command Council', and they reflect the socialist, nationalist, Pan-Arab and anti-colonialist outlook of the Party in the early years following its definitive seizure of power in July 1968. The official ideology of the Ba'athist state developed against the background of the Cold War and the close relations between Iraq and the Soviet Union; and Saddam and other Ba'athist leaders were at pains to reach out, by direct or indirect means, to all sections of Iraqi society (to women, to workers, to students, to farmers, etc) and to indoctrinate them with the Party's all-embracing ideology, as Ofra Bengio describes, through the process that came to be dubbed **تبعيث** or 'Ba'athification' (Bengio 1998: 49-51). The following passage is the opening of an address by Saddam to the Conference of the General Confederation of Farmers' Associations on 1 July 1970:

**خطاب الاستاذ صدام حسين في مؤتمر الاتحاد العام للجمعيات الفلاحية في 1/ 7 /1970:**

ايها الاخوان

ننتهز فرصة حضوركم في هذا المؤتمر لكي نتبادل معكم ما نشعره من اهمية اىصال وجهة نظر الثورة ووجهة نظر حزبكم الى جموع الفلاحين العمود البارز والاساسي من اعمدة الثورة ومسيرتها الظافرة في طريق بناء الاشتراكية والتقدم وبهذه المناسبة راح يكون حديثنا منصب على ما نلاحظه من تحركات من عناصر الرجعية المشبوهة المتضررة بمسيرة الثورة وبتطبيق قانون الاصلاح الزراعي...

The above is just the start of a very lengthy address in which Saddam expands on the Party's policy for the agricultural sector and the problems caused by feudalists and other counter-revolutionary agents of foreign, colonialist powers. The language is predominantly modern standard Arabic, but with shifts into Baghdadi colloquial (first appearing here with **راح يكون حديثنا...**) which become more frequent as the speech continues. Ideology is seen in the abstract lexicon of revolutionary dogma: for example, in **وجهة نظر الثورة...and**

**...and again من اعمدة الثورة الظافرة في طريق بناء الاشتراكية والتقدم...**

...عناصر الرجعية المشبوهة المتضررة بمسيرة الثورة..

It is reasonable to assume that in his Ba'athi speechmaking Saddam was influenced by the earlier revolutionary and Pan-Arab rhetoric of Gamal 'Abdel Nasser, as suggested at the outset by his choice of secular salutation: *ايها الاخوان*. This is a point that we make and exemplify later in 5.2.2, and represents one intertextual feature of Saddam's discourse; there is also the fact that the same type of 'socialist' jargon had been transferred to the soil of Arabic, had taken root and was being used extensively by others in the Arab world at that time, not only in Egypt but also, for example, by Saddam's revolutionary counterparts further south, in the then People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (to which he refers in other speeches of this period). We may note also that Saddam uses the first person plural here, presumably both to assert the authority of the revolutionary Party he represents and to try to involve his audience in its thinking. It is, after all – he tells them at several points in the course of the speech – *their Party*.

Translating a speech of this kind from Arabic to English throws down certain challenges. They are not, however, of the same order as those presented by Saddam's later speeches, with their opaque mixture of genres and their extravagant use of metaphor and general over-lexicalization, as we shall be seeing later in Chapter Five. For the most part, the language of this particular speech may be translated into English in a way that does not violate the expectations of a reader familiar with the international political discourse of the era in question, even though it may sound dated nowadays ('the revolutionary march', 'reactionary elements', 'lackeys of imperialism', 'erroneous tendencies', and so on). Nonetheless decisions will have to be made about how to 'mediate' certain items of un-English Partyspeak that occur regularly later on in this speech (for example, *طموح الشعب المناضل، المناضلين منكم*) in a manner that is both consistent and natural-sounding in English. Should a translator opt for, say, 'struggler' / 'struggling' or something more 'domesticated' such as '[Party] activist(s)'? The Iraqi writer Khalid Kishtainy in fact comments on the key Ba'athist word *نضال* in his somewhat fawning and now very dated Translator's Preface to the collection of Saddam's early speeches which he translated into English in 1979 under the title *Social and Foreign Affairs in Iraq*. After

explaining that this had become one of the key items of new political vocabulary in the Arab world that had ‘helped to revitalize some good old Arabic root-words’, and after briefly reviewing the burdens faced by the ‘Arab nation’ since the nineteenth century (Kishtainy 1979: 7), he goes on to tell us:

*Nidhal* is therefore the one political term which is truly at home in the Arab world and the title of *munadhil* is the most that the struggler can expect as a reward. He is not the activist of Eastern Europe, the militant of British trade unionism, or the fighter of the resistance movement. He is simply the Arab struggler and it also simply means that the two words must go together just like gum Arabic and Arabic numerals (ibid: 7-8).

Kishtainy further suggests that the concept reaches far back into history and has a ‘mystic dimension’ related to the idea of **جهاد**, in the sense that the spiritual legacy of both internal and external struggle summed up in the latter term ‘has been refuelled with the aspirations of socialism and the sacrifices it expects from the people as they march towards the new millennium’ (ibid: 8-9). In other words, we could say, there is an intertextual relationship between the two words. Bengio (1998: 51-52) also describes the evolution of the word **نضال** and its various uses by the Iraqi Ba’ath Party, for which it became the ‘badge of identity’. The term **مناضل** had become not only a synonym of ‘party member’, but also the ‘constant sobriquet’ of Saddam Hussein himself.

There are also the phenomena of motivated style-shifting (between formal, standard language and more colloquial speech) and repetition and parallelism to be taken into account and relayed as far as possible in the translation. Then there is, as always, the need to break up what are mostly long stretches of speech into shorter sentences, while respecting the rhetorical function of the source text. Our translation of the opening would therefore be along these lines:

*Brothers,*

*We take the opportunity to be with you at this conference so as to share with you our thoughts as to the importance of getting across to you the point of view of the Revolution and that of your Party. For all of you farmers are an outstanding and a fundamental pillar of the Revolution and its triumphant march along the road of building a progressive socialism. And so it is that what we have to say here today is*

*going to be directed at those moves that we are aware of on the part of dubious reactionary elements to harm the progress of the Revolution, as it seeks to implement the agricultural reform law...*

#### **4.4 Ideology and the translator**

We have seen in 4.3 above how, as Hatim and Mason (1990: 161) claim, ‘ideologies find their clearest expression in language’. The examples we have provided should be sufficient to illustrate some of the kinds of difficulties facing would-be translators that arise from the ideologies carried by different types of discourse, along with their intertextual features. How would a translator into Arabic, if called upon to do so, deal with *The Times*’s apparently oxymoronic ‘Facebook sheikh’, or Bob Slosser’s deeply pejorative ‘omnipresent Arab’; how would a translator into English decide to relay the meaning of Saddam Hussein’s heavily ideological and intertextual المناضلين منكم? The overall problem, however, goes well beyond the agonising that constantly takes place in the mind of the translator anxious to come up with the most adequate ‘equivalence’ for a particular word or phrase. Ian Mason has demonstrated how in reality the whole translation process is affected by the triad of genre, discourse, and text, which together impose sets of constraints which ‘take precedence over incidental equivalences at the level of the referential meaning of individual lexical items’ (Mason 1994: 33). Such ideological constraints acting upon the work of translators (and representing culture-specific semiotic systems) are of a comprehensive nature:

Consciously or subconsciously, text users bring their own assumptions, predispositions, and general world-view to bear on their processing of text at all levels. Individual lexical choices, cohesive relations, syntactic organisation and theme/rheme progression, text structure and text type are all involved (ibid: 23).

Using the above as a framework for analysis, Mason goes on to present as a subject for micro-level analysis a UNESCO-published magazine article relating to the history and heritage of Mexico, in which there are subtle and significant divergences between the ST Spanish and TT English versions. The same example is also analysed and discussed in Hatim and Mason (1997: 15-17, 35, 153-159), highlighting the fact that the translation into English ‘constituted a radical departure from the source text in terms of

register membership, intentionality, socio-cultural and socio-textual practices' (ibid: 153), with the result that 'this different text world of the target text relays a different ideology' (ibid). Whereas the rhetorical purpose of the ST Spanish is to assert, by counter-argumentation, that the previously neglected contribution of indigenous Mexican voices should be considered when viewing Mexican history, the English version has the effect of privileging the official and better-known historical accounts of the Spanish Conquistadors. The ST has a dynamic and emotive quality which is not reproduced in the more static and conventionally historical exposition of the English translation.

Hatim and Mason see varying degrees of 'mediation' at work in determining 'an underlying motivation or orientation on the part of the translator' (ibid: 147). 'Mediation' is defined by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 182) as 'the extent to which one feeds one's current beliefs and goals into the model of the communicative situation'. Applied to the translation process, this means in more concrete terms 'the extent to which translators *intervene* in the transfer process, feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into their processing of a text' (Hatim and Mason 1997: 147; my emphasis). The example described above is accordingly one involving 'maximal mediation' on the part of the translator in the model presented by Hatim and Mason (ibid: 153), for the reasons we have mentioned. An example of 'minimal mediation' is also presented and analysed. This is from a translation into English of a message from the late Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran to the instructors and students of religious seminaries, and is noteworthy as a 'foreignizing' type of translation in which 'the characteristics of the source text are made entirely visible and few concessions are made to the reader' (ibid: 148). The English version opens with 'In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful' and continues not only with such colourful, emotive and – above all – alien language as '*the crimson of martyrdom and the ink of blood*', '*these deceptive snakes with colourful spots on their skins*' and '*the deceitful face of the World Devourers*', but also with the motivated and heavy repetition of the words 'It was through the war [the Iran-Iraq war of 1980-88] that...' From an overall perspective, what makes this text seem particularly alien to a 'western' readership is the mixture of genres, for example the political polemic, the sermon and some aspects of Islamic jurisprudence. However, in

commenting on it, Hatim and Mason make an important point, and one that is especially relevant to the subject-matter of our next chapter:

Such a combination of generic elements, however, although it is disconcerting for the average English-language reader, is entirely appropriate – and not necessarily perceived as hybrid – in the socio-textual practice of language cultures such as Farsi and Arabic (ibid: 149).

It would, in fact, also have been a lot less alien and ‘disconcerting’ to users of English at various times in the past; but at the present time it is certainly true that such a text comes across as not just unfamiliar but, in many respects, positively outlandish – at least in this type of translation in which, as Hatim and Mason comment (ibid: 150), ‘the translator’s mediation appears to be minimal’.

Often, however, the degree of mediation revealed in a translation lies somewhere between such extremes. Let us consider some instances of this in the opening part of an opinion article that appeared in both an English and an Arabic version in two different newspapers in the UAE in April 2003. The article is written by a prominent businessman in Dubai, Khalaf Aḥmad al-Ḥabtūr, a Gulf notable who moves easily between two cultural worlds and regularly comments on political and intercultural issues in both Arabic and English. It relates to a critical point in the early weeks of the invasion and occupation of Iraq, and – characteristically – addresses George W. Bush and Tony Blair directly. The English version, which appears to have been written by Mr al-Ḥabtūr himself, was published in the ‘Opinion’ section of the *Gulf News* on 9 April 2003 (p.9). The Arabic version appeared in the equivalent section of *Al-Khaleej* the following day, 10 April (p.12). The uncertainty over which version was prepared first need not affect our observation of certain points of convergence and divergence as we examine the opening paragraphs of these two texts.

1) The English version:

***Final message...before it's too late***

The final message...

Before it becomes too late

Mr George Bush, President of the United States of America

Mr Tony Blair, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom

Peace be upon you,

In the name of the Almighty God, in the name of all prophets and Messengers of God,

In the name of Moses, Jesus and Mohammed, the last Prophet,

In the name of the mothers, children and elders of the American, British and Iraqi Peoples, in the name of the youngsters who dream of a better future, of peace and coexistence of all peoples,

In the name of all infants who crawl around, looking forward to the warmth of their mothers and the family life,

In the name of all peoples who seek to live in one society where all cultures interact, and where all talents compete to bring about a better future for humanity,

In the name of generations that have not come yet,

In the name of all those, and for them all, an end must be put for what's taking place in Iraq...

2) The Arabic version:

## الرسالة الأخيرة قبل فوات الأوان

علاقات الأمم، لا تبنى على القهر، ولا على الاكراه، ولا على القوة، فما يجري حالياً يؤسس  
لأحقاق قد لا تنتهي بمئات السنين

السيد جورج بوش رئيس الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية

السيد توني بلير رئيس وزراء بريطانيا

السلام عليكما

باسم الله الواحد الأحد، وباسم الأنبياء والرسل،

باسم موسى وعيسى ومحمد خاتم الأنبياء،

باسم أمهات وأطفال وشيوخ الشعب الأمريكي ولانجليزي والعراقي،

باسم أولئك الشباب الذين لم يغادروا مرحلة الحلم.. الحلم بمستقبل مشرق، بغد أفضل، بالسلام،

بالونام، بالتوافق، بالتفاعل بين حضارات العالم.

باسم كل رضيع، يدب في الأرض واثقاً بدفع الأم، وثقافة المدرسة، والحياة العائلية، والأفة الوطنية.

باسم شعوب العالم الساعية لمجتمع واحد، تتمازج فيه الدول، وتتنافس الكفاءات، لخير الأوطان،

وصولاً نحو حلة زاهية، مشرقة، مشرفة للانسانية،

باسم الأجيال التي لم تأت بعد،

باسم ومن أجل هؤلاء جميعاً.. يجب وقف ما يحدث على أرض العراق..

In certain respects there seems to be very little mediation going on here between the two versions. For example, in the English text readers are likely to be surprised, if not startled, to find an opinion article beginning with a direct address or appeal to well-known politicians and then invoking the name of God and of His prophets and messengers, making it sound like the opening of a sermon or religious tirade. There is also the re-iteration of 'In the name of...' in both versions, with a fairly abrupt transition from the divine to the human, down-to-earth dimensions in this series of invocations. Another feature which is as much evident in the English as it is in the Arabic text is that of 'through-argumentation', a type of argumentative discourse which, according to Hatim's (1997b) typology of texts, 'is characterized by extensive substantiation of an



initial thesis' and seems to enjoy a distinct preference in current Arabic rhetoric (ibid: 47). Thus Mr al-Ḥabtūr's article calls for an urgent cessation of hostilities in Iraq, continues to substantiate his thesis and concludes (again, in the name of all the women, children and men of this world) by appealing to Messrs Bush and Blair to either draw back from their tragic error or resign. There is no citing of any possible counter-arguments to this thesis. This feature also suggests an overall approach of 'minimal mediation'.

At the same time, however, there is some evidence in the English version (whether it was produced by Mr al-Ḥabtūr or someone else) of downtoning and of concessions to the probable expectations of the target readership. Downtoning arising from some appreciation of religious sensibilities seems to be behind the use of 'Almighty God' and 'Mohammed, the last Prophet' in the English, given that the Arabic has the much stronger and more emotive *باسم الله الواحد الأحد* and later *محمد خاتم الأنبياء*. In addition, the effects of the emotive language and the parallelism used in the succeeding paragraphs of the Arabic version have been considerably reduced or even discarded in the English one, which is (intentionally or otherwise) much blander in tone. Thus the Arabic

*باسم أولئك الشباب الذين لم يغادروا مرحلة الحلم.. الحلم بمستقبل مشرق، بعد أفضل، بالسلام،  
بالونام، بالتوافق، بالتفاعل بين حضارات العالم*

becomes the English

...in the name of the youngsters who dream of a better future, of peace and coexistence of all peoples.

A further point worth noting is that the Arabic version quotes, between the title of the piece and the opening salutation, words from a paragraph towards the end of the article which act as an emotive subheading [shown above in italics]. This is not the case in the English version, in which those words are rendered as follows, without any particular saliency:

Relations among peoples could [sic] not be based on oppression or the use of force. What you are doing now is laying down the basis for grudges and bitter feelings that would last many centuries.

It can be argued, of course, that this is simply the result of an editorial decision, rather than one on the part of the author / translator. Yet it does appear to suggest a policy of downtoning in the English version.

Intervention on the part of translators themselves or of their employers or other patrons has become a rich field for investigation within translation studies, particularly since the ‘cultural turn’ which we first mentioned and discussed briefly in Chapter One (1.4). There are many classic instances that have been cited and discussed in the literature on this topic. André Lefevere (1992: 59-72), for example, analyses the ideologically-motivated manipulation of the diary of the Dutch Jewish girl Anne Frank – and consequently the image of its author - in both the 1947 Dutch edition and a 1950 German translation; a type of manipulation that expresses itself largely through the omission of certain sensitive material in the original text. We have already mentioned in 3.3.3 above Lefevere’s description of Edward Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat* as an instance of ‘rewriting’: ‘ideologically’, he claims (ibid: 8), ‘Fitzgerald obviously thinks Persians inferior to their Victorian English counterparts, a frame of mind that allows him to rewrite them in a way in which he would never have dreamed of rewriting Homer, or Virgil’.

Said Faiq (2008: 29) has more recently described the realities of translation in this way:

Translation is not innocent. On the contrary, it has played decisive roles in the formation and/or deformation of cultural realities through its transcreating and interventionist methods across linguistic divides. As such, translation has been used by different cultures for specific domestic agendas.

There is, he explains, a ‘master discourse of translation’, arising out of the fact that specific target reading constituencies ‘have at their disposal established systems of representation, with norms and conventions for the production and consumption of meanings vis-a-vis people, objects and events’: consequently, the process of translation happens within a framework in which points of intercultural identity and difference are highlighted, ‘leading often to the production of target texts that bear almost no resemblance to the realities of the sources, but rather satisfy particular agendas of the translating culture’ (ibid: 30). This, he goes on to claim, is what happened in the case of

the UNESCO magazine bilingual article on the history and heritage of Mexico which we mentioned a little earlier, in which ‘perhaps unwittingly...the constraints and norms of the master discourse seemed to have guided the [English] translation’ (ibid: 35).

In this article and in an earlier contribution (Faiq 2004), Faiq refers to specific instances of the manipulative power of the English language, of Anglo-American culture and of its publishing industry with regard to Arab and Islamic culture. There is, for example, the ‘exoticism’ of Richard Burton’s translation of *The Arabian Nights* – a title which, Faiq comments (2008: 37), is ‘preferred for its exotic and salacious resonance to the original *A Thousand and One Nights*’ and which represents a work that is ‘more famous in the West than in the Arab East’. There is also the ideologically driven marginalization or even exclusion of the work of writers such as ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Munīf, as compared with that of, for example, the Egyptian Nobel Prize winner Najīb Maḥfūz (see also Hatim and Munday 2004: 94-95, 256, 303). Again, there is the media manipulation of certain Arabic religious terms intended to trigger ‘images of violence, terrorism and fundamentalism’ (Faiq 2004: 11). An example of a rather more sophisticated type of manipulation is that from *The Times* newspaper which we analysed above in 4.3. Most importantly, perhaps, Faiq argues (2008: 37-38) that the kinds of manipulation, subversion and appropriation that have attended the translation of Arabic (and indeed the whole coverage of the Arab and Islamic world) have had the effect of denying (or at least obscuring) its diversity and heterogeneity:

In the discourse of translation, the Arab/Islamic world has become a homogeneous sign. This in turn ultimately leads to the conclusion that translation also becomes the site of conflictual relationships of power and struggle between the cultures being translated and those doing the translating, with potentially dire consequences and accusations and counter accusations of misrepresentation and subversion.

A major catalyst for this in the new century, he points out (ibid: 38), has been the reaction to the events of 11 September 2001, with the following years seeing ‘an unprecedented use and abuse of stereotypes of Arabs and Islam’, which in turn ‘has also led to the rise of counter (anti-) discourses in the translated culture’.

In their valuable contribution to the recent study of translation and ideology, Susan Cunico and Jeremy Munday (2007a: 141) point out that previous collections of studies

published since the turn of the millennium (including Faiq 2004) have focused especially on literary and religious texts. In so doing, such studies have tended to limit 'wider understanding of how ideological clashes and encounters pervade any context where power inequalities are present'. Cunico and Munday's collection of papers therefore draws attention to the question of ideology in the translation of a range of lesser-studied genres such as academic, legal and scientific writing, political discourse, advertising, national language policies and the discourse of the European Parliament (ibid). Munday himself presents an important new perspective on the issue of how ideology is expressed textually in translation by examining translations into English of certain political speeches or other pronouncements by revolutionary leaders in contemporary Latin America (Munday 2007b). His analysis takes as its starting point the frameworks developed by early proponents of critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis such as Hodge and Kress (1979/1993) and Fairclough (1989/2001); however, he highlights the main weakness of such previous work and its overall perspective, namely that it 'has been performed monolingually, primarily on English texts' (Munday ibid: 198-199). In his own study of English translations of political texts in Spanish (Fidel Castro's proclamation in 2006 regarding his temporary handing over of power to his brother, Hugo Chavez's anti-Bush speech to the UN in the same year, and web-disseminated statements by the Mexican rebel 'subcomandante Marcos' around the turn of the millennium), Munday goes on to show how the frameworks previously developed to link language use with ideology need to be applied with some caution to the translation process; this is because of the more complex discursive situation, the role of both translators and those who commission and control their work, and the fact that some lexicogrammatical choices may be unconscious rather than consciously reflecting an ideological motivation. Interestingly, Munday finds that, while on the one hand translations that would appear to be controlled by the source text originator (for example, the Cuban government's official translations of Castro's speeches) in fact exhibit some blurring of the message perspective through translation choices, on the other hand translations of sensitive and significant texts such as the Castro proclamation and the Chavez UN speech in the foreign press and other agencies that could be expected to be hostile or at least biased 'may actually be more faithful to those source text structures and message' (ibid: 213). Examples of this latter phenomenon that he earlier cites are translations of Castro's proclamation in the *Miami*

*Herald* newspaper and on the BBC World Service website, the latter provided by the BBC Monitoring Service, whose task is ‘to provide as direct access as is possible to key foreign-language communiqués for its news, analysis and intelligence services’ (ibid: 203). In the light of his own analysis, then, Munday concludes: ‘It is not therefore possible to predict the translation strategy based on the TT publication outlet’ (ibid: 213-214).

#### **4.5 Ideology and Media Translation**

Related to the issue of power inequalities is that of news translation, a phenomenon that has recently been receiving attention from scholars in translation and cultural studies. Esperança Bielsa and Susan Bassnett, for example, describe the assembly of a newspaper as following a pattern similar to that of the translation process, being ‘a deliberate and conscious act of selection, involving the structuring, assembling and fabricating of information into a format that will satisfy the expectations of readers’ (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009: 12). Not surprisingly, then, they note that news translation does not commonly take the form of direct translation of a text from one language into another, but much more often involves ‘the restructuring of material in a form congenial to the target readership’ (ibid). They also make certain points that are of direct relevance to our own study in the next chapter. First is the difference in stylistic conventions – including between English and other European languages – which calls for adjustments in translation to overcome problems of translatability even when the relaying of content is relatively straightforward. Thus, the often crude but comic short headlines that tend to be a feature of the British tabloid press

would be unacceptable practice in many countries, though unacceptable to British readers would be the use of hyperbole and highly florid rhetoric that is the norm in much of the Arab world, for example. *Translating such rhetoric literally has the effect of making the speaker ridiculous, as has been the case with the English translations of extracts from speeches by political figures such as Colonel Gaddafi or Saddam Hussein* (ibid) (my emphasis).

The second point concerns the variation in the acceptability of register shift in different languages. Bielsa and Bassnett explain the contrasting situation between languages like Arabic and Farsi, in which register shift is ‘relatively unproblematic’, and English, in

which it is ‘highly significant’ because shifts of register ‘can signal major shifts of meaning or of position’ (ibid).

The underlying thesis of Bielsa and Bassnett’s study is that there are important issues of truthfulness and trustworthiness surrounding news translation, as provided by foreign correspondents and news agencies to which they are linked, particularly since they ‘write and shape stories for designated audiences’ (ibid: 132). This is exemplified in the differing ways in which news of the capture and subsequent trial of Saddam Hussein was dealt with in specific British, French and Italian newspapers (ibid: 118-132). Bielsa and Bassnett show how, for example, in the case of coverage of Saddam’s trial by two British newspapers, the *Independent* and the *Daily Telegraph*, there is a clear contrast between the ways in which these publications represented the proceedings and the participants in the courtroom (based rather vaguely on official transcripts and, presumably, their own reporting). They note that, since in the case of news translation the only traceable source is an event – ‘and not any single identifiable textual account of that event’, it usually happens that ‘the source material is synthesized even as it is transferred across languages, then adjusted stylistically in accordance with target culture norms’ (ibid: 123). A further interesting and relatively uncommon feature of the material they illustrate is that the reporting format chosen by these newspapers is that of the dramatic text, with the protagonists’ names given before each utterance. In other words, the news event is ‘theatricalized’ – and this fact, as Bielsa and Bassnett argue, ‘deserves critical attention, since this would seem to be a strategy utilized for a particular end’ (ibid: 122). They go on to present and analyze two rather differing ‘transcripts’ that appeared in the *Independent* and the *Daily Telegraph* newspapers in Britain on 2 July 2004 by way of reporting the fairly brief appearance of the former dictator before an Iraqi judge (with the *Daily Telegraph* version of events considerably shorter than that published in the *Independent*).

In considering these two published transcripts, comment Bielsa and Bassnett (ibid: 124), the question that is raised is one of both trust and veracity:

Readers unable to access an original Arabic version have to rely on what they read in English as offering an accurate, truthful version of what took place in the courtroom. Yet even a cursory reading of the two versions shows some significant differences.

At the outset of the proceedings, when the judge asks Saddam for his identity, the two versions differ in important respects, and as Bielsa and Bassnett put it (*ibid*), ‘we can grasp the gist of the exchanges between Saddam and the judge, but little else.’ The concluding exchange between these two protagonists in the courtroom is also presented rather differently. The *Independent* has it as follows:

SADDAM: Then please allow me not to sign anything until the lawyers are present.

JUDGE: That is fine. But this is your...

SADDAM: I speak for myself.

JUDGE: Yes, as a citizen you have the right. But the guarantees you have to sign because these were read to you, recited to you.

SADDAM: Anyway, why are you worried? I will come again before you with the presence of the lawyers, and you will be giving me all of these documents again. So why should we rush any action now and make mistakes because of rushed and hasty decisions or actions?

JUDGE: No, this is not a hasty decision-making now. I’m just investigating. And we need to conclude and seal the minutes.

SADDAM: No, I will sign when the lawyers are present.

JUDGE: Then you can leave.

SADDAM: Finished?

JUDGE: Yes.

According to the *Daily Telegraph* version, however, this preliminary court hearing ended rather more abruptly, albeit without any sign of a confrontation:

SADDAM: Would you accept if I do not sign this until the attendance of my lawyers?

JUDGE: This is one of your rights.

SADDAM: I am not interfering with your responsibilities.

JUDGE: Fine, then let it be recorded that he has not signed. You are dismissed from the court.

SADDAM: Finished?

JUDGE: Finished.

SADDAM (as he is led away by guards): Take it easy, I’m an old man.

In this second version Saddam has less to say, and according to the published 'stage direction' at the end he makes a remark to his guards which is 'rendered into colloquial British English, a register that jars with the language he has been represented as using hitherto' (Bielsa and Bassnett *ibid*: 126).

Bielsa and Bassnett point out (*ibid*) that, even if both versions could be said to give the gist of what happened in the courtroom, the divergence in areas of detail does matter to readers who expect veracity in news reporting. Furthermore:

From the perspective of a translation analyst, these differences also matter greatly, because the two texts create a very different impression of the event and, were they to be dramatized, actors would find themselves playing very different roles depending on which script they were given.

When the whole content and varying language and register of the two transcripts is taken into account, Bielsa and Bassnett demonstrate in their analysis, it is fair to come to the following overall conclusion. On the one hand, the *Independent* version considered overall (we have not reproduced it in its entirety here) makes Saddam seem a more serious and articulate figure, since the newspaper has clearly decided to retain a measure of 'foreignness' in the (translated) language, which 'serves both as a reminder to readers that the proceedings were not conducted in English and supplies a hint of Saddam's personal style of speaking', thus reinforcing the idea of authenticity. The fact that this particular newspaper has a reputation for having consistently taken an interest in reporting on the Middle East and for having opposed the war in Iraq 'is a contributory factor in the process of representation of Saddam' (*ibid*). The *Daily Telegraph*, on the other hand, provided its readers with a domesticated translation of the proceedings, with traces of the foreign being kept to a minimum and Saddam generally appearing shabby and ridiculous. As Bielsa and Bassnett comment:

These subtle textual differences lead readers in rather different directions. It is important to remember that domestication brings a text wholly into the target system, while the retention of foreign elements reminds readers that what they are encountering derives from somewhere else (*ibid*: 127).

News translation, then, consists of varying degrees of manipulation, resulting in texts (tailored to particular readerships) that do not fit the standard, traditional definitions of translation. Study of this phenomenon and the manipulative processes involved can therefore serve to make us more aware of what really lies behind the news we read and



hear, and to ‘raise serious questions about the extent to which we can ever know what was or what was not said in another cultural context’ (ibid: 132).

In this connection, Jerry Palmer discusses the interesting and important case of the Mahmoud Ahmadinejad speech to which we referred earlier in 3.3.3 (Palmer 2009: 189). He explains that, because news translation takes place at various different stages in the overall process of news gathering and dissemination, ‘translated material may exist in several, sometimes divergent, versions’ (ibid). This is what happened in this case, Ahmadinejad’s apparent statement that ‘Israel should be wiped off the map’ first being quoted in English-language media after being taken from versions of a speech published in Farsi by the official Iranian news agency on 26 October 2005. In the following hours, three translations of this speech were widely circulated among international and transnational media; one was done by the Farsi section of the BBC Monitoring department, one by correspondents of the *New York Times* working in Teheran, and one by the pro-Israeli, US-based monitoring organization MEMRI (Middle East Media Research Institute).

These translations showed significant differences, ‘and have since been heavily contested’ (ibid). As well as illustrating various factors at work in contemporary ‘news translation’, argues Palmer (ibid), including the relationship between *in extenso* translation and summary (‘since the phrase in question was only a small part of an extensive text which was already summarized in the translations referred to’), this case ‘shows – by being the exception that tests the rule – how rarely translation in news is questioned’. Finally, a point that Palmer does not highlight, but which seems to be important, is that it was the English language that acted in this case, as with many others, as the dominant discourse in world affairs, presenting its versions (or at least its key quotation) as the clear and indisputable ‘equivalent’ of the source text.

At this point it is worth noting that certain forms of media manipulation of the text-receiver (whether deliberately conceived or not) seem to take place regularly within any given language and culture – and not least at what is commonly thought of as the ‘quality’ end of news and opinion provision. Often, of course, the most obvious manipulative device is the headline, which discerning but busy readers absorb fleetingly, may analyze critically for an instant, but are nonetheless influenced by as they read or skim the item in question. But sub-titles and sub-headings also play a major part in

steering the thoughts of the reader, and at times appear to be inserted by a sub-editor who has either not read the actual text carefully enough or thinks that readers will not bother to read carefully. An example of this occurs in an opinion article by Richard Haass published in *The Times* on 12 February 2010 under the title *'Only one force can stop Iran now: its people'*. The article is about Iran's nuclear enrichment activities on the one hand, and the protest movement against the current government in Iran on the other. In one paragraph in the middle of the article the writer explains that the current situation is not a stable one: he summons up for his readers a scenario in which Iran 'could provoke an Israeli or American preventive military strike against its nuclear facilities', which would be likely to prompt Iranian retaliation throughout the region, with oil supplies vital for world economic recovery being disrupted. The alternative scenario, he suggests, would be hardly more desirable:

But tolerating an Iranian nuclear weapon would almost certainly lead several of Iran's neighbours to develop or acquire nuclear weapons of their own, leaving the Middle East perched uneasily on a nuclear precipice. In terms of global risk, Iran is now centre stage (my emphasis added).

Shortly after this, the following sub-title appears prominently, right in the centre of the article: *'The Middle East is perched uneasily on a nuclear precipice'*. This – for any scrupulous reader – is a blatant and rather melodramatic distortion of the actual message in the text, which clearly expresses a future possibility and not a current fact.

A further – and related - new field of research in translation studies that we should briefly take note of here is that of narrative theory, the concept of 'framing' and the neutrality or otherwise of translators dealing with contested issues in a world of political and ideological conflict. Mona Baker (2006a, 2006b, 2007) has been prominent in this area, and has investigated narrative theory and the notion of framing 'to explore various ways in which translators and interpreters accentuate, undermine or modify contested aspects of the narrative(s) encoded in the source text or utterance' (Baker 2007: 189). As we might expect, several of her examples have to do with the Israel/Palestine conflict and the 'War on Terror', and such major sites of conflict inevitably invite 'framing' strategies by translators and interpreters and the agencies that employ them. The essential point is that 'processes of (re)framing can draw on practically any linguistic or non-linguistic resource to set up an interpretive context for the reader or

hearer' (ibid: 196): translators of written text can do this either by using various linguistic devices within the text or by adding items around it (for example, by adding introductory information, subheadings, footnotes and so on). According to Baker:

This distinction can be very important in some contexts because of the key role that the notions of accuracy and faithfulness tend to assume in the context of professional and particularly politically sensitive translation (ibid).

She demonstrates here (ibid: 196-199, and with more detail in Baker 2006a: 73-76, 108-109) how this can be observed in the translation activities of the neo-conservative advocacy organization MEMRI (= Middle East Media Research Institute) in the U.S. MEMRI is careful to produce accurate translations in order to win and sustain credibility; however, as even a cursory trawl through translated items from the Arab media on the MEMRI website ([www.memri.org](http://www.memri.org)) will indicate, such concern for accuracy and faithfulness has to be set against an obvious strategy of deliberately selecting Arabic source texts 'to elaborate a narrative of Arab societies as extremist, anti-semitic and a threat to western democracies'. This, as Baker points out, is the first and basic form of framing used by MEMRI and other similar organizations such as *Watching America*: the use of 'the narrative feature of selective appropriation' to frame (or, in other words, to portray by default) the Arab world as extremist and dangerous 'by simply choosing to translate the worst possible examples of Arab discourse, which they also circulate to the media and Congress free of charge'. (We cite two such MEMRI translations in the next chapter in the course of our discussion in 5.2.2.)

The *Guardian* journalist and Middle East specialist Brian Whitaker first drew attention to the activities of MEMRI, questioning its impartiality and underlying agenda in particular, in his 2002 article '*Selective MEMRI*', then a year later engaged in an online debate on that subject with the MEMRI President Yigal Carmon, a former colonel in Israeli military intelligence (Whitaker 2002, 2003). Baker (2007: 196-199) describes how other, more specific framing devices are also regularly used by MEMRI. There is the arbitrary assigning of titles to translated items so as to give them an alien and threatening character; then, the insertion of images along with captions in the English text that 'frame the translated narrative as part of the broad, meta-narrative of the War on Terror'; and finally – 'and perhaps most importantly' – the provision by MEMRI of

annotated links to video clips to accompany a particular translation, thus adding a further framing device which has the effect of ‘encouraging the reader to interpret even the most reasonable of Arabic discourse as one that hides an extremist subtext’. This is something that Whitaker also returns to in his 2005 article *‘Arabsats Get the MEMRI Treatment’* (Whitaker 2005). Interestingly, Baker (ibid) notes, amongst a range of foreign languages translated it is only Arabic and Persian that have been subjected to this last-named framing strategy (that is, the use of links to MEMRI videos ‘that serve to demonize the community in question’).

Framing by translators and others can - and indeed does – also happen in the opposite direction. In the case of book translations, Baker (2007: 199) mentions such paratextual elements as cover images and blurb, introductions, prefaces and footnotes as significant sites for manipulation or intervention – the first two on the part of publishers and the last three on the part of translators. She cites the case of two Arabic translations of the book *The Clash of Civilizations* by Samuel Huntington, one published in Egypt in 1998 and the second in Libya the following year. In both translated versions either the Arab translators themselves or other Arab intellectuals have added lengthy introductions serving effectively as counter-arguments to Huntington’s thesis, and thus they pre-empt the response of their target readership to his original line of argument:

They [the introductions] frame the translated texts that follow them in very negative terms, encouraging the readers to interpret Huntington’s thesis from a specific angle even before they start reading it (ibid).

Elsewhere Baker (2006b: 481) makes the point that translators, in common with other professional groups, are nowadays finding it increasingly hard to adopt a ‘neutral’ stance in relation to the various conflicting narratives circulating in today’s world. The worldwide web allows activists for a range of causes to use professional translation ‘to elaborate their alternative narratives across national and linguistic boundaries’, while the activist translators themselves ‘are beginning to organize themselves in various ways in order to elaborate their own narratives and play a distinct role in shaping an alternative vision of the world’. A future line of research to be pursued in translation studies, according to Baker, should therefore be to use narrative theory in order to critique not only their translation practices ‘but also their own narratives about

themselves': this is important 'not least because developing a critical stance towards the stories circulating among members of a community may ultimately help it to avoid sustaining the very narratives it set out to challenge' (ibid). Similarly, Munday (2001, 2008: 138-139) has already drawn attention to the fact that 'cultural theorists' approaching translation from various committed perspectives such as feminism and postcolonialism do of course have their own ideological agendas, and therefore apply their own forms of manipulation and intervention to the business of translating.

#### 4.6 *Conclusion*

In this chapter, we have examined the meaning of ideology in its broadest, socio-linguistic sense as a carrier not only of cultural conditioning and therefore intertextuality, but also of manipulation by text producers, by translators and by those who control the processes of translating and disseminating information. At this point it is perhaps appropriate briefly to re-state **the method we have adopted in this study** (as originally set out in the **Introduction**) as a preparation for the examination of our sample Saddam speeches in the next and final chapter. We began by reviewing what we consider a relevant history of ideas about translation: relevant both to our own topic and sample material (in which one question that arises is whether a literal translation is inevitably a 'faithful' one) and indeed also to important contemporary issues in translation studies, as shown by the way Bielsa and Bassnett, for example, in their 2009 study cited above, have highlighted the importance of those perennial concerns 'veracity' and 'trust' in the present-day domain of news translation. Building upon that broad foundation, we have begun to examine in Chapter Two the whole problem of 'equivalence' in translating between Arabic and English. This initial examination has then been given further depth through the topics that we have discussed and exemplified here and above in Chapter Three. Furthermore, we have previously (in 2.3) mentioned the notion of '**communicative equivalence**' as posited by Neubert and Shreve (1992: 143-145); they see it as 'a result of deliberately mediated intertextuality' and as an 'integrated and interdisciplinary' approach to translation which takes into account a range of factors that affect the translation process (ibid: 145). Our chosen method has thus been to discuss and exemplify a number of ideas, problems and realities affecting translation with a

view to using them as analytical tools for the investigation of our material in Chapter Five. Keeping this complex ideological and intertextual reality of language that we have so far illustrated in mind, then, as we proceed now to analyse our specific sample of Arabic texts, we shall consider how and to what extent such 'communicative equivalence' has been, or could be achieved in translating such challenging material from a different cultural world for the benefit of the English-speaking target reader.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### TRANSLATING SADDAM: THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNICATIVE EQUIVALENCE

#### 5.1 *Introduction*

In the previous chapters we have endeavoured both to survey the development of ideas, debates and realities connected with the business of translating and to present the whole question of equivalence in translation (specifically between Arabic and English) as one involving problematic linguistic, cultural and ideological dimensions. In Chapter Three we built on the foundation of our initial examination of equivalence and translatability problems in Chapter Two by looking deeper into the whole-text domain of communication and especially the phenomenon of **intertextuality** and the translation challenges it can present. Then, in our previous chapter, we discussed how such intertextual ingredients of language are ‘carried’ by the overarching vehicle of **ideology**, realized through **discourse**. We also exemplified ways in which translators **intervene** or ‘**mediate**’ in the process of translating interlingually and interculturally; furthermore, we saw how in the domain of international news, world politics and ideological conflict especially, translation tends to be carried out by the staff of agencies or media organizations with particular missions or affiliations. In this latter context translation naturally becomes something less than ‘innocent’, with its various stages and processes easily subjected to forms of **manipulation** by those controlling the output of news ‘in translation’.

With this background in mind, we now proceed to a study of two key speeches delivered by the late deposed Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein in the months preceding the invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq by American and British forces that began with air attacks on targets in Baghdad on 19 March 2003. These particular speeches

have been selected as a sample for examination mainly because of the availability of both the original Arabic texts and their translations into English published both online and in at least one newspaper. Both, as will be explained further below, were broadcast on dates that were anniversaries important in the political and ideological calendar of Saddam himself and of his 'Arab Ba'ath Socialist Party' (ABSP). The first was on 8 August 2002, the 14<sup>th</sup> anniversary of 'the Great Day of Victory', as the Ba'ath regime termed the day in 1988 on which hostilities with Iran were officially set to cease. The second was on 17 January 2003, probably the more significant of these two dates since it marked the 12<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 'mother of battles' (the beginning of the Gulf War over Kuwait in 1991) at a point in time when a further, major confrontation between Saddam's Iraq and a foreign military coalition was starting to seem inevitable. The speeches are in essence reformulations of previous speeches delivered on the same occasions over the previous decade and more, and they represent a considerable ideological shift from the language of Saddam's earlier period, when as a younger Ba'athist activist, secular ideologue and leader-in-waiting in the 1970's he gave speeches, lectures and interviews couched in the sort of language we exemplified earlier in 4.3. The original Arabic versions of the speeches in question, together with their translations into English provided by official agencies in Iraq, were found on the Internet and downloaded from a website soon to be defunct prior to the invasion of Iraq in March 2003 and the subsequent overthrow of Saddam. Later it became clear that these official Iraqi translations into English had been disseminated to customers by the BBC Monitoring Service and also (in the case of the second one) reproduced by the *Guardian* newspaper in print and online. In the latter case they were reproduced as given, whereas the BBC Monitoring Service output included editorial insertions such as brief introductions and sub-headings.

The translations provided by translators in Iraq (whose conditions of work, remuneration and level of professional motivation at the time can only be guessed at) are definitely of the 'foreignizing' type, which we saw earlier in 4.4 with the example of the Khomeini text, making the source text characteristics abundantly visible through a mainly 'literal' translation strategy and making few concessions, if any, to target English-speaking readers with limited knowledge and understanding of the Arab and



Islamic context. The apparent generic hybridity of the texts, combining the elements of sermon, political rallying cry and history lesson, seems disconcertingly alien in the English translations, but – as we noted above in 4.4 – is something by no means unfamiliar in what Hatim and Mason (1997: 149) term the ‘socio-textual practice’ of language cultures such as Arabic and Farsi. The colourful rhetoric and sometimes extravagant use of metaphor in the speeches also contrive to produce, in literal English translation, an alien and sometimes ‘mediaeval’ feel to them. Colourful and even blood-curdling rhetoric has not, of course, been unknown in political discourse in English (witness Enoch Powell’s controversial so-called ‘rivers of blood’ speech regarding immigration in 1968) or in other languages of ‘the West’ (witness some ‘Christian’ discourse found in speeches made during the Spanish Civil War, or by the Greek Colonels, or during the more recent conflicts in the former Yugoslavia). Saddam Hussein’s discourse can, indeed, seem mild, reasoned and pious when compared with a great deal of material (including offensive and abusive ‘comments’) found online these days in the content of websites and the ‘blogosphere’. Nonetheless, we see these texts as exemplars of a type of material that presents a translation problem: how to transfer a message and a world view, however distorted and manipulative, from one cultural, ideological and intertextual world to another, in such a way that the target readers will not simply dismiss the source text as unintelligible or ridiculous foreign ‘gibberish’ that is best thrown straight into the waste bin. Given that this type of material, arising out of and bearing upon international politics and relations, is likely to be ever more prevalent in the new century (and not only in the context of Middle Eastern affairs), it seems important that it should be translated with the highest possible degree of both linguistic and intercultural competence, the latter skill including an understanding of the target language and culture’s ‘intertextual system’ - in other words, of what we described earlier in 3.3.3 as its ‘socio-historical web of linguistic, ideological and intertextual complexities’.

Our aim in this final chapter is therefore to analyze each of these speeches in turn, making use of the analytical tools and concepts we have discussed in the previous chapters. This means considering each one as a whole text presenting a translation challenge and requiring a strategy at the macro level, then identifying some problems of

equivalence and translatability at the micro level as we assess the strengths and weaknesses of the published translations and make suggestions for improvements. While doing this we will seek to keep in mind both the supposed dichotomies in translation approaches that we surveyed in **Chapter One** and the ‘standards of textuality’ mentioned earlier in 3.2.3, particularly the presence of ‘intertexts’ as defined and exemplified in 3.3. Finally, we will seek to judge whether Neubert and Shreve’s (1992) notion of ‘communicative equivalence’, which we cited in 2.3 above, has been, or could be applied to the translation of these texts into English. However, before we can usefully proceed to a study of the texts we need to consider the background to these three speeches in terms of their historical and ideological context, their antecedents, the nature of their content and their (presumed) intended audience, and this will be the subject-matter of the next section.

## ***5.2 Background to the speeches: history, ideology, intertexts and audience***

In order to assess the nature of the texts in question - and consequently the strategic choices facing any conscientious would-be translator into English – some kind of analytical model is required. To provide such a model, what we propose to do at this point (as concisely and with as much relevance to our subject matter as possible) is to examine the political realities of Iraq at the time of the speeches; the ideological outlook, discourse habits and stylistic characteristics of the ‘text producer’ (Saddam Hussein); the common features of overall content (including intertextual elements); and, finally, the nature of the target text receivers, both of the source texts and of their English translations. Further relevant detail will be supplied as necessary later as we study each text.

### ***5.2.1 ‘Saddam’s Iraq’ and the world in 2002-2003***

Comparing Saddam Hussein’s political thinking with that of Gamal Abdel Nasser at a point in the early 1980’s, Peter Mansfield (1982: 62) observed that the two men were ‘the two most influential revolutionary leaders to have emerged in the Eastern Arab

world since World War II'. In Saddam's case, little was known of his ideas at that time in the West 'because few of his speeches have been adequately translated and he only very rarely gives interviews to Western journalists' (ibid). We noted above in 4.3 that the Iraqi writer Khalid Kishtainy translated some of Saddam's early speeches, delivered to various audiences through the 1970's, and at that time entertained a starry-eyed view of the rising and charismatic young political activist. During those years – the first decade following the Ba'ath Party's final takeover of power on 17 July 1968 – Saddam had first to consolidate his own position through partnership with his kinsman Aḥmad Hasan al-Bakr (Marr 2004: 144-146; Tripp 2007: 186-191); but by the late 1970's he had achieved a dominant position in the Party and therefore in Iraq. For several years he had 'retained the role of grey eminence', as Mansfield (1982: 69) puts it; but in July 1979 President al-Bakr was forced into 'retirement' and Saddam assumed total control of the Party and the country. This was at the end of a turbulent decade in the Middle East during which the governments of 'the West' had experienced first alarm because of the devastating economic effects of the jump in oil prices in the wake of the Yom Kippur War; later some encouragement and optimism over the apparent breakthrough in Israeli-Arab relations following Egyptian President Sadat's 1977 visit to Jerusalem; and then alarm and a feeling of unease once again as a result of the revolutionary upheaval in Iran. As Mansfield (ibid: 62) implies, Saddam Hussein had at least been noticed as an up-and-coming Ba'athist leader and ideologue, but he and his country had not been under the spotlight except at particular times such as Saddam's March 1975 meeting with the Shah of Iran in Algiers to sign an accord over the border delimitation between the two countries in the Shatt al-'Arab waterway. From the summer of 1979, however, things were to be very different. Saddam began his career of totalitarian rule as he meant to go on, by ruthlessly eliminating all potential rivals or dissidents within the Ba'ath hierarchy (Marr 2004: 178-180; Tripp 2007: 214), and by late September 1980 he had taken Iraq – a country then rich from oil revenues - into a prolonged and brutal war with the revolutionary regime in Iran. By this time a formidable cult of personality had grown up around Saddam and was to become ever more enlarged as the war continued, so that even in the early 1980's Mansfield could write that it had 'surpassed even that of Nasser in Egypt', and that even though credit for any state achievements was officially given to the Party (the ABSP), it was by then possible [for outsiders] to talk of 'Saddam's Iraq' (Mansfield 1982: 69).

The overthrow of the Shah in Iran and the establishment of the clerical regime there under Khomeini posed considerable dangers for Saddam and the Ba'ath Party in Iraq, and it rendered the Algiers accord of 1975 effectively obsolete. Amongst the members of the predominantly *sunni* power elite in Baghdad, as Phebe Marr explains (2004: 181-182), there already existed a traditional suspicion of and prejudice towards Iran. The tense situation engendered by the revolutionary turmoil in the neighbouring country became gradually worse in late 1979 and into 1980; in northern Iraq Kurdish forces were permitted and indeed encouraged by the Iranians to skirmish with and challenge Baghdad (in violation of one part of the 1975 accord), while in retaliation Baghdad revived its historic support for dissident Arab groups in Iran's south-western Khuzestan province (Marr *ibid*: 182). The resulting war lasted from September 1980 to August 1988, and saw several phases, starting with a failed Iraqi offensive on the central and southern fronts in late 1980, a long war of attrition in the middle years of the decade, and then (as a result of the intensified 'tanker war' in the Gulf) a period of 'internationalization' in which there was increasing intervention by the USA and diplomatic offensives by the UN, before a renewed Iraqi offensive in 1988 led to a weakened Iran accepting UN Resolution 598 and the war fizzling out with an inconclusive and unsatisfactory peace (*ibid*: 184-193).

The Iran – Iraq war inevitably brought the nature of both the revolutionary regime in Tehran and that of Saddam Hussein in Baghdad increasingly under international scrutiny. On the Iraqi side, the single incident that brought down the greatest opprobrium on the Baghdad regime must surely have been the chemical warfare attack (as part of the regime's *Anfal* campaign) on the Kurdish town of Halabja in March 1988, leaving an estimated 4000 – 5000 civilians dead (Marr *ibid*: 201-202; Tripp 2007: 236). The notoriety of this particular incident could be said to equal that of the aerial attack on the Basque town of Guernica earlier in the twentieth century, during the Spanish Civil War. Another unfortunate outcome of the war for Saddam's regime was the fact that Iraq had gone from being a wealthy state to one that was now heavily in debt and with a deteriorating economy. The regime needed funds to maintain the system of political patronage and to satisfy a population grown accustomed to a 'subsidised, import-based, consumption-oriented economy' (Tripp *ibid*: 241). More significantly for Saddam

himself, as Charles Tripp (*ibid*) points out, ‘the very indebtedness of Iraq to a wide range of creditors placed the country in the position of a petitioner, again undermining the credibility of Saddam Husain’s image as an all-powerful leader’. Finding himself thus in a relatively weak and vulnerable situation on account of economic realities, Saddam – ever the resourceful opportunist – once again looked beyond Iraq’s own borders for a solution to his problem. He had projected himself and his country as defending the Arab world, and especially the Arab Gulf region, against the Iranian threat, and now looked particularly to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait to help him out by maintaining a high price for oil and contributing towards Iraq’s economic reconstruction. The fact that, despite menaces, he failed to get the expected acquiescence from the Gulf states led him once again to miscalculate consequences and to invade and annex Kuwait (as the nineteenth province of Iraq) in August 1990. In taking this step Saddam saw himself as acting in defence of Iraqi national rights and historically legitimate aspirations. Just as in 1980 he had sought to take advantage of a supposedly weak and disorganised regime in Iran in order to reclaim Iraqi rights over the Shatt al-‘Arab and in Khuzestan and to humble Iran’s new rulers, so in 1990 he planned to rectify the British colonialist error of ‘separating’ Kuwait from Iraq and also to humble the oil-rich rulers of the wealthy Gulf Arab states (Tripp 2007: 243).

The extent of his miscalculation over Kuwait began to be evident over the ensuing months. By the late autumn the US Administration had moved large numbers of troops to Saudi Arabia, Saddam’s position on Kuwait remained intransigent and defiant, and in November 1990 the UN Security Council passed Resolution 678 sanctioning the use of military force to restore Kuwait’s sovereignty if Iraq failed to withdraw unconditionally by 15 January 1991. With a military confrontation looming, Saddam’s priority ‘now became “survivable withdrawal”’ (Tripp *ibid*: 244). When the Gulf War over Kuwait began on the night of 16/17 January 1991, it took the form of a devastating aerial bombardment that lasted for several weeks, with a ground offensive not taking place until late February. (The opening of the war was termed by Saddam أم المعارك [Umm al-Ma’ārik = Mother of Battles], and we shall be encountering this expression later in our analysis of the speeches.) By March of that year Saddam’s regime was in a precarious position: Iraqi forces had been chased out of Kuwait, the intelligence and security

apparatus of the state was in temporary disarray, and Iraq was isolated internationally as never before - all as a result of an avoidable miscalculation, coming on top of the huge waste of human life and material resources involved in the ultimately futile conflict with Iran. Saddam and his associates were by now very much in the dock internationally over issues of proven brutality and violation of human rights, ranging from Halabja and the execution in March 1990 of the British journalist Farhad Bazoft to the atrocities committed in Kuwait and the manipulation of civilian hostages at the same time. Fortunately for Saddam, the coalition forces appeared unwilling to do more than chase him out of Kuwait, probably for fear of causing the fragmentation of Iraq and thereby encouraging adventurism on the part of Iran; American President George H. W. Bush had, nonetheless, called upon Iraqis to rise up against Saddam and overthrow him (Tripp *ibid*: 248). There then followed the short-lived period of the *intifāḍah* (uprising) in southern and northern parts of the country through March 1991 which, though unsupported from outside and not successful in dislodging the regime, nevertheless 'was a defining moment in Iraq's modern history in revealing attitudes toward the regime and the state' (Marr 2004: 242).

Probably the single most extraordinary fact over the decade following the Gulf War and into the new millennium was the very resilience and survival of Saddam's regime, with the result that foreign powers came to see a further act of war as the only possible way of removing it from power (Tripp *ibid*: 259). We are concerned here not to review this period in detail, but merely to recall the political context of the period prior to the invasion of 2003. The essential paradox, as Tripp (*ibid*) explains, is that despite all the problems he faced internally and externally during this final phase of his career Saddam managed to further tighten his grip on Iraq. The problems were manifold: punitive sanctions were imposed, 'no-fly' zones in the north and the south were patrolled by the USA and Britain, a UN weapons' inspection regime (UNSCOM) was instituted from May 1991, Iraq's air defences were periodically attacked, and in the north the Kurds succeeded in breaking away to form their own autonomous enclave (Marr *ibid*: 261; Tripp: *ibid*). Although Iraq tried to assert itself in foreign affairs it achieved only limited success, and its 'sovereignty remained compromised and its development stunted' (Marr: *ibid*). Yet Saddam remained in control, with a narrow power base composed mainly of

people from the ‘*sunni* heartland’ of Iraq whom he had implicated in his own style of rule and had effectively made dependent on his patronage. Tripp (*ibid*) has estimated their number (including dependants) at around 500,000, while the total population whose lives they controlled numbered around 26 million. Lurking behind the elaborate and overpowering bureaucracy of the public state lay a ‘shadow state’, which Tripp (*ibid*) describes as

formed by networks of associates, chains of patrons and clients, circles of exclusion and privilege emanating from the office and person of the president.

During the increased political repression and economic stagnation of the 1990’s the number of skilled and educated Iraqis moving into exile in various foreign countries grew steadily, and this was another factor threatening Saddam’s long hold on power. The exiles included many who sought to organize effective opposition to the regime at home, and in June 1992 a meeting of such opposition groups in Vienna resulted in the formation of a new umbrella group, the Iraq National Congress (INC), which came to be led by one Aḥmad Chalabī, who was an academic and banker from a well-known Iraqi Shi‘ī family (Marr *ibid*: 274; Tripp *ibid*: 266). Chalabī came to acquire connections and influence with those in Washington who were pressing for ‘regime change’ in Baghdad but had been frustrated by both the apparent ineffectiveness of economic sanctions and the extreme difficulty of breaking into Saddam’s closed circle – his ‘shadow state’ referred to above – in order to engineer change from within. In the end the regime-changers gained a victory with the passage by the US Congress in late 1998 of the Iraq Liberation Act, which committed funds to approved Iraqi opposition groups (Tripp *ibid*: 267). This probably marked the beginning of the end for Saddam. The Clinton Administration at the end of its term had settled for a policy of ‘containment’ and deterrence; but with the advent to power of George W. Bush and his ‘neo-conservative’ associates in early 2001 ‘there seemed to be an opportunity for the United States to reshape its policy towards Iraq’ (*ibid*: 270). There was the sense of unfinished business from the days of the Gulf War a decade earlier (during the presidency of George Bush senior), and then in the aftermath of the 11 September 2001 attacks the urge to intervene militarily in Iraq, as the USA and its allies had done in Afghanistan, became ever stronger. President Bush declared his ‘war on terror’, and

although there was no evidence for any Iraqi involvement in the planning and execution of the attacks on the USA Saddam inevitably fell under greater suspicion and hostility – not least because he alone of Arab leaders failed to condemn the attacks and indeed in the days and weeks immediately following 11 September produced a series of ‘open letters to the American peoples and the western peoples and their governments’, in effect accusing the USA of terrorism and strongly suggesting that it had now reaped the evil that it had itself sown in the world (ibid: 271; Hussein 2001).

Above all, however, the ‘9/11’ attacks gave the new Bush Administration a pretext for shifting the grounds for the indictment of Iraq to the allegation that the regime there was developing chemical, biological or nuclear weapons of mass destruction (Tripp ibid). Fresh from an apparently easy and straightforward success against the Taleban in Afghanistan in late 2001, President Bush began to articulate his new interventionist policy when in January 2002 he referred to Iraq, Iran and North Korea as representing an ‘axis of evil’ – an expression heavy (at least to Western ears) with intertextual allusion to the Second World War. Thereafter, through 2002, the idea of necessary ‘regime change’ in Iraq became a dominant part of the Bush Administration’s discourse, and attention was focused mainly on the Iraqi regime’s level of compliance with UN resolutions concerned with its alleged weapons programmes. In November of that year Iraq, having been under considerable pressure for several months, accepted Resolution 1441, which allowed for the UN Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) to begin its work in the country under Hans Blix (Marr ibid: 304-305; Tripp ibid: 272-273). Although particularly adept at frustrating any attempts to unseat him from within Iraq, Saddam now faced a real threat in the form of military invasion, unilaterally or otherwise, from a major external power or powers; and this led him to try to mend his fences during 2002 with his two largest regional (and Muslim) neighbours, Saudi Arabia and Iran (Tripp ibid: 272). Nevertheless, the ambivalent signals regarding Iraq’s weapons capabilities and the fact that the USA and UK had already assembled forces for an invasion and occupation by late 2002 meant that the mainly positive reports produced by UNMOVIC in early 2003 were of little avail in halting or delaying military action. The USA had assembled a ‘coalition of the willing’, despite the misgivings of many others and opposition within the UN from France and Russia, and on 17 March 2003 George W. Bush gave Saddam an ultimatum to leave Iraq within forty-eight hours. Two days later saw the beginning of ‘Operation Iraqi Freedom’,



marked by massive aerial bombardments on targets in Baghdad (Tripp *ibid*: 273-274). Within less than a month the power of the regime had crumbled and its leaders gone into hiding, although as Tripp (*ibid*: 276) points out, the ‘shadow state’ was something much less easy to pulverize. Saddam, the once respected Ba’ath Party activist and policymaker of the 1970’s as depicted by Mansfield (1982), had over a quarter of a century shown his true colours; ‘the one who confronts’ (Coughlin 2005: 3) had at last been decisively confronted, and was now on the run.

### ***5.2.2 Saddam: the man and the message***

The above narrative is intended to provide the surface historical overview that we need in order to understand the political background of the speeches under consideration. We now need to superimpose on this surface account of events leading up to the drama of 2002-2003 another narrative: that of the development of Saddam’s self-image and its projection to Iraqis, Arabs, Muslims and the rest of the world. In order to understand the ideology behind the speeches and the intertextual elements that are conveyed by it, some understanding of Saddam’s manipulative exploitation of language, history and religion through political discourse is essential.

Albert Hourani (1991: 404-405) describes how the powerful notion of ‘Arabism’ flourished and reached a climax during the 1950’s and 1960’s. This was mainly through the creation and development of two new movements, Ba’athism and Nasserism. The leading theorist of the Ba’ath (‘Renaissance’) from the 1940’s onwards was the Syrian Christian Michel Aflaq, who propounded the idea of a single united ‘Arab’ state based on the historical and cultural experience of the Islamic society created by the Prophet Muhammad: an experience that belonged not just to Arab Muslims ‘but to all Arabs who appropriated it as their own, and regarded it as the basis of their claim to have a special mission in the world and a right to independence and unity’ (*ibid*: 405). This original Ba’athist idea developed as an ideology in Syria and surrounding countries in the middle of the century, and subsequently became a political force in Syria and Iraq. By contrast, the group of military officers who took power in Egypt in 1952, and who

soon came to be dominated by Gamal Abdel Nasser, found themselves needing to develop an ideology in order to legitimize their new political regime (ibid).

The other main political ideology current at the time was communism, and in their survey of the period Marion Farouk-Sluglett and Peter Sluglett (1990: 194) see the 'ideological arena' in Iraq before the Ba'athist seizure of power in 1968 as having been divided between Arab nationalism and communism. Both of these ideologies professed to be secular; however, Nasserism – which fairly quickly began to use 'the language of Islam' (Hourani 1991: 405) – was seen as essentially a *sunni* movement. Farouk-Sluglett and Sluglett (ibid: 194)) make an observation about the period that is interesting in the light of more recent developments when they state that the schemes for political unity that were enthusiastically proposed in the late 1950's and early 1960's were largely unattractive to the Shi 'is, most of whom felt themselves to be more Iraqi than Arab and also feared that any such arrangement with Egypt or Syria might lead to their being drowned in a 'Sunni ocean'.

Thus, they claim (ibid), a major component of Iraq's population was not in the main 'positively attracted either to Arab nationalism or to Ba'athism'.

Once the Ba'athists in Iraq had achieved power in the 1968 coup, however, the nature of politics was to become highly personalized, as well as clan-based. Farouk-Sluglett and Sluglett (ibid: 134) find it absurd to depict the power struggles of the early years of Ba'athist rule in *ideological* terms, as though the Party had a coherent set of principles. Saddam had in fact established himself as the regime's strong man from the early 1970's, though operating from a dangerously narrow power base, and found himself having to face a variety of internal and external challenges. Indeed, it appears that he was beginning even at that time to see himself as an actor on the world stage (ibid: 163), given that he himself (Hussein 1977: 18) compared his embattled situation - in conflict with the forces of imperialism and reaction – with that of Salvador Allende in Chile. By the late 1970's Saddam was exercising the power that had gravitated into his hands in an increasingly paternalistic manner, while a cult of personality grew up around him (Marr ibid: 151-152) that extended to audiences well beyond the borders of Iraq, as in the *New York Times* advertisement of July 1980 (perhaps, with the benefit of hindsight,

Saddam's best year) which posed the question whether Iraq would 'repeat her former glories and the name of Saddam Hussein link up with that of Hammurabi [and] Asurbanipal' (ibid). As Marr (ibid: 3-4) explains, the civilization of ancient Mesopotamia is one of three elements that have been important in 'forming the collective memory and consciousness of twenty-first-century Iraqis and shaping their institutions and practices' (the other two being the Arab-Islamic heritage and the Ottoman legacy), and it became a part of Ba'ath government policy in the late twentieth century to propagate the notion of 'a Mesopotamian heritage as an integral part of Iraqi tradition'. Mansfield (1982: 64) also notes that for Saddam and his fellow ideologists there was no conflict 'between their Mesopotamian heritage and modern Arab nationalism'. Ofra Bengio (1998), describing and analyzing Saddam Hussein's preoccupation with history, makes the point that he was at odds with the traditional Islamic viewpoint that terms all periods of time prior to the rise of Islam as **الجاهلية** [al-jāhilīyyah, or 'the time of ignorance']; this was because he viewed the Sumerians, the Babylonians and indeed all Semitic peoples to be Arabs, and believed that the rise of those early civilizations and that of the monotheistic religions was all 'a single continuum in which the Arabs formed the links between cultures and creeds' (ibid: 168). Tripp (ibid: 217) makes the same point in describing how Saddam, by using such an official narrative, sought more than any predecessor 'to impose a political unity on Iraq that found its expression chiefly in his person':

Obedience to him was to be the common cause of Iraq's heterogeneous inhabitants. Under this leadership distinct myths of Iraqi identity were promulgated, stressing not only the usual qualities of martial prowess, spiritual fulfilment and historical-rootedness common to all nationalist myth-making, but also emphasising the succession of absolute rulers who had allegedly presided over the mythical forging of the Iraqi nation. A continuous line of political succession was established between the rulers of the ancient kingdoms of Mesopotamia, the Abbasid caliphs and Saddam Husain himself. He was the historical necessity towards which this long march of absolute rulers was inexorably heading.

In other words, Saddam was (we might say) 'the one who was to come', or a kind of mystical 'final revelation' or 'seal' of all the previous rulers.

Words, as we noted earlier in 2.4.4, carry a burden of connotation, and this is nowhere truer than in the domains of politics and religion. The Arabic word **ثورة** [thawrah, or 'revolution'] appeared in the 1970 speech by Saddam Hussein that we used as an

example of ideology in 4.3 above. By that time it had changed from having the ‘negative overtones of a rebellion against legitimate authority’ to the ‘positive ring’ accorded to it by the Arab revolutionary regimes of the period (Bengio *ibid*: 12). Furthermore, the connotations of the word had been broadened to signify not simply an event but a lasting (and laudable) condition, and the Iraqi Ba’ath gave it ‘an aura of magic’ through constant repetition and the linking to it of the idea of everything noble in the individual and in society (*ibid*). At the same time the supposedly secular Ba’ath was adept at exploiting the language of Islam – probably, as Bengio (*ibid*: 30) suggests, in order to widen its appeal to the populace by using religiously-loaded language that would mean more to all Muslims in Iraq than would the dry, new Arabic terminology that was simply borrowed from the socialist jargon of elsewhere. A good early example of this is the word رِدَّة [riddah], the original meaning of which in early Islamic history was ‘apostasy from Islam’, or a reversion to paganism. This word was used by the Ba’athist propaganda machine to mean, in effect, political ‘reaction’, and was applied not only to the period between the two Ba’ath regimes (1963-1968), but also to the Kurdish revolt and even to a faraway event, the ‘Prague Spring’ of 1968 (*ibid*: 30-31). It was also used, with a special vehemence, to refer to events connected with the competing Syrian Ba’ath, as part of a struggle to assert ideological legitimacy (Bengio *ibid*; Mansfield *ibid*: 68).

With the beginning of the war with Iran the image-building surrounding the person of Saddam and the manipulation of history, language and Islam took on a new dimension. During the period of its consolidation of power in the 1970’s the Ba’ath had made much of the term استعمار [isti‘mār, or ‘colonialism’], enforcing its use within the educational system and in society at large (Bengio *ibid*: 127-128). The term had previously been used regularly in the political discourse of Arab nationalism from the start of the British and French mandates (for example, in Nasser’s speeches at the time of the Suez crisis). Bengio (*ibid*: 129) points out that it was also used by the Ba’ath to refer to real or imagined threats to Iraq and its regime – an ‘imperialism on behalf of’ a third party – posed by the Kurds, the Zionists or Iran, probably in order to ‘appeal for greater internal cohesion’. But by the end of the decade it was ‘the Persians’ who constituted the real and main threat, and during the early war years especially there was racist discourse and

demonization of the other on both sides of the conflict, as exemplified by ‘Samir al-Khalil’ (1991: 262-264). Talal Atrissi (2008: 320-332) has documented the image of the hostile and conspiratorial Persians (from the Umayyad period onwards) presented in Iraqi intermediate - level school books of the period covering history and geography. For Saddam the ‘Persian threat’ and the ensuing war provided the opportunity to move away from the original Ba’athist ideology and create a fresh focus for both Iraqi nationalism and Pan-Arabism. It was a time to invoke the heroes and great confrontations of the past. Professional writers and ‘image-builders’ were employed to compare Saddam to a number of great men of the Arab past, including Saladin who, although a Kurd, happened usefully to have been – like Saddam – a native of Tikrit in north-central Iraq (Bengio *ibid*: 79-85). Again - and perhaps giving inspiration to Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia a little later - Saddam used the memory of a great and historic battle: that of Qādisīyyah, the epic clash between the conquering Muslim Arabs and Sassanian Persian forces that took place in the vicinity of Najaf in about 636. The war of the 1980’s thus came to be referred to in the controlled media as ‘Saddam’s Qādisīyyah’, with the regime using the great emotive power of this myth to promote its ideology of Arab nationalism and, whether intentionally or not, ‘to further blur the borderline between the past, the present, and the future’ (Bengio *ibid*: 173).

Increasingly, Islamic terminology and Qur’ānic references in addition to historical ones became a part of Saddam’s personal and Party rhetoric and were exploited in the service of the war. One of the pejorative epithets applied to Khomeini was طاغوت [ṭāghūt], a word found in Q2: 256 and generally interpreted to signify an idol, heretic, or the Devil himself (*ibid*: 144). The word came to be used frequently and, after Khomeini’s demise, was applied to other perceived threats such as non-Muslim aggressors ( as we shall see in the Saddam speeches later), and also Arab rulers who were suspected of being willing to aid those aggressors against Arabs or Muslims. It appears in two of MEMRI’s published translations. One is of a Friday sermon on Iraqi TV on 30 January 2003, in which the preacher declares: ‘The Zionist American idol [“**Taghut**”] is a barbarian armed from head to toe that resembles...the vampire Dracula’. The other (with a large number of helpful footnotes) is of a sermon delivered by Osama Bin Laden and broadcast on Al-Jazeera TV in February 2003 on the occasion of the Muslim Feast of

the Sacrifice. At a point in the sermon Bin Laden refers to President Karzai of Afghanistan and the ‘Karzais’ of the various Arab Gulf states as tyrannical and treacherous rulers who are engaged in selling out their fellow Muslims: he calls them, according to a footnote, **طواغيت** [ṭawāghīt, the plural form of the word in question] and quotes Q2: 256. Another way of portraying the Persian threat and building national solidarity was to evoke memories of the devastating Mongol conquest of Baghdad in 1258, which led to the collapse of the Abbasid caliphate of that time and the destruction of the civilization that Iraq enjoyed in the thirteenth century. Iranians were equated with the Mongols of the past as a kind of ‘yellow peril’, and specific reference was made to Hulagu, the grandson of Genghiz Khan and leader of the Mongol army in 1258. Bengio (ibid: 143) cites a poem about the Mongols written by an Iraqi at the time which mentions ‘the face of the new Hulagu...’ Some twenty years later, Saddam was to recycle this expression (with a different enemy in mind) on the eve of the invasion that was indeed a much more potent threat.

We have referred earlier (in 2.4.4) to the emotive word *jihād*. This began to be used frequently by Saddam’s regime from the start of the war with Iran in the sense of a ‘liberation war’ against people who at best were heretics; and the newspaper *Al-Jumhūrīyyah* wrote that the Arab nation was ‘the nation of *jihād*’ (Bengio ibid: 186). Furthermore, the honorific title *mujāhid* [person engaged in *jihād*] was accorded to Saddam, replacing the original Ba’athist one of *munāḍil* [struggler] that we referred to earlier in 4.3 (ibid); later, at the time of the Gulf War, *jihād* was applied to the task of fighting infidel Christian powers and also to liberating the holy places of Mecca and Medina from their clutches, given that the Saudis were portrayed as collaborating with them (ibid). By this time other Islamic expressions had also become woven into the public discourse of the Ba’ath: the *basmala* ( **بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ** ) and the words **الله أكبر** [allāhu akbar] were used regularly in military bulletins and in the media generally, and on the eve of the Gulf War the latter words were ordered by Saddam to be inscribed on the Iraqi flag (ibid: 188-191). References to the flag (of Iraq, or of Islam) became commonplace as a rallying cry; and a further expression that was often used at the conclusion of speeches or communiqués was **وليخسأ الخاسنون** [‘contempt upon the contemptible ones’] (ibid: 191), as we shall see later.

There can be little doubt that Saddam was influenced by the career and the oratory of the man who passed away as he himself was establishing his position in power: Gamal Abdel Nasser. In his speeches Nasser had combined powerful invective against the crimes and schemes of the colonialist powers with a vivid interest in and sense of Egypt's history. On 1 November 1956, at the height of the Suez crisis, he addressed his fellow Egyptians on the subject of **العدوان الثلاثي** ['the tripartite aggression', or 'three-pronged attack'] that had been perpetrated by Israel, Britain and France (Nasser 1951-1961: 424-429). Early in this speech (ibid: 424-425) he declared that Britain in particular had always had its eye on Egypt: in the time of Muhammad 'Alī [in the nineteenth century] it had seen the growing strength of the Egyptian armed forces as a threat to its own influence, and so had conspired to sink the Egyptian fleet at Navarino and later, in 1882, to subject the country to its own colonial purposes. Would history now repeat itself? :

هذا هو التاريخ، تاريخنا في الماضي.

واليوم، بعد أن أصبحت مصر كتلة واحدة متحدة متماسكة متساندة.. هل سيعيد التاريخ نفسه؟

The speech is replete with fine examples of Nasser's powerful oratorical style, making use of rhetorical tactics that are also familiar in English and other languages and which, as Nathalie Mazraani (1997: 200-224) has argued, exhibit a universality of form-function relationships. One such tactic is the listing of three elements, instances of which typically 'strengthen the argument (without necessarily adding much to the argument) and, at the same time, move the audience emotionally by the repetition and symmetry of the phrase structure', thus pandering to their poetical sense and co-opting their commitment and involvement in the discourse (ibid: 205). Nasser introduces at the beginning of this speech the idea that Egyptians have the legitimate aspiration to live with **شرف وكرامة** ['honour and dignity'], and after his brief historical excursion returns to the crisis of the present (Nasser ibid: 425-426), demanding of his audience:

هل نقبل احتلال بريطانيا وفرنسا لقطعة من أرض مصر؟ هل نقبل راضين هذا الاحتلال، أو هل نقاتل في سبيل حرية وطننا، وفي سبيل الشرف وفي سبيل الكرامة؟

Here the significant elements, which are both verbal and nominal ('*Shall we accept..., shall we accept..., or shall we fight for our country's freedom, and for our honour and for our dignity?*') have been underlined. Such listing is a prominent stylistic and

rhetorical feature of the speech in question, with the emotive keywords coming thick and fast, especially towards the end. Another tactic is the use of contrasting pairs, which may consist of words, phrases or whole clauses, in order to introduce an element of conflict or tension into the discourse (Mazraani *ibid*: 207). Thus George W. Bush, in closing a May 2004 speech regarding US policy in Iraq (Bush 2004), says, ‘These two visions – one of tyranny and murder, the other of liberty and life – clashed in Afghanistan...’ In the same way Nasser (*ibid*: 425) declares:

كُنَّا نَقُولُ إِنَّا نَسَالِمُ مَنْ يَسَالِمُنَا وَنَعَادِي مَنْ يَعَادِينَا...

which could be translated as ‘*We said we would make peace with those who wanted peace with us, but would oppose those who opposed us*’. Again, as he moves towards the close of his address, he asks his listeners whether, in the situation they faced, they should all fight or give in (هل نقاتل أو نسلم؟) (Nasser *ibid*: 428).

Mazraani (1997) has made a special study of language variation (code-switching between Modern Standard Arabic, or MSA, and dialectal manifestations) in the Arabic political discourse of Gamal Abdel Nasser, Saddam Hussein and Muammar Al Gaddafi. From a comparison of her three sets of Arabic data, she observes that they ‘share a certain number of functions and strategies associated with a particular language level’ (*ibid*: 189). All three of the speakers in question tended to use MSA ‘whenever the speaker is constructing an abstract argument, recalling historical events, expanding new political ideas, and axioms’; they tended to use dialect forms (that is, Cairene, Baghdadi or Tripoli Arabic respectively) when, for example, explaining or specifying a political programme, recounting conversations with various other leaders or sharing personal experiences (*ibid*). MSA, states Mazraani (*ibid*), is ‘the expected code’ for those occasions when the speaker feels he needs to take an authoritative tone and instruct his listeners:

General and abstract concepts are presented as if they were unquestionable text, as opposed to exegesis. As the speaker distances himself from the audience, he tends to depersonalise the discourse.

Overall, she claims, the rhetorically-motivated switches between MSA and dialect are ‘much more marked and drastic’ in Nasser’s speeches than in those of Saddam Hussein and Gaddafi (*ibid*: 190-191). This is because Nasser was a populist politician who



deliberately used such switches to convey his message and to make it comprehensible to the broadest possible constituency in Egypt and beyond (ibid). Yet both Saddam and Gaddafi, despite operating in different periods and political contexts, ‘seem to have been influenced by Nasser’s style in their imitation of the call to the Arab nation and in their mixing of MSA and dialectal levels for the achievement of their rhetorical aims’ (ibid: 191).

In his speech of 1 November 1956 which we referred to above, Nasser uses almost exclusively MSA, no doubt chiefly because of the extreme seriousness of the occasion but perhaps also to give his message a ‘Pan-Arab’ appeal. Nonetheless he maintains contact with his audience by addressing them periodically, but especially at the beginning and towards the end, as either **أيها المواطنين** [‘Citizens!’] or **أيها الاخوة** [‘Brothers!’]. There is a subtle and by no means marked use of what we referred to above as ‘the language of Islam’; generally speaking, this must have been regarded as perfectly normal, though it appears also to have been for the purpose of boosting feelings of corporate identity and solidarity at such a critical moment. The speech is framed by a terse and businesslike **السلام عليكم** at the start and the closing salutation **الله وفقكم الله، والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله** at the end. This closure amounts simply to ‘*God grant you success*’ / ‘*God speed*’ and would surely have been no more remarkable than the ‘*May God bless / continue to bless America*’ at the end of many a speech by George W. Bush and other US Presidents. Within the text of the speech there are occasional uses of Islamic terminology which are probably intended for emotive effect. We saw, for example, the words **في سبيل...** being used in the three-part listing cited above, and these words tend to bring to mind the Qur’ānic concept of fighting or struggling ‘in the way / path of Allah’. The notion of ‘jihād’ is also alluded to in the latter part of the speech when Nasser is building up the morale of his audience by telling them how other peoples before them who were struggling against colonialist powers (interestingly, he now calls them **قوى الظلم**, or ‘*unjust / evil powers*’) had managed to repel the aggressors, or were currently trying to do so. He cites the Yugoslavs, the Greeks, the Indonesians and the Algerians before coming closer to home and mentioning those [EOKA] forces

in Cyprus who were fighting both British and French forces stationed there (Nasser ibid: 428-429):

والآن يوجد مجاهدون في قبرص يجاهدون ويقاتلون ضد الجيش الإنجليزي ...

It is interesting here that Nasser singles out the Cypriot fighters (rather than, say, the ‘brothers in Algeria’ he has just mentioned) as deserving the appellation ‘mujāhidūn’, even though he also uses the more standard and basically secular word for ‘fighting’. He does not refer at all to their [Greek Cypriot Orthodox] version of Christianity. Whatever the reason, we could probably translate the above words along the lines of ‘*And now there are people in Cyprus engaged in battling for their freedom with the British army...*’ At least Nasser does not (in the manner of Saddam, as we shall see a little later) go so far as to declare that Egypt is ‘*the land of jihād*’, or anything of that sort. He does, however, appear to anticipate Saddam’s later discourse when he says that final victory will be achieved through patience and faith (الصبر والإيمان) (Nasser ibid: 429).

A year later, on 29 October 1957, Nasser delivered a fairly short address (ibid: 588-589) to mark the first anniversary of the ‘tripartite aggression’ against Egypt and its defeat, and in this the tone and language is more overtly religious. Three times the speaker reminds his audience of the ‘raging gale of aggression’ (العاصفة العاتية الظالمة) with which they had been battered (and indeed his choice of words here seems to foreshadow the ‘desert storm’ that Saddam was to face in 1991). His use of the emotive word ظالم takes up the idea of قوى الظلم which, as noted above, occurred once in the 1956 speech and creates an intertextual link with the world of the Qur’ān, in which forms of this word are found in, for example, Q2: 258 and Q21: 14 and translated variously into English as ‘evil people’, ‘wrongdoers’, ‘polytheists’, etc. in a way that is reminiscent of George W. Bush’s ‘evildoers’. Nasser also leaves his audience in no doubt as to whom they should be thanking for their victory, since Allah had been ‘*our General, our Guardian and our Guide*’ (... كان الله قائدنا وراعينا ومرشدنا ...). Finally, he declares that he would like his listeners to join with him in expressing their gratitude to the Almighty with the words الحمد لله.

From all of the above account we have seen how Saddam, like many another dictator in human history, sought to control the thinking of his own subjects (and also of others beyond his direct authority) through the manipulation of historical narratives and of language (especially religious discourse). The personality cult he built up through the regime and the media he controlled inevitably led to his own increasing self-delusion, with his vaunted image as a new Saladin, a champion of the Arab world, sharply at odds with his own record of extreme human rights violations and of poor political and military judgement (despite a talent for scheming and for personal survival). We shall see shortly how Saddam the speech-maker in times of crisis weaves the narratives of history, Islam and Iraqi nationalism into a discourse of victimhood and anti-colonialism that is particularly rich in intertextual references and consequently poses challenges for those who would translate it. One influence and source of such references appears to be the much earlier career and speeches of Gamal Abdel Nasser, which is why we have devoted some space above to Nasser's content and style.

### ***5.2.3 Common features of the speeches***

Having surveyed in some detail the historical and ideological background of our selected corpus of speeches, we can now turn more briefly to a preview of the features that they have in common. Perhaps the most obvious such feature is the common thread of presupposition of a mainly Muslim audience that will understand, appreciate and respond to 'the language of Islam': that is, to the powerful language and original contexts of Qur'ānic quotations, the references to events in Islamic history, the roll call of great Muslim names of the past and the emotive mention of (or allusion to) issues in the present day that generally unite Muslims and appear to set them at odds with the non-Muslim world. Although the appeal is essentially to all Muslim believers inside and beyond Iraq, Saddam also seems to want to address others who will (possibly) be prepared to listen to and understand his message – those whom he addresses as 'good people in the world, wherever you may be'. Not surprisingly, in view of the overtly Islamic tenor of their discourse, both speeches open with verses from the Qur'ān and close with highly charged rhetorical invocations. In this way they seem to resemble the expected format of a sermon, and the use of these elements constitutes what Richard

Bauman (2004: 4) terms a 'generic framing device'. The religious and rhetorical framing of the speeches – with multiple addressees or invocations at both opening and close – appears exaggerated and alien, and therefore at once presents a translation problem, together with the emotive intertextual appeal carried by the discourse as a whole.

Another common feature is the appeal to what Saddam calls (in the first text that we will examine) 'the voice of history'. We have discussed earlier Saddam's interest in history, in his own part in it and in the resources it offers for self-justification, for political manipulation and as a potent rallying cry in times of crisis. In these speeches several separate historical events are alluded to, from the early battles of Islam and the Mongol invasion of Iraq in the thirteenth century to the more familiar conflicts of more recent times, such as the Palestinian struggle against Israel, the Iran-Iraq war, the Gulf War over Kuwait (and its consequences for the people of Iraq) and even the '9/11' attacks on the USA in 2001. There is generally as much abstract philosophizing on the 'lessons of history' (and especially regarding Iraq's place in human history) as there is specific reference or allusion to particular events. During the period in which these speeches were delivered the external threat to Saddam's regime was steadily mounting, and consequently the speaker uses the memory of past conflicts to refer to the present and to try to warn and motivate his audience with regard to a likely future confrontation. Intertexts (such as Qur'ānic quotations and allusions or other 'proper name' allusions, such as the use of the name of the Mongol conqueror Hulagu) are recycled and recontextualized to suit the new communicative purpose, and there is little new information. The speeches are all given, as we stated at the beginning of this chapter, on anniversary occasions and therefore have antecedents in respect of both language and content that will have been familiar and mostly predictable to the audience both at home and abroad.

As for the style of the speeches, certain common features also stand out. First, there is the use of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) to which we referred above in 5.2.2, citing Mazraani (1997), as the 'expected code' for an address that includes abstract argument and concepts, the rehearsal of historical facts or 'lessons', comment on the international

situation and religious exhortation. The frequently long stretches of discourse contain much repetition and redundancy, in addition to examples of rhetorical questioning and exclamation, as would normally be expected in such a politico-religious hybrid genre. Then, as part of the generally emotive discourse, there is the rich use of metaphor and sometimes personification to arouse the audience and achieve the communicative aim. There is a good deal of rhetorical invocation, especially towards the close of each address, and in the second text more than in the first there is also fairly frequent flattering of and appeal to the listeners in order to establish and maintain solidarity with them. Above all, however, the speeches exhibit the characteristics of what Mohammed Sa'adeddin (1989: 47) has termed the 'aural mode of text development with its attendant insider-to-insider, community-presumptive, social relationship'. This, argues Sa'adeddin (ibid: 49-50), is the mode of text development that is dominant in Arabic, whereas in English a 'visually developed' text is the accepted norm in the written language, a situation that causes 'negative transfer' when it comes to second-language writing and translation. We will return later to Sa'adeddin's notion of aural versus visual modes of text development when, after analyzing the two speeches, we conclude by discussing the challenges they and their existing translations pose in terms of communicative equivalence.

#### ***5.2.4 The source-text and target-text receivers***

Our final, brief task before we proceed to the texts is to consider the nature of the intended, or presumed, audience of the original Arabic speeches and also the readers of the English translations. The former can be identified as, first and foremost, all of the citizens of Iraq (presumably including the Kurds), both civilian and military, Ba'ath party members and non-members; others in the Arab world, both Muslim and Christian (and perhaps especially Palestinians, given their special status as victims and the backing that Saddam had had from the late Yasser Arafat over the Kuwait issue in 1991); and other Muslim or non-Muslim sympathizers anywhere else in the world. Such an audience could have been expected either to listen to the speeches as broadcast on, for example, Iraqi radio or the Iraqi Satellite Channel, or to have read the text on the Iraq News Agency (INA) website or in any of a number of official Iraqi newspapers or

other sympathetic publications such as *Al-Quds al-'Arabi*, published in London. They were also presupposed to be familiar with Saddam's previous speeches, with the political situation in which Iraq found itself at the time, and – not least – with the wealth of allusions to the Qur'ān and to historical events and persons in the distant as well as the recent past. They would have been expected, no doubt, to respond positively to the emotive power of the web of intertextual associations constructed by the speaker. For many, however, both inside and outside Iraq, the tone and content of the speeches must have been all too familiar as the rhetorical stock-in-trade of an increasingly embattled dictator, and for them any force that the words might once have had must surely have been blunted.

As for the latter (that is, putative readers of the published English translations), they can reasonably be identified as belonging to one of two groups. The first consists of those reading national newspapers such as *The Guardian* (either print or online versions) and interested or curious enough to sample something of Saddam Hussein's world view at a time when he and Iraq were especially newsworthy. Unfortunately, though, the relaying of the highly foreignizing, officially produced English translations without any editorial intervention (in the form of subheadings, for example) is most likely to have caused mystification or plain amusement in the minds of readers unprepared for the processing of such texts. The second group consists of the regular customers (in government, journalism, business, etc) for the output of news gathering agencies such as BBC Monitoring. These readers are helped by the addition of various editorial insertions, but also have to cope with the official Iraqi translations. They would be likely to be already familiar with the general tone and content of the speeches, even if baffled by much of it, and would probably skim through the material without expecting to encounter any new or useful information.

### **5.3 *The speeches and their translations***

With all this background information in mind, we now come to an analysis of the two speeches, along with some comments on the translations that have become available. In each case we first consider the actual occasion on which, and the situation in which the

speech was delivered; we then comment on the presumed intention and communicative goal of the speaker, and on the likely level of response to or acceptability of the message on the part of the audience. In this way we keep in mind Beaugrande and Dressler's textual notions or 'standards' of situationality, intentionality and acceptability. Later, as we examine the texts, we comment on how and to what extent the other 'standards', namely cohesion and coherence, informativity and intertextuality are upheld. It is not our intention to examine the original Arabic texts and the available English versions line by line, but rather to consider the overall strategy or approach adopted by the translator and then to comment on selected issues of equivalence and translatability that arise from it. We offer concluding comments with respect to each speech in turn, and then consolidate these into a final discussion of the question of communicative equivalence and to what extent it has been, or could better be achieved in the case of such material. The Arabic texts of the speeches, followed by their respective versions disseminated in English, can be found in Appendices A and B.

### 5.3.1 *Text A: 8 August 2002 – the 'Great Victory Day' Speech*

This speech was delivered to mark the 14<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 'Great Victory' that brought the war with Iran to a less than clear and certain end in August 1988. According to Dilip Hiro (1989: 248), 8 August 1988 was the day on which the UN Security Council unanimously approved the details for implementing its Resolution 598, in preparation for a ceasefire to take effect from 20 August. On 9 August that year Saddam Hussein brought joy and relief to his subjects by declaring a three-day holiday to celebrate 'this great victory' (ibid). As Saddam's popularity soared in Iraq, so also in Iran was there a mood of relief, support for Khomeini's acceptance of the ceasefire and rhetoric from the leadership to the effect that the moral victory belonged to Iran (ibid: 249). A year later, Bengio (1998: 193) notes, an increasingly 'Islamic' Saddam used the occasion of the first anniversary of Iraq's 'victory' over Iran to express his new sense of personal and national mission 'in terms of a primordial experience': he linked it (in his speech carried by the official newspaper *Al-Thawra* on 9 August 1989) with the story of the Prophet Muhammad's night journey to Jerusalem and ascent to the seven heavens (الإسراء والمعراج). Previously in that year his great adversary Khomeini had died, and

so had Michel 'Aflaq, one of the founders of Ba'athism; the close of the year was to see the demise of the East European communist regimes. These events, in Bengio's analysis (ibid: 192 – 202), marked the onset of a new phase in Saddam's projected self-image. He was now to turn more decisively away from the old ideals of secular Ba'athism and to cast himself 'in the role of some kind of modern prophet combining the qualities of spiritual, political, and military leadership and possessed of a universal mission, like Muhammad' (ibid: 193). Not surprisingly, then, he was to use the considerable propaganda means at his disposal to try to lift the mood of his own long-suffering population through Islamic rhetoric and increasingly messianic and apocalyptic imagery.

In the summer of 2002, as we have seen above, the situation facing Saddam and Iraq was much less rosy than in 1989. The country's sovereignty had been compromised over the past decade', and now there was talk of 'regime change' emanating from Washington especially. In the aftermath of '9/11' Iraq had been depicted as being part of an 'axis of evil'. Against this darkening background, Saddam seems to have decided to continue using established anniversary occasions to prepare the mood of his people – and of possible supporters and sympathizers beyond his own borders – by delivering rallying cries pregnant with religious and historical allusion. There is an almost Manichean opposition of good and evil, and the past history of Iraq, the Arabs and Muslims blurs into present realities and future threats. The communicative goal, or intentionality, therefore, seems to be largely to project and justify the self-image of the speaker (as 'history man', spiritual guide and military champion) and to evoke vague feelings of solidarity and loyalty in the target audience. However, as we argue at the end of this analysis, the purpose is surely also to establish a link between the outcome of the war with Iran and the major threat Saddam is now facing. As we have already observed, most of the target audience had already been exposed, or indeed over-exposed, to the general message, and whether its recontextualization to fit the latest current events gave it any extra force is a matter for conjecture. As for readers of the English version, they are likely to have found it 'rambling' at best, and in parts absurd: jumping at will between distant and recent history, and completely lacking in any apparent statement of policy.



The Arabic ST of this speech is in Appendix A1; the official Iraqi translation provided by the Iraqi News Agency (INA) is in Appendix A2; and the same translation relayed by BBC Monitoring Middle East, but with editorial insertions in the form of an introductory summary and subsequent sub-headings, is in Appendix A3.

The Qur'ānic quotation (from Q21: 18a) that opens and serves to 'frame' the speech has a rather stale quality about it. Saddam had long been in the habit of using such quotations, and this one had been deployed on several previous occasions, for example in Saddam's Army Day speech on 6 January 1991, shortly before the Gulf War (translated by the American Foreign Broadcast Information Service). The section in the early part of Sūra 21 from which this verse is taken proclaims the triumph of Truth and the inevitable punishment and destruction of Evil and Falsehood. It appears to have been a useful, off-the-peg device enabling Saddam to set up from the outset an opposition between **الحقّ والباطل** (Truth and Falsehood - words that occur again in the speech and help to create a thematic coherence) and also the idea of the inevitable defeat of Falsehood. It is interesting that the Iraqi translator has decided to try to transfer the full emotive force of the *basmala* by using 'Most Compassionate' and 'Most Merciful', but has omitted any translation of the standard formula **صدق الله العظيم** which is rendered in translations of the other two speeches as either 'Allāh's is the Word of Truth' or 'God speaks the Truth', and whose closest Christian cultural equivalent in English seems to be 'This is the Word of God'. The BBC Monitoring version does not offer readers any editorial elaboration on the Qur'ānic intertext, but simply identifies it as 'Koranic verse'. The archaic English of its translation (apparently that of 'Abdullah Yūsuf 'Alī) immediately produces in the TT reader the expectation of a generally unfamiliar genre, that of the '(pseudo-) religious rant'.

Such an expectation is not, however, met at the outset in the essentially abstract discourse on the lessons of history. This is a regular feature of the later Saddam speeches which seems to echo (whether consciously or unconsciously) similar, but more rhetorically urgent and appealing passages in many of Nasser's major speeches such as that which he delivered before the Egyptian National Assembly on 5 February 1958 to mark the merger of Egypt and Syria into the United Arab Republic, beginning with these words:

في حياة الشعوب أجيال يواعدها القدر، ويختصها دون غيرها بأن تشهد نفض التحول الحاسمة في التاريخ...

*(In the life of nations there are generations who have a date with destiny, generations to whom alone it is given to witness decisive turning points in history...)*

The strategy adopted for the official translation of Saddam's speech is (not surprisingly) one of 'literal' faithfulness to the original, with minimal mediation and therefore a challenge to those TT readers not mentally prepared and equipped for so allusive a text. At the same time there is much that is at least basically competent, and the translation problems become more apparent in the latter part of the speech. The opening paragraphs are not too problematic, but certain improvements could be made. The initial theme is clear enough and is usefully summed up for readers in the BBC Monitoring sub-heading "*Greed and arrogance*": *lessons from history*. This highlights the key words **الطمع والغطرسة** in the ST – words which once again echo a theme in Nasser's oratory, for example when in his 26 July 1956 speech on nationalizing the Suez Canal he speaks of **الأطماع الدولية المتنافرة** (*the clash of other nations' greedy ambitions*). The first paragraph of the speech works well enough in the original Arabic, opening with two prepositional phrases followed by the resumptive ... **فإن الدرس الإنساني** ... even though it is a markedly depersonalized, abstract and almost 'professorial' way of opening a speech compared to the style of Nasser. The English version is not satisfactory, however; it smacks of a machine-translation approach, and fails to foreground the main idea. A better way of handling it, and more effectively meeting TT reader expectations, might be as follows:

*The lesson that humanity can learn from history – never mind the details of how one period has led into another – is that the present condition of any nation or people cannot be detached from its past: this is how nations and peoples have built their present, whether that happens to show progress or a decline in relation to the past.*

The next paragraph could then develop this idea on the lines of: *A further useful lesson from the history of mankind is that greed and arrogance...* Then the third paragraph could begin a little differently with: *History, both ancient and modern, teaches us amongst other things that...* Such changes would, we believe, improve the translation stylistically as well as in terms of the type of coherence expected by the TT reader.

Emotiveness using a combination of standard rhetorical devices and intertextual allusion abounds in the Arabic text from the second paragraph onwards. A large part of this resides in the use of vocabulary that we have already introduced above, and at the same time the alien and exotic character of the text unfolding before the eyes of the TT reader is enhanced by the lack, at this stage, of any specificity or exemplification. There are also curious expressions such as *إن كل الإمبراطوريات، وحاملي تابوت الشر...*, translated literally – and yet still mysteriously – as ‘that all empires and bearers of the coffin of evil...’ ‘*Coffin-bearers of evil*’ is a suitably intriguing and distinctly ‘foreignizing’ image that is likely to stay in the mind of the TT reader and possibly arouse closer interest and attention; but at the same time a ‘domesticating’ transposition such as ‘*bringers/ merchants of death and destruction*’ would surely fit the message and the presumed context and also sound more familiar within the TT reader’s intertextual world (as, indeed, would the word ‘bodybags’ rather than ‘coffins’ in the context of foreign military adventures). Another type of emotiveness is to be found in the use of assonance, as represented by the *هم* sound in a succession of words in the third paragraph – *دُفِنُوا هُم، وأحلامهم المريضة، وخطرستهم، وطمعهم في تابوتهم...* (underlining added). This is surely there to stir up the required ‘us-and-them’ feelings, but the effect is lost, or at least muted, in the English. It could perhaps be preserved rhetorically in English by saying ‘*these / those people were themselves buried in their own coffin, along with their own sick dreams and their own arrogance and greed...*’ Again, as we would expect, there is semantic repetition and parallelism for rhetorical effect, as in the words in the third paragraph *في كل الحقب الماضية، والدهور السابقة* whose effect, we suggest, would be better rendered by ‘*all ages and epochs of the past / all past ages and epochs*’ or (using the ‘merging’ technique) simply by ‘*all ages past*’ rather than the less familiar-sounding ‘times and eras of the past’. These words are followed at the end of this paragraph by a rhetorical question / exclamation that provides quite a nice example of another form of assonance, that of polyptoton (*جناس الإشتقاق*):

فهل يمكن أن يوصف من يحاول أن يتجاهله الآن بغير الأوصاف التي لا يسرّ عاقل حكيم أن يوصف بها..!؟

The force of this might be better conveyed by: ‘*can anyone trying to ignore this [fact of history] then avoid being called names that no sensible person in his right mind would be happy to be called?!*’ Unfortunately, in this and other instances the rigidly literal and

over-formal approach of the non-native translator(s) often fails to 'connect' with the target language's natural idioms and rhythm and with its rhetorical and intertextual system.

The early portion of the speech continues in this abstract and highly allusive manner, taking an increasingly religious tone as it moves gradually from the lessons of 'distant' history to more recent events and to the situation of the summer of 2002. Saddam declares that those who fail to learn the lesson of history run the risk of being consigned to *مزبلة التاريخ* – an expression used in the 1980's, according to Bengio (1998: 167), by one of Saddam's 'court' writers to refer to the fate of lesser leaders in Iraq or elsewhere, and which might be better translated as 'the dunghill of history'. Later he takes up the theme of justice and right versus injustice and oppression, and asserts that Iraq's true strength lies in its faith, one of the key words of the speech that the translator sensibly highlights by separating it out into a new paragraph, with the BBC Monitoring version also assigning the sub-heading "*Faith...is the decisive factor*". At this point in the speech there are other items in the emotive lexicon that seem to be deliberate echoes of their earlier use by Nasser, especially since Saddam is specifically addressing the whole Arab world (*أيها الإخوة العرب*): words such as *عدوان، عبودية، نذل* (aggression, servitude, humiliation). Then there is the deliberately affective metaphor of the 'Arab nation' as mother and the Iraqi homeland as father, one that Saddam quite skilfully constructs with his picture of the parents in chains, powerless to do what they should for their children, and the children who would be nothing but *disrespectful renegades* (our suggested translation in place of 'ungrateful apostates') were they to fail to take action to free their parents from that bondage. We can assume that Saddam is here alluding principally to the restrictions placed upon Iraq (the sanctions, the no-fly zones, the weapons inspection regime, etc) in the decade following the Kuwait episode and also to the mounting 'regime-change' threat in 2002. This and the opaque reference to the start of the war with Iran in 1980 appear to be the speaker's way of saying to the rest of the Arab world, '*We went to war to protect all of us, so now it's time for all of you to come to the aid of Iraq*'. The communicative goal so far, then, is to give a history lesson as the introduction to a rallying cry for Pan-Arab solidarity, but the English version seems too allusive and insufficiently explicative to serve that goal effectively.

A favourite Saddam word that starts to appear at this point in the speech, and which causes some problems in translation, is the verb وقف and its derivatives. We feel that some variation of the translator's notion of 'taking a stand' is required in order to fit with TT stylistic expectations. Thus ... وقفنا في عام 1980 لنحمي شعبنا وأمتنا might, we suggest, be better translated as 'we did what we had to do in 1980 to protect our own people and the Arab nation'; and later, when Saddam reminds his audience of the Ba'ath revolution in July 1968, he says وقف الثوار وقفهم في تموز عام 1968 which surely means simply '...the revolutionaries of July 1968 acted as they did'. Again, the use of the derivative موقف a little further on in the typically emotive triad عراق الجهاد والرؤية والموقف presents a translation problem in English which the translator has neatly sidestepped by simply omitting the word in question and thereby (no doubt unwittingly!) robbing Saddam's phrase of its full rhetorical power. There seems to be a case here for grammatical transposition rather than literal translation, which simply cannot do the job, and so we suggest something like '...Iraq the land of Jihad, the land that stands [firm and] resolute under the banner of Islam'.

In this same section of the speech the translator seems to begin to respond to the force of Saddam's rhetorical listing by using the technique of the cleft sentence – but then fails to follow it through as could have been done. Saddam at this point is rehearsing, for the benefit of his wider Arab audience, the occasions in recent history when Iraqis (and, implicitly, he himself in the vanguard) had stood up to threats and dangers, and at the same time is providing the justification with ... وعلى أساس هذه المعاني ...، وعلى هذا etc. So the translator wisely gives us 'It is on the basis of these meanings... [that is, that 'our mother and father are the nation and the homeland']', but then it is only some time later that we find another cleft sentence, in the too-literal 'It is also on the basis of these concepts...' The whole passage would, we believe, have more power and fascination for the TT reader (despite its general opaqueness) if there was a series of cleft sentences, along the lines of 'It was through that way of looking at things...', 'It was for that reason that...', and so on. Although the general idiom of the original may have seemed a bit stale and predictable to many listeners at the time, the rhetoric is still powerful, is well constructed and appears - at this stage at least – to be going somewhere. It is

pregnant with emotiveness and intertextual allusion, with vocabulary from the Qur'ān, from previous speeches by Saddam and by Nasser and from the political idiom of the new 'Islamic' Ba'athism. One example is the expression **إِتْكَنَّا عَلَى اللَّهِ** ('we put our trust in Allāh') which, as Bengio (1998: 190) explains, harks back to the words of Q7: 89 and was actually used to name Iraqi military operations aimed at recovering territories lost to the Iranians in 1980-88. It is hard to see how the force and purpose of this insertion could be reproduced in translation without recourse to an explanatory footnote to aid the uninitiated. The same is probably true of Saddam's reference – when he finally becomes more specific and talks about Iraqis standing up to the arrogant aggression of America and her allies in 1991 – to the 'unforgettable Mother of Battles' (**أم المعارك الخالدة**), that is, the start of hostilities over Kuwait on the night of 16/17 January 1991. Then, again, there is the use of the offensive word **ṭāghūt** which we mentioned above in 5.2.2 as having been applied previously as an epithet to Khomeini. Here it is used shortly after a mention of Satan / the Devil, and is now clearly being applied to the Americans and their allies in the current political situation when Saddam says of those he is attacking

.. ويظن بأن على الناس ان يصيروا عبيداً للطاغوت بالتهديد، أو بتنفيذ التهديد ..

(our suggested translation would be: '*...and thinks that other people should bow down to Evil Tyranny as a result of threats made, or carried through..*'). The fact that the published translation of this expression capitalizes the word Tyranny is highlighted in the BBC version; but the apparent personification seems to have much the same demonizing purpose as that of 'terror' in other, opposing discourses.

Before we move on to consider the later part of the speech, it is worth commenting on a particularly emotive couple of lines that begin with the words **وسوف يحمل الأشرار** **تابوتهم على ظهورهم ...**. Here Saddam is speaking – like George W. Bush – of 'evildoers', and he does not mince his words. The published English translation hardly does justice to the power and wealth of connotation of the original Arabic (with its suggestion of animals awaiting slaughter), and at the same time fails to convey the whole meaning. The image depicted by the literal translation 'The forces of evil will carry their coffins on their backs...' is certainly an arresting one, but it is one that fails to link up with the TT intertextual system. Perhaps it would be clearer to translate this sentence as follows: '*These evildoers are doomed from the outset – doomed either to die*

*of remorse when they fail and when their evil schemes rebound on them and strike them in their own countries, or to dig their own graves after they bring about their own destruction on any Arab or Muslim territory they attack, including that of Iraq...'*

Having made some specific reference to the source of current threats, and also to problems with the UN Security Council, Saddam leaves aside his main history lesson and proceeds, in the second half of the speech, to try to arouse his audience with an even more rhetorical and sometimes almost enraptured mode of discourse. There is still history, in the form of references to early Islamic battles (including the 'First Qadisiyah' of the seventh century), to the events of 1980-88 (that is, of 'Saddam's Qadisiyah', even though that expression is not used here) and – more obliquely – to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. But the rhetoric of the *tabbīr* becomes increasingly salient from now on. Bengio (1998: 191) states that the cry of **الله أكبر** [allāhu akbar] is 'the shortest way to enunciate God's greatness...and is used on numerous occasions to give thanks to God or to ask for his succor'. Saddam's party and media had appropriated the cry as a political slogan and a kind of mascot, using it in some rather strange ways as though personifying it (ibid), while Saddam himself had been in the habit since the war with Iran of concluding speeches by repeating the slogan three times, 'a practice expected to elicit enthusiasm and augment motivation' (ibid: 183). This, of course, presents a translation problem, especially at the over-ecstatic close of the speech, where the full literal translation is given when, for the TT reader, some omission or reduction by merging seems to be required. Another problem is presented by the whole of the rather mystical invocation that begins with the words **أيها الصوت الحبيب.. يا صوت الحبيب** **المصطفى** which seem to imply that Saddam had a personal 'hotline' to the great Arab spiritual and military leaders of the past: Muhammad, the Caliphs (interestingly, 'Alī is placed before 'Uthmān, possibly as a sop to the Shi'a listeners) and soldiers such as Khālid bin al-Walīd and Sa'd bin Abī Waqqās. This could probably be better rendered as *'I seem to hear the voice of our dearly beloved Prophet, and that of Bilal...'* rather than by addressing the voices directly.

Saddam then returns to his anniversary topic as the final rallying cry, and invokes memories of the struggle with the Iranians as he repeats the word for 'Charge!' or 'Onwards!' Here the translation 'the dear chant is raised...' could be improved, we suggest, with *'that marvellous battle cry goes up...'*, and in what follows the reference to Jerusalem probably needs to be explicated in brackets or in a footnote. Finally we come to the ostensible main point of the whole speech, the celebration of the 'Day-of-Days' or Great Day, 8 August 1988. (This designation, incidentally, is not really as exotic or alien as it may seem at first, given that a certain other great day in the history of other peoples, 8 May 1945 or 'VE' Day, was described by the *Liverpool Echo* as the long-awaited 'Day of Days'.) This leads into the final part of the speech, and to a line in the translation that stands out for its infelicity and is a good example of how certain literal translations need to be radically and creatively modified so as to avoid attracting ridicule. Saddam's expression of admiration (اعجاب) and gratitude for the month of August .. يا آب الله.. الله needs to be translated not as 'Oh God.. Oh God.. Oh..August' (which runs the risk of arousing 'Comical Ali' thoughts in the mind of the TT reader), but rather as something like *'Yes, what a wonderful month is August!'* Rhetorically addressing or invoking a month does not fit well with modern English textual expectations, so we would have to go on to change the ensuing translation of ما أشد ... حرارتك to something like *'It's so hot, and that heat serves not just to ripen the dates for harvesting, but above all to curb the power of anyone wanting to harm us, and so to defeat any wicked aggressors in the name of Allah'*. What Saddam says next also seems absurd and redundant when translated as 'Brother to July and it [sic] link to September!!' This, however, is because the translator has failed (or perhaps at this point could not be bothered) to explicate the rhetorical purpose here, which is surely to remind listeners of how August completes a sacred trio of months, being sandwiched between the July of the 1968 Ba'athist revolution and September, the month when the war with Iran started. Our suggested translation would continue like this, avoiding the direct address but retaining something of the personification:

*'It's the month that joins hands with our other two glorious months of July and September! As we stand here and now, we salute this precious month, this precious day and all its other precious days. We salute our dear fellow citizens still living, and we*



*salute those who, by their death, have won the race to be admitted, by the will of the Most Compassionate One, to the highest abodes of heaven.'*

The personification of a month was in fact nothing new in Saddam's public discourse. Along with many other favourite lexical items that we have identified in this analysis, the technique forms part of the intertextual thread linking his speeches of this period. Con Coughlin (2005: 321) reports that a few weeks earlier on 17 July 2002, the thirty-fourth anniversary of the Ba'ath revolution, Saddam had delivered his annual address to the Iraqi people and had declared, 'July has returned to say to all the oppressors and powerful and evil people in the world: You will not be able to defeat me this time, not ever, even if you gathered to your side and rallied all the devils too.'

In the conclusion to the speech there is the customary greeting or salutation to others in the Arab world, and particularly to the Palestinians. We have mentioned the use of the word *شهيد / شهداء* earlier in 2.4.4 and noted how 'martyr' is neither an appropriate nor an effective translation into English, but rather a 'dictionary equivalent'. The reference to the Palestinians here is to 'those living and those who have given their lives [in the struggle]'. A final translation challenge is provided by the greeting to the Arab world and the words *والى كل أصيد أغر فيها*, in which the emotive connotations of the metaphor entail some loss in translation, but which can perhaps be rendered as something like '*all its magnificent / splendid pure-bred heroes*'.

There is a wealth of other interesting and challenging items in this speech, but we have covered a good representative sample of the types of translation problem it presents. We have seen that there is a certain difference between the highly abstract and depersonalized, historical-philosophical opening and the much more rhetorical and even mystical outpourings towards the end. The earlier part seems to be a well-constructed, plausible argument (albeit laden with hypocrisy) that seems to have a clear communicative goal, even with its vague message of historical precedents and the protective power of Faith; but then its effect appears to be somewhat dissipated later on (at least in the English translation) as the speaker becomes less specific, more historically allusive and more rhetorical towards the close of the address. A characteristic speech by Nasser such as that of 1 November 1956 which we discussed above in 5.2.2 (and with which this speech by Saddam seems to stand in a 'vertical' or 'generic' intertextual relationship) is equally rhetorical and emotive, but nonetheless

seems more 'focused'. The TT reader is therefore likely to feel frustrated overall by the paucity of clear and explicit reference to current events or developments and by the absence of any policy statement on the back of the obvious manipulation of Arab and Muslim sentiment. In the Arabic text cohesion is maintained by a variety of stylistic and lexical means, while coherence is achieved through the densely emotive and allusive diction and the thematic repetition – in other words, through the intertextual richness conveyed by the underlying ideology. Many TT readers would, however, describe the text as 'incoherent' or 'rambling' on account of its apparent failure (in translation) to live up to reader expectations of text development: in terms of structural development and informativity it seems to be sadly lacking. In the English version, for example, the ending does not appear to be linked in a logical and inevitable manner with the opening. Saddam's method, however, seems to have been to link his commemoration of what he portrays as a 'clear victory' over Iran on 8/8/88 with his opening history lesson; he looks both backwards and forwards in time, expecting his listeners to understand that, just as the 'greed and arrogance' of Khomeini and the Iranians got them nowhere, the same outcome will await anyone who in 2002 is thinking of attacking Iraq or the Arab world. The message is highly implicit and allusive, and the translation into a second language fails overall (leaving aside any particular infelicities and equivalence problems) to make that message sufficiently clear and explicit for it to achieve an easy acceptability in the target textual and intertextual system. The BBC Monitoring edition recognizes this, but limits itself to adding an introductory summary of the material (which still fails to highlight or explain the link we have posited above) along with mostly helpful sub-headings, which are not tendentious and do certainly make life easier for the reader. There are no footnotes or extra-textual explanations apart from some helpful items of information in square brackets.

### **5.3.2 *Text B: 17 January 2003 – Speech on the Twelfth Anniversary of the 'Mother of Battles'***

This speech was delivered by Saddam Hussein less than six months later, on the occasion of the twelfth anniversary of the start of the military showdown over Kuwait in 1991. It is described by way of preface in the original Arabic version put out by the INA

(but not in their English translation) as a ‘historic, Pan-Arab address to the great people of Iraq, to the Iraqi Armed Forces, to the glorious Arab nation and to all good people anywhere else in the world on the twelfth anniversary of the grand confrontation of the unforgettable Mother of Battles [Umm al-Ma‘ārik]’. That Saddam was still ready to repeat the myth of another great victory over the forces of evil before a surely disbelieving Iraqi public may seem strange indeed in the light of what actually happened in January – March 1991 (as we have briefly recounted above in 5.2.1). Yet this had been his practice ever since being expelled from the territory of Kuwait, and the 2003 speech seems to be an indicator of the extent not only of his self-delusion but also of his desperation to rally support and sympathy both at home and abroad. The situation he faced was certainly by now a serious one: in January 2003 an invasion of Iraq was not imminent, but nonetheless a likely prospect by the spring. This time the threat was not about liberating a territory that had been invaded, but specifically about ‘regime change’ in Baghdad. Saddam was, however, aware of the divisions at the UN and in Europe regarding the threat of military force against his regime; he was also aware of the strength of the anti-war movement in the USA, the UK and elsewhere in the world, which probably explains why the addressees of the speech include ‘all good people...’ Coughlin (2005: 331) records how, in a particularly calculating move, Saddam had sought at the end of 2002 to gain the support and sympathy of countries not backing the use of force by publicly apologising for the invasion of Kuwait in 1990. This appears to have been part of a strategy to portray the potential aggressors as people who were already forces of occupation (since American and British troops had long been enforcing the no-fly zones in the north and south of Iraq) and thus had designs on the Arab world which all other Arab states should resist (ibid). As usual – and especially at the end of the speech – the appeal to the Arab world is bolstered by references to Zionist aggression and to the Palestinian people, whom Saddam now, as before in 1991, saw as his main constituency outside of Iraq.

It is worth briefly discussing at this point the expression ‘Mother of Battles’ which Saddam and his regime associated with their commemoration of the opening of the Gulf War. Hodge and Kress (1993: 195-201), who provide an interesting critical discourse analysis of the phrase and its English translation, note that the phrase in Arabic seems to

have been coined by Saddam at the time of the Gulf War, and was then immediately translated and circulated in the English-language press around the world as ‘the mother of *all* battles’. As such, it quickly came to have new entextualizations and was used for parody and propaganda, as in ‘the mother of all surrenders’ when Iraqi forces were forced to withdraw from Kuwait. This was no doubt largely because it linked up intertextually with familiar colloquial expressions used in English such as ‘the mother and father of a hiding / headache, etc’ which expressed something big and severe (ibid: 197). Coughlin (2005: 331) gives an example of how the phrase could still be used with reference to Iraq more than a decade later, when at the end of 2002 a British Foreign Office official described the material in the Iraqi submission on outstanding weapons issues as ‘the mother of all gobbledygook’. Hodge and Kress had been told by Australian Palestinian informants that an Arabic phrase with a literal meaning had an intertextual connection with Saddam Hussein’s coinage: this was **أم الشهداء** (‘mother of martyrs’), used originally of a historical woman whose sons all died in battle in the early Islamic period, but subsequently to refer to other such women. The informants also reported that the more metaphorical expression **أم الفتوح** (‘mother of openings / conquests’ ) had been used to refer to the ‘opening up’ of Andalusia in the Umayyad age (Hodge and Kress ibid: 199-200). What seemed strange, though, about Saddam’s phrase – and caused it to be used to represent ‘Otherness’ – was the idea of linking the positive, nurturing connotations of motherhood to the masculine and negative ones of battle. It is interesting to note that, towards the end of this speech, Saddam uses the metaphor of motherhood to refer to Iraq as the ‘cradle of civilizations and of the prophets’ just as he had used it in his 8 August speech to refer to the Arab world. Now he enjoins his listeners to tell ‘the present-day Hulago’ to desist from trying to harm Iraq with a rhetorical force that is hard to translate and which neither of the published translations quite manages to reproduce:

فقولوا له بصوت واضح مسموع أن كُفَّ شرك، أيها الشرير، عن أم الحضارات، ومتحفها وشاهدها الأساس،  
ومهدا ومهد أصل الأنبياء والرسل ...

Our suggested way of dealing with this, so as to retain both the meaning and something of the rhetorical power, would be along these lines: *‘Tell these wicked people loud and clear to get their dirty hands off Iraq. Tell them because it’s the mother of civilizations, the place where those civilizations first saw the light of day and where their relics are*

*stored; because it's where they started out, and where the line of our divine prophets and messengers also began'.*

As an instance of Saddam's increasingly habitual 'manipulation of Islam' Bengio (1998: 184) cites his speech on the first anniversary of the Gulf War in 1992 (using the text reported in the party newspaper *Al-Thawra* on 18 January 1992). In that speech Saddam compared his own age with that of the Prophet, and his struggle against the coalition of thirty 'pagan' states with Muhammad's war with the unbelievers: what they both had in common was the victory of faith, with the help of Allāh, over godlessness. He even appeared to be comparing himself to Abraham as he went on to quote Q21: 69, which describes how Abraham was saved by his Lord from the fire with which the idolaters wished to consume him ('We said, O fire, be coolness and safety for Abraham'). In the 2003 speech the discourse and the overall strategy are much the same, with the customary Qur'ānic framing and indeed a reference at one point to that very same verse (a favourite one which had, in fact, been used for the opening of Saddam's original speech on 17 January 1991, the speech in which he first spoke of the 'mother of battles', as translated by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service). This time, however, Saddam the 'history man' has chosen to concentrate on expounding what he evidently considers a more potent allegory to meet the needs of the new situation, and this time invokes images of the Mongol conquest under Hulago in the thirteenth century, suggesting that the Ba'ath revolution with its 'march' of socialist progress and subsequent re-discovery of 'faith' has given Iraq a 'new birth' in the sunlight after some seven centuries of gloom. The resulting text is a challenging one, dense with mediaeval imagery and extravagant metaphor, which like Text A seeks to achieve its rhetorical effect through the power of allusion and allegory rather than through explicit reference. The communicative goal – the intentionality – seems to be to focus on the land of Iraq as a source and traditional centre of civilization and to arouse a sense of historical pride and therefore solidarity – or at least sympathy – both at home and abroad.

Unfortunately, though, the translated text is decidedly 'foreign' and opaque and fails to mirror the rhetorical power of the source (Appendix B1). This time two English translations are available. One is the official INA version, downloaded from its website, which is an attempt at a literal translation but even within that framework is not

sufficiently competent (Appendix B2). This version was also relayed online by *The Guardian*, with no attempt at any editorial insertions (Appendix B3). The other version is from the Iraq Satellite Channel, relayed by the BBC Monitoring Middle East and supplied with an introductory summary and other editorial insertions in the form of sub-headings and a few items of information in square brackets (Appendix B4). This second version is a somewhat better translation, even though it follows the same basic approach, that of a dictionary-based literalism.

The speech is, as usual, framed by a Qur'ānic quotation, this time from Q3: 173-176. The verses here refer to the lessons to be learned from the Battle of Uḥud in the very early days of Islam, and to the belief that no infidel enemy can hurt the cause of Allāh. Whether Saddam was trying to imply that the Kuwaiti episode (despite his rhetoric about the 'Mother of Battles') was a kind of Uḥud, and that the Iraqis would perform better the next time around, is not clear. In any case, the speech opens with the customary salutations – but this time with an extra layer of emotive intensity – and then embarks, not on the type of historical disquisition that we saw in the 8 August speech, but on an extraordinary and densely metaphorical and allusive version of Iraq's history, her place in the world and the role of the Ba'ath revolution of 1968 in giving the country a 'new birth'. A cursory trawl through the Arabic text is enough to indicate its challenging rhetorical and allusive complexity; and therefore small wonder that the English translations (which the Iraqi translators no doubt had to produce in fairly short order) also exhibit for the TT reader a particularly alien and even 'mediaeval' texture. The reader seems to be taken into a strange but colourful world of multiple births or rebirths, of swords and pens, of the Tigris foaming with much ink (not to mention the blood), of croaking ravens waiting to peck out eyes, of attacking lizards and hissing snakes and crocodiles coming from distant seas, and of Mongol horsemen thundering up to the walls of Baghdad through the gathering gloom. This was not the final message from Saddam, but it appears to have been his last great rhetorical stand, in which Iraq and its history as a reborn and revitalized 'mother of civilizations' takes centre stage.

Interestingly, we find almost hidden amidst the extravagant metaphorical language of the first paragraph two words that take us back to Saddam's much more pedestrian

discourse of the 1970's which we noted in Chapter Four. He is describing the Ba'ath revolution as having represented a newborn Iraq, and he reminds his listeners of 'their' 'splendid' revolution and 'march' (ثورتكم ومسيرتكم الغراء). This may be seen as an intertextual link, consciously or unconsciously fashioned, with the language of the old days when things looked much brighter for Saddam. The speech then goes on to record the Revolution's journey towards a renewed faith, deepened by the events of 1991 and compensating for the traumatic disaster at the hands of the Mongol Hulagu in 1258. There are so many and varied translation challenges as the speech continues, and it is not our intention here to do more than identify a few of them. How, for example, can a translation do justice to the apparent echoing in the second paragraph of قرباناً تقبله ... فنعتت فيها الغربان ('a sacrifice acceptable to Allāh') by the words a little later فنعتت فيها الغربان ('and then ravens started to croak...')? The imagery of ravens croaking has, of course, powerful negative connotations, summoning up the idea of a 'dark age' through which Iraq had to pass before once again emerging into the full sunlight of Ba'athism. (There is also most probably a powerful Qur'ānic intertext being brought into play here, namely the story in Q5: 31 of the raven - or crow - being sent by Allāh to show Cain, who had just murdered his brother Abel, how to bury him.) The dark, murderous world of the ravens is contrasted with a much more favourable and auspicious image presented at the start and end of the speech, that of the 'green birds' (طيور خضر). Later on, we are told that the 'new birth' (of Ba'athism) brought renewal to Baghdad:

أعادت الولادة الجديدة روح بغداد من جديد، ومع الولادة ولد موقف، وسيف، وقلم، وراية.. فبارك نداء (الله أكبر) الموقف والراية والسيف والقلم ...

The INA translation has: 'The new birth brought back once again the spirit of Baghdad, and with the birth a stand, a sword, a pen and a banner were born. The call of "Allāh is the greatest" blessed the stand, the sword and the pen.' The Iraq Satellite Channel translation does it only slightly better: 'The new birth revived the spirit of Baghdad. A position, sword, pen and banner were born with this new birth, and these were blessed by the call of God is great.' Both of these translations are inadequate if the object of translation is indeed to communicate meaning effectively in someone else's linguistic and intertextual system, rather than to provoke gales of laughter. We would suggest that these words could be rendered as something like: *'It was this political rebirth/ revival that brought Baghdad back to life again, since it was accompanied by both military*

*might and learning, standing together firmly under the banner of Islam / Faith and blessed by the slogan / cry of "Allāhu akbar"*'. Another example, this time of a single word that has caused one of the translators to produce something linguistically and interculturally inadequate and incompetent, is that of the word ارتقاء , first encountered at the beginning of the second paragraph. The INA translator has reached for his dictionary and selected the word 'ascent', which is clearly not the right one in the context. The TT reader who reads something like 'a determination for ascent...' is probably going to be somewhat baffled and unlikely to read on very carefully or sympathetically. The other translation again does a rather better job with '..determination to advance and overcome difficulties...'

Clearly one of the main difficulties of translating such a speech as this one lies in deciding how to deal with the 'metaphorical exuberance' it displays. Dickins (2005: 256 – 264) discusses this phenomenon in language, and comments that, although English in some text types is capable of displaying such exuberance,

Arabic would appear to allow even greater 'metaphorical exuberance' than English, particularly where the author is being emotive. Accordingly, Arabic ST metaphors not infrequently appear too strong or too dense for equivalent forms of English writing and there is some need to tone down the metaphors of the Arabic ST in the English TT (ibid: 256).

In effect this speech presents an extended metaphor, indeed an allegory of Iraq and its civilization as a body that has needed periodically to be revived, having always been preyed upon by evil beasts and by the enemies of civilization. The situation is more threatening than in the summer of 2002, and now the 'Hulago of this age' (Bush, Blair and co. rather than Khomeini) is poised to attack once again. The imagery, as we have said, is distinctly 'mediaeval', featuring arrows, lances and swords and attackers dying or 'committing suicide' at 'the walls' of Baghdad, Jenin [in the northern West Bank – presumably an allusion to the Israeli operations there in 2002] and elsewhere. One can hardly blame the non-native translators into English of such a text for adopting a basically literal, dictionary-based approach. There may indeed be much to be said in favour of following a 'faithful' approach in order to mirror the megalomania and self-delusion of the text-producer in this case. However, there is surely a need for some downtoning of the material, more explication of the allusions, and in many places more



flexible if not creative translation in order that the translation becomes acceptable to TT readers as, first of all, a readable text and then as a recognizable instance of a familiar type of text, whether it be a political rallying speech, a sermon or a piece of political allegory. We believe that the TT can be made to sound less alien, and more in tune with an English-speaking intertextual system, even by making relatively minor changes, such as replacing 'O good people wherever you are in the world' with 'People of good will, anywhere in the world' (as in fact the INA translator did, more or less) or the problematic word 'martyrs' with either 'victims of aggression' or simply 'the noble dead'. We acknowledge once again that the BBC Monitoring output helps the reader by providing a (suitably toned-down) summary of the overall message and also sub-headings; the translation relayed, however, remains very foreign because of the outlandish imagery and its many instances of unfamiliar collocations in English.

#### **5.4 Conclusion**

In this final chapter we have discussed two challenging Arabic texts, the two anniversary speeches delivered by Saddam Hussein for the benefit of his audiences in Iraq, the wider Arab world and beyond on 8 August 2002 and 17 January 2003, in the run-up to the invasion of Iraq that was to quickly topple Saddam in the spring of 2003. Before offering some analysis of, and explanatory comments on the Arabic texts, together with some criticism of the published English translations, we provided what we saw as necessary background information for an understanding of the historical, ideological and intertextual setting in which these texts were produced. We believe that such contextual knowledge is indispensable for comprehension of both the Arabic ST's and the English translations.

We have seen how the ideology behind Saddam Hussein's political discourse changed over the time he was in power from that of Ba'athist socialism to that of an almost messianic Islamic rhetoric and a strong sense of history (and of its usefulness as a tool for political manipulation). We have also seen how this ideology became in his speeches a carrier of intertextuality. This took the form not only of many and various

Qur'ānic quotations and other religious and historical allusions, but also of a generic connection with Arab political speeches of the past, such as those of Nasser, and with Saddam's own previous speeches. All of this presents any would-be translator into English with a number of problems in trying to convey such rhetorically dense and intertextually laden messages into an 'equivalent' TT form. The strategy of the Iraqi official translators has been one of 'minimal mediation', with a 'faithful' but mostly over-literal approach to the task: one that – to be fair – sometimes reveals good linguistic and intercultural competence, but mostly betrays an inadequate familiarity with TT prototypes, reader expectations and intertextual world. The texts lack sufficient informativity, while at the same time their rhetorical power and the way they provide 'conceptual linkage' through lexical repetition (Dickins 2005: 259) are not adequately accounted for. This is why they are likely to be received by the TT reader with varying degrees of amusement, irritation or simply incomprehension (depending of course on the amount of intercultural and interlinguistic awareness that is there to be activated).

As we mentioned earlier, Sa'adeddin (1989) has argued that English typically uses a 'visual' mode of text development and Arabic an 'aural' mode 'as the norm model for written texts' (ibid: 49), although Arabic has also a 'visual' mode at its disposal. 'Communal text norms of power and solidarity' are forged over time as text producers respond to the expectations that are developed by text receivers, and this inevitably gives rise to intercultural problems:

Hitherto a major misapprehension in writing in a second or foreign language has been to disregard these norms, and assume that they can be transferred from one language community to another without re-assessing the structural implications of a given mode and the question of its acceptability to the text receivers in a different language community (ibid).

This statement clearly applies to the practice of translating into a second language, examples of which we have seen in the case of Saddam's speeches. The first 'major surface distinction' that Sa'adeddin identifies (ibid: 48) between the two modes of text development lies in the degree of implicitness or explicitness. Whereas, generally speaking, Arabic has a tendency in many ways to be more explicit than English, as exemplified by Emery (1987: 63-64), Sa'adeddin (ibid) posits that the 'aurally developed' text has a higher degree of implicitness than the 'visually developed' one,

which ‘foregrounds explications’ and seeks to clarify concepts and relations, connotations and symbols, without automatically assuming shared knowledge or attitudes with the text receiver. This distinction does seem to apply to the way our Saddam speeches begin, with their historical-abstract or historical-poetic language, and indeed to the manner in which they continue, which – even allowing for cross-cultural expectations of political rhetoric – make harsh demands on the unaccustomed ‘visual’ text receiver.

So how can Neubert and Shreve’s (albeit somewhat vague) notion of ‘**communicative equivalence**’ be applied to the translation problems we have identified in the speeches? They state (1992: 145) that ‘only the professional translator can produce translations which are the communicative equivalents of source texts’, while students and novices tend to produce texts that are ‘on the fuzzy margins of textuality’ – texts which are ‘wholly linguistic’ and thus ‘force the user to supply all the textual cues that the translator normally provides’. What we understand by this is that professional translators into their own or a second language will first of all have the bilingual structural and lexical competence to produce translations that are accurate and ‘faithful’ (in the sense of not being overly ‘creative’) and which demonstrate an understanding of such things as the normal collocational patterns and foregrounding / backgrounding habits and characteristics of the target language. In addition to that they will have sufficient intercultural knowledge to be aware of textual norms, of text receiver expectations and also of ideology in language as a natural carrier, within any language and culture, of intertextuality in its various manifestations. They will need to ‘mediate’ such intertextuality as best they can in such a way that certain connections are activated in the mind of the TT reader and thus facilitate real communication. In the case of translating Saddam, a knowledge of the typical patterns of political speech-making in the Anglo-American tradition would no doubt be useful, as would some experience or specific training in such areas, relevant to this type of translation, as the treatment of metaphor and rhetorical invocation. It is, we believe, only through this type of increased (and systematically developed) intercultural as well as interlingual competence that the challenge of translating such apparently ‘alien’ material as Saddam’s later speeches can

be met in future with greater confidence and with a greater measure of communicative success.

## **Conclusion, Recommendations and Prospects**

'Rhetoric', writes Abdul-Raof (2006: 1), 'is the flesh and blood of the Arabic language'. This is because it provides users of the language with 'the appropriate and effective stylistic mechanisms required for eloquently forceful discourse', enabling language to meet the communicative needs of the language user; furthermore, it combines speech act, or pragmatic, awareness with context knowledge, so that the speaker 'analyses the communicative context of his or her speech act with a view to determining whether a given speech act will meet its desired communicative goal' (ibid). Above all, Arabic rhetoric gives importance to the psychology of communication:

As language users and text producers, we need our communication to be expressive and forceful. If language is the weapon, words are the bullets (ibid).

As we have seen in the last chapter, the power of language was certainly seen as a weapon by the late Saddam Hussein. It was also wielded effectively through a range of rhetorical devices, including dense metaphor usage, and through the power of intertextual allusion in particular. Given Saddam's tendency to repeat himself in his anniversary speeches, and to recontextualize many of his favourite intertexts to suit the needs of the hour, it is hard to know how his rhetoric was actually received by his main intended audience at home and in the Arab world: possibly not entirely as he intended. In any case, that is outside the scope of our study. We have, however, seen from many examples just how challenging it is to reproduce his rhetoric in a way that sounds at all natural in English.

In the course of this study we have prepared the ground for analysis of two of Saddam's late speeches by, first of all, reviewing the whole practice of translation in its historical context, and later by examining the relationship between ideology, as an overarching feature of language in use, and intertextuality, surely one of its most fascinating components. We have also provided earlier in the study a solid and detailed account of the types of equivalence and translatability problems existing between Arabic and English, and have encountered many of those problems in the Saddam speeches. We have argued that ideology is essentially a carrier of intertexts, and that the truly professional and competent translator working on this particular language pair needs to

acquire, over time, a good understanding of the ‘intertextual system’ of the other language and culture in order to produce translations that are ‘communicatively equivalent’ according to the rather loose criteria suggested by Neubert and Shreve (1992: 142-145). As we stated in the **Introduction**, the only real claim to originality in this study lies in its application of the notion of ideology as a carrier of intertextuality to an analysis of the Saddam Hussein material. We saw in the last chapter how this material is rich in intertextuality not just in the form of religious quotations and historical allusions, but also in terms of a generic connection with Saddam’s previous speechmaking and with past political oratory in the Arab world, notably that of Gamal Abdel Nasser. Drawing on Mazraani’s important earlier (1997) study of language variation in Arab political discourse, we have suggested a ‘vertical’ intertextual link between the rhetoric of Nasser at a time of crisis for Egypt and the Arab world and that of Saddam in the run-up to the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

Our study of the published translations into English of the Saddam speeches in Arabic has highlighted both general issues of translation equivalence and also some issues related to ‘textual competence’ and to translation into the second language. The latter phenomenon has been investigated in a pioneering study by Campbell (1998), who makes the point that in many parts of the world translation into the second language is a normal practice – even though one that has been largely ignored by most writing on translation (ibid: 11-12):

In virtually any post-colonial society in the developing world where a major European language still has a foothold, there will be people who regularly write and translate in that language as a second language. Similarly, in countries of high immigration, there will be second language speakers of the host language who write and translate in that language (ibid: 12).

This, he adds, necessitates ‘a model of translation competence for second language translator education’ (ibid), and given that professional translators are expected to be able to deal competently with certain typical genres (official prose, administrative and legal texts, etc), translation pedagogy has as one of its major concerns ‘to teach students to create texts like these in a second language’ (ibid: 56). Consequently:

Textual competence is the element of translation competence that such pedagogy addresses (ibid).

The case studies that Campbell uses deal mainly with Arabic speakers undergoing translator training in Australia. However, in the Arab world itself there is (and has been

for a long time) a great deal of translation from Arabic into English as a second language being done regularly and on a large scale – though much of it without adequate professional preparation. Degrees of ‘textual competence’ encountered in such output naturally vary over a wide range. It is in this context that we have examined the English versions of the Saddam speeches, and while there is much in them which is at least competent they also indicate the need for training in coping with the genre of political speechmaking, which is surely as important a genre as any other to be considered by those who plan translator training programmes.

Achieving ‘communicative equivalence’ need not mean straying from a ‘faithful’ approach to tackling a challenging text. It may well, however, entail sometimes abandoning the kind of dictionary-based, word-for-word and word-by-word approach which we have found so evident in our English versions of the Saddam speeches. In our analysis of the translations and our suggested alternative versions we have sought to demonstrate that in many instances a literal translation is not actually ‘faithful’, since without using any creative transposition or expansion it may fail to convey actual meaning, context and intertextual allusion (as in the example of ‘Oh God..Oh God.. Oh..August’ and what follows). Probably all translators, and not just those in the Arab world working into English as a second language, can benefit a great deal from the fruits of corpus-based research into, for example, collocational usage in both English and Arabic. Greater awareness of acceptable stylistic patterns likewise has to be developed, along with better understanding of divergent textual norms and text receiver expectations. Not least, translators need to be trained to see how techniques for transposition, omission, merging or explicitation can and should sometimes be used, since their use is not inconsistent with an overall commitment to ‘faithfulness’.

As we mentioned in our **Introduction**, the translation of material in Arabic that has some similarity to the language of Saddam Hussein is likely to increase in the years ahead, and most people in the English-speaking world are probably much more likely to become exposed to this than they are to Arabic literature. There will be no shortage of official or institutional customers for such translations relating to Middle Eastern affairs, whether these are produced and circulated by BBC Monitoring, MEMRI, other news

agencies, research bodies, individual newspapers or intelligence and security organizations. The general approach we have adopted here could perhaps be applied to understanding and translating better the output of people like Osama Bin Laden; and it might also be usefully applied to a study of the output of a maverick Arab leader such as Gaddafi (whose official translator gave up trying to cope with his speech to the UN General Assembly in September 2009) or to that of other powerful and less eccentric orators in the contemporary Arab world such as Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of the Lebanese Hizballāh, whose speeches at the time of the 2006 conflict with Israel aroused and inspired listeners in the Arab world beyond Lebanon and were also, of course, monitored with interest elsewhere.

Furthermore, it is our belief that the same approach – seeing ideology as a carrier of intertextuality – could also usefully be applied to the translation and study of political discourse in languages other than Arabic. An obvious and suitable case for treatment is Farsi, given the current state of relations between the present regime in Iran and many governments in the West. No doubt the same could be said of many other languages and nations of the world, from Cuba and Venezuela to North Korea. The case of Farsi, however, seems to be a particularly interesting and urgent one, given that the Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is possibly facing a situation of crisis and danger rather similar to that faced by Saddam in 2002/3. We have already referred in 4.5 to the way his October 2005 speech was translated and disseminated through the Western news media. In an important paper examining this and other cases of figurative language in Iranian political discourse, Farzad Sharifian (2009: 420-421) shows how in the much-quoted ‘Israel should be wiped off the map’ passage Ahmadinejad was actually quoting the late Imam Khomeini rather than expressing his own view, and moreover how the Farsi source text clearly refers to the political regime in Israel rather than to the country or state itself. Sharifian draws attention to a phenomenon in media translation that is worrying and surely needs urgent attention:

The use of figurative language is prevalent in all domains of language use, including politics. In today’s international arena, where the figurative use of language by politicians is immediately rendered into other languages, the socio-cultural situatedness of figurative language gives rise to the possibility of cross-cultural misunderstandings, which have the potential to cause significant damage to international relationships (ibid: 416).



On a positive note, it is a heartening development in this new century that many other such papers published recently in the *Journal of Language and Politics* have provided useful and timely analyses (including intertextual ones) of political discourse trends and patterns that should be of interest to all those concerned with the translation of political texts. Many have, of course, concerned themselves with the use of English (for example, Emanatian and Delaney 2008, Lazar and Lazar 2008), while others have investigated Arabic (for example, Boussofara-Omar 2006) and Farsi (for example, Amouzadeh 2008, Sharifian 2009, Stokes 2010).

Our own study, then, represents just a small contribution to this growing pool of research motivated by a concern for accuracy, clarity and honesty in translation and in international relations. This research has, we believe, shown that for all those who care about successful interlingual and intercultural communication, the rhetoric and the intertextual world of 'the other' offers a very important, worthwhile and rewarding field for exploration.

**APPENDIX A1**

**Saddam Hussein Speech of 8 August 2002 (Text A)  
(original Arabic source text)**

**pages 223 - 228**

## خطاب يوم النصر العظيم 8 / آب / 2002

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

( بل نقذف بالحق على الباطل فيدمغه فإذا هو زاهق ) ..

صدق الله العظيم

أيها الشعب العظيم ..

أيها النشامى والماجدات ..

أيها الرجال في قواتنا المسلحة الباسلة ..

أيها العرب ..

أيها المؤمنون حيثما أنتم ..

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته ..

بغض النظر عن التفاصيل ، وعن طبيعة التطور بين الفواصل التاريخية المتعاقبة ، فإن الدرس الانساني المستخلص ، هو أن حاضر أي أمة ، أو شعب لا يستطيع أن ينسلخ عن الماضي ، وإن الأمم والشعوب ، على وفق هذا ، بنت حاضرها ، وإن تطورت عن ماضيها ارتقاءً أو هبوطاً ..

ومما يستفاد من تأريخ الانسانية أيضاً ، أن الطمع والطمع والغطرسة ، عندما يتحدان ، لا يؤديان بالظالم الى ظلم الآخرين فحسب ، وإنما الى ظلم نفسه أيضاً ، بعد ان يوهمه اتحاد الطمع والغطرسة بالمكنة والقوة التي لا تقهر ، حتى وهو يسلك طريق الباطل والعدوان ، ويرتكب ابشع الأعمال ، منطلقاً من ذاك التصور المريض .. فيهبوي صاحبها الى تهلكة .. ومن بعدها الى سقر .

ومن دروس التاريخ القريب والبعيد ، ان كل الإمبراطوريات ، وحاملي تابوت الشر ، حيثما توجهوا بالشر ضد الأمة العربية ، أو ضد بلاد المسلمين ، دُفِنوا هم ، وأحلامهم المريضة ، وغطرساتهم ، وطمعهم في تلبوتهم على أرض العرب والمسلمين ، أو شيعوا أنفسهم ، ليموتوا على الأرض التي انطلقوا منها معتدين .. وهذا ينطبق على كل الإمبراطوريات قبل تاريخنا هذا .. وإذا كان هذا هو ما ينبئنا به التاريخ من غير أي استثناء عن حكمه في كل الحقب الماضية ، والدهور السابقة .. فهل يمكن أن يوصف من يحاول ان يتجاهله الآن بغير الأوصاف التي لا يسر عاقل حكيم ان يوصف بها .. ؟!

إن هذه النتيجة الحتمية تنتظر كل من يحاول الاعتداء على العرب والمسلمين .. وإذا أراد أحد ان يفيد من التاريخ ، فطليه ، حيثما اتحد لديه الطمع مع الغطرسة والغرور ، ان يتذكر ذلك ليرعوي ، وألا فإن مصيره ( مزبلة التاريخ ) وفق ما يصف سياسيو القرن العشرين ..

أمام مثل هذه الدروس كلها ، وقفنا ونقف ، كلما ذر عدوان بقرنه علينا وعلى امتنا ، ولم ، ولن نواجه أي عدوان بقوة سلاحنا أو عضلاتنا وعضلات شعبنا بالأساس ، وإنما بقوة إيماننا ، وبأن الله ناصر المؤمنين بالحق ضد الباطل .. وإن الأيمان ، على هذه القاعدة ، هو الحاسم في صلة النتيجة بمصلحة الشعب ، والأمة ، وفي رضا النفس ، مع ما يمكن ان يبسر به العزة من وسائل يعدها المؤمنون على أساس قوله ، سبحانه ، ( واعدوا لهم ما استطعتم من قوة .. ) وكنا دائماً ، نحن ورفاقنا ، ومعنا شعبنا وجيشنا ، نسأل أنفسنا : هل يستطيع الأب والام أن يفيا بواجب الأبوة والأمومة إزاء أبنائهما ، عندما يكونان مثقلين بالقيود وعبء العبودية ؟ وهل يمكن للأبناء ان يكونوا الا جاحدين وعاقين ، لو رأوا آباءهم وأمهاتهم مكبلين بالقيود والسلاسل ، وينقض ظهورهم عبء العبودية الثقيل ، من غير أن ينتخوا ، ليندودوا عنهم ، ويفكوا قيودهم ، أو يشكلوا سياج الوفاء بصدورهم العامرة بالإيمان بوجه كل واهم شرير طامع ؟!

أتعرفون ، أيها الاخوة العرب ، من هو أبونا وامنا ، نحن العراقيين ، وجيشنا وقيادة الجيش والشعب ؟ إن أمنا وابتانا هما أمتنا والوطن .. وعلى أساس هذه المعاني ، وعلى أساس ما استحضرناه من دروس التاريخ ، وقفنا في عام 1980 لنحمي شعبنا وامتنا بوجه من أراد أن يذلها ، بعد أن يكبلها ، ليحطها ، ويجعل وطننا يصابون بالعفن .. نعم ، على هذا وقفنا ، وتذكرنا ، ولم ننس ، ان من يريد الوطن حراً معافى ، وامته حرة طليقة ، عليه ان يكون براً بهما ، ليكونا برين به ، والا بقي ذليلاً ، نقتله حسرة الشعور بالتقصير .. ينوء تحت وطأة المذلة ، والتخلف عن الدور ، واي موقف يعتز به الأحرار إزاء شعبهم وامتهم ووطنهم ..

وعلى هذا ، اتكلنا على الله ، ووقفنا مع شعبنا وجيشنا ، لنواجه الخطر والعدوان والغطرسة طيلة ثماني سنوات ، هي الزمن الممتد من الرابع من أيلول عام 1980 ، حتى أراد الله ما أراد من نصر مبين في آب 1988 ..

وعلى أساس هذه المفاهيم ودروسها ، وقف الثوار ووقفهم في تموز عام 1968 ..

وعلى نفس الأسس والمنطلقات ، وقف شعب العراق وجيشه ، بقيادة من قادهما ضد عدوان وغطرسة أميركا ومن تحالف معها أو أطاعها مجبراً ، أو مختاراً ، منذ 1991/1/17 في أم المعارك الخالدة ، حتى يومنا هذا .

وعلى أساس هذا ، سوف يبقى موقف من أمنوا واثقوا ثابتاً معافى ، وسيندحر أي ظلام ، وتنقشع أي غيوم لا تتبى بمطر مفيد .. لتبزغ الشمس على ربيع دائم مبارك من عند الله ، يعزّ أهله ، بعد ان يخزي أهله فعل الظالمين ..

وسوف يحمل الأشرار تابوتهم على ظهورهم ، ليموتوا بحسرة فشلهم ، وارتداد كيدهم الى نحورهم في بلداتهم ، أو يحفروا قبورهم ، بعد ان يسوقوا أنفسهم الى حتفهم بظلفهم على أي ارض عربية أو إسلامية يعتدون عليها ، ومن بينها عراق الجهاد والراية والموقف ..

نقول قولنا هذا ، لنرد على رغاء وفحيح من أعجبه قوته ، فركبه الشيطان ، حتى صار وليه في كل سوء وجريمة ترتكب على ارض العرب والمسلمين ، ويخوض في دماء الأبرياء في العالم .. ويظن بأن على الناس ان يصيروا عبداً للطاغوت بالتهديد ، أو بتنفيذ التهديد .. أما لو أرادوا لانفسهم ولشعبهم الأمان والسلام .. فهذا ليس دربه ، وإنما احترام أمن وحقوق الآخرين والتعامل معهم بسلام ، والاهتداء بالحوار المتكافئ الى الضمانات الواجبة على أساس القانون والمواثيق الدولية ..

ان الإجابة على أسئلة العراق ، ووفاء مجلس الامن بالتزاماته المقررة وفق قراراته ، هما الطريق ، ولا مجال لمن يستخدم يستخدم التهديد والعدوان ألا ان يخسأ حتى لو أصاب من يصيبه بالأذى ، وان الله القادر العظيم فوق كل ذي قدرة ، وسيمحق كيد الظالمين .

أقول هذا ، مع أنني كنت أتمنى لو تجنبتة لو أن الحال غير هذا الحال مثلما فعلت من قبل حتى الآن بوجه علم .. ولكنني أقوله بهذا الوضوح ، لكي لا يتصور ضعيف ان تجاهلنا الرد على قول السوء يحمل الخشية تجاه التهديدات الوقحة ، فنصطك ركب واسنان من فقدوا الصلة برحمة الرب الرحيم ، والثقة بشعبهم ، أو يطمع المتجبرون ، فنوهمهم بما يورطهم في شأن لم يحسبوا أمره وعواقبه ..

والله أكبر ..

الله أكبر ..

الله أكبر ..

يا لها من نعمة نعمة أيمان عظيمة زكية ، وصوت كأنه يستنفر من عمق التاريخ والتراث الخالدين ، بل كأننا فيه وهو فينا ، بنفس الروح التي ردها أجدادنا في معارك اليرموك الجهادية ضد البيزنطيين ، ومعارك القادسية الأولى ، وهم يقتحمون ، بأسم الله ، جيوشاً غازية ، احتلت ارض بلاد الشام وارض العراق ، وراحت مع الظلم والقتل ، يدفعها عنادها ،

لتبقى على الباطل وهي تواجه الحق ..

الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. هي صيحات أبنائكم وإخوانكم في عراق الأيمان ، أيها المؤمنون ، وأيها العرب ، وهم يحملون على من أراد بالعراق سوءاً ، ولم يحسب الله وللأنسان حساب ، مع كل ما واجهه به العراقيون من صبر وجلد ، ولم يصغ الى أي صوت كان قد وجهه من وجهه إليه من المسلمين والعرب .. بل لم يصغ الى أي دعوة ورغبة في السلام السلام ، كنا قد أطلقناها ، بأسم شعب العراق في غير مرة من مبادرات السلام..

الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. هو نداء كل من حمل على الأعداء بالبندقية والمدفع والدبابة والطائرة وزوارق الصوالة البحرية ، لملايين الرجال على التوالي ، من العسكريين والاحتياط والمكلفين والجيش الشعبي والمهمات الخاصة ..

الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. صولة .. ودفاعاً .. تقدماً وهجوماً في عمق ارض العدو ، وهم يلاحقون الشر لينهزم .. أو يشكلون بصدرهم الحبيبة سياج هذا الوطن المؤمن الصابر المعافي .. او عندما يريد الله ان يكونوا خلف الحدود على وفق ما كانوا عليه في الفاو وبنجوين .. وفي ثغرة هنا وثغرة هناك ، على جبهة طولها ألف ومئتا كيلو متر من الفاو ، وما يلفها ويحيطها من جنوبها ، حتى لسان منشاف ، في شمال الوطن الحبيب ..

الله أكبر ..

الله أكبر ..

الله أكبر ..

أيها الصوت الحبيب .. يا صوت الحبيب المصطفى .. وصوت بلال .. وأبي بكر ، وعمر ، وعلي، وعثمان .. وخالد ، وأبي وأبي عبيدة.. وسعد .. واسامة !!

يا عطر الرسالة ، وصوت التاريخ ، ونداء الروح لتحمل الجسد الى حيث يريد الله ، ليكون طاهراً ، اميناً ، عطراً ، أزهر ، وهو شهيد على ما يريد الله .. أو وهو حي شهيد ، بعد ان قرر وابقاه الله .. حيث لا راد لأمره ، سبحانه ، ونحمده على على ما أراد ويريد ..

الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. لا اله الا الله .. الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. والله الحمد ..

صولات ، وصولات ، ويطو الهنات الحبيب ، كأن الرجال يطوفون حول الكعبة ، او يزورون المكان الذي عرج منه رسول الله الى ربه ، في تلك الليلة المباركة ، بعد ان يطهروا ارض فلسطين من دنس الصهاينة ..

الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. الله أكبر .. مع ملايين فوهات البنادق، تتناوب في جبهات القتال ، او تستقر حيث ينبغي ، من بداية بداية القتال الى أن أذن الله بنصره المبين ..

الانف فوهات المدافع ، والدبابات ، ومنصات الطائرات ، والى الخلف منها ، تتطلق حناجر ملايين الشرفاء من العرب والعراقيين والمؤمنين بدعواتهم الصادقة ان ينصر الله العراق .. فنصر الله العراق..

ومع النصر ، كان اول معاني الشكر لله ، ان غسل قلوب المؤمنين المنتصرين من أي حقد على من تسبب في كل هذا ..

ومنع أي غل من ان يتسلل الى النفوس ، مقابل الغل والعنت الذي واجهنا على مدى ثمانى سنين من القتال . وما سبقها من زمن إضافي في كل تدبير سوء . وقول سوء .. سائلين الله . جلت قدرته . وتعالي شأنه . ان يجنبنا غلامه . او غلاما لا نعرفه ..

لقد ولد النصر حصيلة لكل هذا ، وارتفع صوته وروحه ونفحات الأيمان فيه عالية مدوية في بيان البيئات . في يوم الأيام الذي أراده الله يوماً حاسماً للنصر وتاجاً له فكان يوم الثامن من آب . عام 1988 ..

الله .. الله .. يا اب ..

ما أشد حرارتك ، لا لتنضج الرطب ، فتجعله جنياً لاهلك ، فحسب ، وانما لتخضع شوك من يستخدم شوكه على اهك ، وتقهّر الظالمين بأسم الله..

يا شقيق تموز ، وحال الوصل بينه وبين أيلول !!

أيها الشهر الحبيب ، واليوم الحبيب ، تحية منا ونحن فيك الى كل يوم حبيب فيك .. والى كل نفس حبيبة من الأحياء ، وأولئك الذين سبقوا من سبقوهم بما فازوا به الى عليين ، حيث اراد الرحمن الرحيم ، أن شاء سبحانه ..

وتحية مثل التحية التي نوجهها الى الأحياء والشهداء العراقيين، الى العرب ، وفي مقدمتهم شعب فلسطين البطل والى كل مؤمن غيور مجاهد لاقى ربه بقلب سليم..

سلاما شعب فلسطين . رجالا وماجدات .. أحياء وشهداء

سلاما . سلاما يا عراق .. سلاما ..

سلاما . سلاما فلسطين .. سلاما ..

سلاما الى امتنا . والى كل أصيد آخر فيها ..

سلاما .. سلاما .. سلاما ..

والله اكبر ..

الله اكبر ..

الله اكبر ..

لا اله الا الله . والله أكبر ..

الله اكبر ..

وبه الحمد ..



**APPENDIX A2**

**Saddam Hussein Speech of 8 August 2002 (Text A)  
(Iraq News Agency: English version)**

**pages 229 - 238**



---

President Saddam Hussein's Address ON the 14<sup>th</sup>  
Anniversary of

The Great Victory day August 8, 2002

**In the name of Allah**

**The Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful**

*Nay, we hurl the Truth against falsehood, and it knocks out its  
brain, and behold, falsehood doth perish!*

**Our Great People,**

**Our Valiant Men and Women,**

**Our Men of the Heroic Armed Forces,**

**Our Arab brethren,**

**Fellow Believers, Wherever you may be,**

**Peace Be Upon You..**

Regardless of details, and of the nature of evolution between successive historical chapters, the human lesson derived is that the present of any nation or people cannot be isolated from its past; and that, according to this, nations and peoples have established their present, even though it might be distinguishable from their past in terms of advancement or retraction.

Of the lessons also gained from the history of mankind is the fact

that greed and arrogance, when combined, lead the oppressor to do injustice not only to others, but to himself as well; once this combination of greed and arrogance has misled him into a sense of undefeatable capability and power, as he takes the road of falsehood and aggression, committing the most heinous acts and proceeding from that sick imagination, to fall down the precipice and then into hell.

One of the lessons of recent and distant history is that all empires and bearers of the coffin of evil, whenever they mobilized their evil against the Arab nation, or against the Muslim world, they were themselves buried in their own coffin, with their sick dreams and their arrogance and greed, under Arab and Islamic soil; or they returned to die on the land from which they had proceeded to perpetrate aggression. This has been the case with all empires preceding our present time. If this is what history tells us about its judgment on all times and eras of the past without exception, can we then describe those who are trying to ignore history now except in the words which no wise or prudent person would wish to be described with?

This is the inevitable outcome awaiting all those who try to aggress against Arabs and Muslims. If anyone wants to learn from history anyone with greed and arrogance combined in himself, he ought to remember this fact and think again. Otherwise, he will end up in the dust-bin of history, as twentieth century politicians would say.

We always stood, and continue to stand, to learn from all such lessons, whenever the horns of aggression loomed large against us. We never faced, nor will face, any aggression relying basically on our force of arms, or our muscles and the muscles of our people, but rather on the strength of our faith, in the belief that Allah always helps the faithful and their just cause to prevail over injustice.

Faith, according to this rule, is the decisive factor in linking the final outcome to the good of the people and the nation, and to

self-satisfaction, with all that Allah Almighty shall extend of the means of strength provided by the faithful on the basis of His Divine instruction: "Extend to them all the strength you can provide...". We have always, along with our comrades, our people and our armed forces, asked ourselves: Can fathers and mothers discharge their parental duties towards their children when they are placed in chains under the burden of servitude? Will the children be ungrateful apostates, if they see their fathers and mothers in chains, enduring the heavy burden of oppression, and never move to save them, break their chains, or surround them with their protective chests of faith, against all misguided evil aggressors

Do you know, brothers in the Arab homeland, who our father and mother are, we the Iraqis, our armed forces, and the leadership of our army and people? Our mother and father are the nation and the homeland. It is on the basis of these meanings and what we recall from the lessons of history, that we took our stand in 1980 to defend our people and nation against those who sought to enslave them, put them in chains, and then leave them to decay.

Yes, this was our stand. And we recall, and never forget, that he who wants his homeland to be liberated and healthy, his nation free and unfettered, has to be loyal to them so that they will remain generous to him. Otherwise, he will remain doomed to subservience, killed by a sense of guilt, labouring under the heavy burden of contempt, of having fallen behind and failing to play his role in the position that brings pride to freedom-fighters in the eyes of their people, their nation and their homeland.

Thus, we relied on Allah, and took the position required under the circumstance, along with our people and armed forces, to confront danger, with stand aggression and defy arrogance, for eight long years which lasted from September 4<sup>th</sup>, 1980, to the date which Allah designated to be the day of final victory in August 1988.

It is also on the basis of these concepts, and the lessons derived from

them, that our revolutionaries made their day in July 1968.

On these same grounds and concepts, the people of Iraq and their armed forces, led by their brave leaders against the aggression and arrogance of the United States and those who allied themselves to the Americans, or followed them under duress, or by choice, from 17 January 1991, the day of the battle of Um el-Ma'arick until today.

On this basis, the stand of loyalty taken by the faithful shall remain firm and healthy. Darkness shall be defeated, and every cloud that carries no useful rain shall be dispersed, giving way to the sun to usher in endless spring, blessed by Allah, fill with pride its people who themselves bring disgrace to the conduct of the aggressors.

The forces of evil will carry their coffins on their backs, to die in disgraceful failure, taking their schemes back with them, or to die their own graves, after they bring death to themselves on every Arab or Muslim soil against which they perpetrate aggression, including the Iraq, the land of Jihad and the banner.

We say this to refute the grumbling and sibilation of those bragging their power, governed by the devil, their master in every evil act and crime which they perpetrate against the land of the Arabs and Muslims, while they wade in the rivers of innocent blood they shed in the world, believing that the people of the world should become slaves to Tyranny and its threats, both declared and executed threats. But if they wanted peace and security for themselves and their people, then this is not the course to take. The right course is to respect to the security and rights of others, through dealing with others in peace and establishing the obligations required by way of equitable dialogue and on the basis of international law and international covenants.

The right way is that the Security Council should reply to the questions raised by Iraq, and should honour its obligations under its

own resolutions. There is no other choice for those who use threat and aggression but to be repelled even if they were to bring harm to their targets. Allah, the omni-powerful is above all power and shall repel the schemes of the unjust.

I say this even though I had preferred to avoid referring to it, under a different circumstance, as I have generally done so far. But I say it in such clear terms so that no weakling will imagine that when we ignore responding to ill talk, then this means that we are frightened by the impudent threats which will make those who have lost all ties with God the Compassionate, and all trust in their people, tremble and shiver; and so that no greedy tyrant will be misled into an action the consequences of which are beyond their calculations.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

What a pure, magnificent and melodious breeze of faith; a voice, a if recalled from the depth of our eternal heritage and history, a voice in which we find ourselves and it in us, in the same spirit raised by our forefathers in the battles of Jihad at Yarmouk against the Bizantines, and the Battles of the First Qadissiyah, in which our forefathers broke, in the Name of Allah, the ranks of the invading armies that had occupied the land of Sham (Syria) and Iraq, where they brought injustice and death, motivated by stubbornness, to remain on the side of falsehood in the face.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great

These our brethren the faithful and the Arabs, are the calls made by your sons and brothers in Iraq, the land of faith, as they confront the enemy who wants to harm Iraq, with total disregard to God and man, despite all the resilience and resolve with which the Iraq people have faced this enemy who has refused to listen to any Islamic or Arab voice, and indeed rejected all the initiatives and

calls for peace, which we had proposed more than once, name of the people of Iraq.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

This is the call made by everyone confronting the enemies with a gun, a cannon, on a tank, in a plane, or on a naval boat, by millions of men amongst our troops, in conscription or reserve, our peoples army and our special task forces.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

Allah is Great.. Attacking.. defending.. advancing and charging forward deep in enemy territory, chasing evil to defeat it; or forming with their dear chests the fence protecting this faithful, patient and healthy homeland; or standing, whenever Allah so wills it, behind the borders in the same way as they did at Faw and Penjaveen, in a trench here and a trench there, along a battlefront extending over one thousand and two hundred kilometers from Faw and the territory surrounding and protecting it to the south up to the head-land of Minshaf in our dear northern part of Iraq.

Allah is Great..

Allah is Great..

Allah is Great..

Our beloved call.. the voice of our dear Prophet, the voice of Bilal, Abi Bakr, Umar, Ali and Uthman.. of Khalid, Abi Ubayda, Sa'd and Usama.

The fragrance of the Message, the voice of history, the call of the spirit carrying the body to the destination determined by Allah, to be pure, secure, aromatic, and rosy, as he is a witness to the will of Allah, or a living martyr, so destined by Allah Almighty, whos

command is irrevocable, praised He be for all He wills and all He wants.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

There is no God but Allah.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

Praise be to Allah

Charge on.. Charge on.. Charge on..

The dear chant is raised, as if the men are circumambulating around the Ka'ba, or returning to the place from which Prophet Mohammed, the Messenger of Allah, ascended to God on that Blessed Night, after they cleanse the land of Palestine from Zionis desecration.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. with millions o gun-barrels, exchanging places on the battle- fronts, or bein stationed where they ought to be from the start of the battle until Allah grants His final victory.

Thousands of artillery-guns and tanks and hundreds of aircraft, backed by millions of honourable Arabs and Iraqis and of the faithful who prayed for Iraq to be granted Allah's victory, which the Almighty graced Iraq with.

With victory, came the first expressions of gratitude to Allah, for having cleansed the hearts of the victorious faithful from all hatred, and prevented any grudge or rancour from infiltrating our souls, against the hatred and hard-headedness we had faced throughou eight years of fighting, preceded by an additional period o scheming and abuse, praying to Allah the omni-powerful, the Almighty, to spare us any such hatred or any hatred which we don't

know.

Victory was born out of all this. Its voice, spirit and breeze of faith were raised high, in the resounding "Communique -of-all-Communiques" on the Day-of-Days which Allah Almighty had destined to be the day of decisive victory, crowned by it on the 8<sup>th</sup> of August 1988.

Oh God.. Oh God.. Oh.. August.

How hot is year temperature, not only to ripen the date-fruit to be picked by your people, but also to break the spikes that others want to use against your people and thus defeat the unjust aggressors, in the name of Allah.

Brother to July and it link to September!!

Dear month, dear day, we extend our greetings to you as we live your dear days one by one, and to every living soul and every soul that has a place in heaven, blessed by Allah, the Almighty.

Greetings similar to those we extend to our Iraqi brothers and Iraq martyrs, to the Arabs in the forefront of whom come the heroic people of Palestine, and to every honourable Mujahid of the faithful who met his God with a pure heart.

Greeting to the people of Palestine, men and women, living and martyrs.

Greetings, Greetings to Iraq

Greetings, Greetings to our Arab

ation, and to everyone of its brave heroes,

Greetings, Greetings, Greetings



Allah is Great

Allah is Great

Allah is Great

There is no God but Allah

Allah is Great

Praise be to Allah



**APPENDIX A3**

**Saddam Hussein Speech of 8 August 2002 (Text A)  
(BBC Monitoring Middle East: English version)**

**pages 239 - 244**

**Saddam says "aggressors" to be "buried in their own coffin" - text of speech.**

bbcmep0020020808dy88001jl

2522 Words

08 August 2002

09:49 GMT

BBC Monitoring Middle East - Political

English

(c) 2002 The British Broadcasting Corporation [date of publication]. All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced except with the express permission of The British Broadcasting Corporation.

Saddam Husayn has said that "greed and arrogance" sometimes lulls "oppressors" into a false sense of security, but that the "inevitable outcome" awaiting those who try to commit aggression "against Arabs and Muslims" is that they will be "buried in their own coffin". He said that this is the lesson that past experience has taught and that anyone ignoring this would be consigned to "the dustbin of history". The Iraqi president said that his people would not be facing the "misguided evil aggressors" relying on force of arms, but on the strength of their faith. He also warned that those who want their nation to be "free and unfettered" have to remain loyal to it. The following is the text of the speech by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn given on the 14th anniversary marking the end of the Iraq-Iran war in 1988, called "The day of great victory", reported in English by Iraqi news agency INA web site; sub-headings inserted editorially; all ellipses as received:

Speech of his excellency President Saddam Husayn on the occasion of 14th anniversary of the Day of the Great Victory

In the name of Allah the most Compassionate, the most Merciful. Nay, we hurl the Truth against falsehood, and it knocks out its brain, and behold, falsehood doth perish! [Koranic verse]

Our great people, our valiant men and women, our men of the heroic armed forces, our Arab brethren, fellow believers, wherever you may be, peace be upon you.

"Greed and arrogance": lessons from history

Regardless of details, and of the nature of evolution between successive historical chapters, the human lesson derived is that the present of any nation or people cannot be isolated from its past; and that, according to this, nations and peoples have established their present, even though it might be distinguishable from their past in terms of advancement or retraction.

Of the lessons also gained from the history of mankind is the fact that greed and arrogance, when combined, lead the oppressor to do injustice not only to others, but to himself as well; once this combination of greed and arrogance has misled him into a sense of undefeatable capability and power, as he takes the road of falsehood and aggression, committing the most heinous acts and proceeding from that sick imagination, to fall down the precipice and then into hell.

One of the lessons of recent and distant history is that all empires and bearers of the coffin of evil, whenever they mobilized their evil against the Arab nation, or against the Muslim world, they were themselves buried in their own coffin, with their sick dreams and their arrogance and greed, under Arab and Islamic soil; or they returned to die on the land from which they had proceeded to perpetrate aggression. This has been the case with all empires preceding our present time. If this is what history tells us about its judgment on all times and eras of the past without exception, can we then describe those who are trying to ignore history now

except in the words which no wise or prudent person would wish to be described with?

This is the inevitable outcome awaiting all those who try to aggress against Arabs and Muslims. If anyone wants to learn from history, anyone with greed and arrogance combined in himself, he ought to remember this fact and think again. Otherwise, he will end up in the dustbin of history, as twentieth century politicians would say.

"Faith... Is the decisive factor"

We always stood, and continue to stand, to learn from all such lessons, whenever the horns of aggression loomed large against us. We never faced, nor will face, any aggression relying basically on our force of arms, or our muscles and the muscles of our people, but rather on the strength of our faith, in the belief that Allah always helps the faithful and their just cause to prevail over injustice.

Faith, according to this rule, is the decisive factor in linking the final outcome to the good of the people and the nation, and to self-satisfaction, with all that Allah Almighty shall extend of the means of strength provided by the faithful on the basis of His Divine instruction: "Extend to them all the strength you can provide...". We have always, along with our comrades, our people and our armed forces, asked ourselves: Can fathers and mothers discharge their parental duties towards their children when they are placed in chains under the burden of servitude? Will the children be but ungrateful apostates, if they see their fathers and mothers in chains, enduring the heavy burden of oppression, and never move to save them, break their chains, or surround them with their protective chests of faith, against all misguided evil aggressors?

Do you know, brothers in the Arab homeland, who our father and mother are, we the Iraqis, our armed forces, and the leadership of our army and people? Our mother and father are the nation and the homeland. It is on the basis of these meanings and what we recall from the lessons of history, that we took our stand in 1980 to defend our people and nation against those who sought to enslave them, put them in chains, and then leave them to decay.

Loyalty key to a free nation

Yes, this was our stand. And we recall, and never forget, that he who wants his homeland to be liberated and healthy, his nation free and unfettered, has to be loyal to them so that they will remain generous to him. Otherwise, he will remain doomed to subservience, killed by a sense of guilt, labouring under the heavy burden of contempt, of having fallen behind and failing to play his role in the position that brings pride to freedom-fighters in the eyes of their people, their nation and their homeland.

Thus, we relied on Allah, and took the position required under the circumstance, along with our people and armed forces, to confront danger, withstand aggression and defy arrogance, for eight long years which lasted from 4 September 1980, to the date which Allah designated to be the day of final victory in August 1988.

It is also on the basis of these concepts, and the lessons derived from them, that our revolutionaries made their day in July 1968.

On these same grounds and concepts, the people of Iraq and their armed forces, led by their brave leaders against the aggression and arrogance of the United States and those who allied themselves to the Americans, or followed them under duress, or by choice, from 17 January 1991, the day of the battle of Um el-Ma'arick [Mother of Battles] until today.

On this basis, the stand of loyalty taken by the faithful shall remain firm and healthy. Darkness shall be defeated, and every cloud that carries no useful rain shall be dispersed, giving way to the sun to usher in endless spring, blessed by Allah, fill with pride its people who

themselves bring disgrace to the conduct of the aggressors.

The forces of evil will carry their coffins on their backs, to die in disgraceful failure, taking their schemes back with them, or to dig their own graves, after they bring death to themselves on every Arab or Muslim soil against which they perpetrate aggression, including the Iraq, the land of Jihad and the banner.

UN Security Council should "honour its obligations"

We say this to refute the grumbling and sibilation of those bragging their power, governed by the devil, their master in every evil act and crime which they perpetrate against the land of the Arabs and Muslims, while they wade in the rivers of innocent blood they shed in the world, believing that the people of the world should become slaves to Tyranny [capitalization as published] and its threats, both declared and executed threats. But if they wanted peace and security for themselves and their people, then this is not the course to take. The right course is of respect to the security and rights of others, through dealing with others in peace and establishing the obligations required by way of equitable dialogue and on the basis of international law and international covenants.

The right way is that the Security Council should reply to the questions raised by Iraq, and should honour its obligations under its own resolutions. There is no other choice for those who use threat and aggression but to be repelled even if they were to bring harm to their targets. Allah, the omni-powerful is above all power and shall repel the schemes of the unjust.

I say this even though I had preferred to avoid referring to it, under a different circumstance, as I have generally done so far. But I say it in such clear terms so that no weakling will imagine that when we ignore responding to ill talk, then this means that we are frightened by the impudent threats which will make those who have lost all ties with God the Compassionate, and all trust in their people, tremble and shiver; and so that no greedy tyrant will be misled into an action the consequences of which are beyond their calculations.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

Iraq, "land of faith"

What a pure, magnificent and melodious breeze of faith; a voice, as if recalled from the depth of our eternal heritage and history, a voice in which we find ourselves and it in us, in the same spirit raised by our forefathers in the battles of Jihad at Yarmuk against the Byzantines [AD 638], and the Battles of the First Qadisiyah [Islamic battles], in which our forefathers broke, in the Name of Allah, the ranks of the invading armies that had occupied the land of Sham (Syria) and Iraq, where they brought injustice and death, motivated by stubbornness, to remain on the side of falsehood in the face.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

Allah is Great

These, our brethren the faithful and the Arabs, are the calls made by your sons and brothers in Iraq, the land of faith, as they confront the enemy who wants to harm Iraq, with total disregard to God and man, despite all the resilience and resolve with which the Iraqi people have faced this enemy who has refused to listen to any Islamic or Arab voice, and indeed rejected all the initiatives and calls for peace, which we had proposed more than once, name of the people of Iraq.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

This is the call made by everyone confronting the enemies with a gun, a cannon, on a tank, in

a plane, or on a naval boat, by millions of men amongst our troops, in conscription or reserve, our people's army and our special task forces.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

Allah is Great.. **Attacking.. defending.. advancing and charging forward deep in enemy territory, chasing evil to defeat it; or forming with their dear chests the fence protecting this faithful, patient and healthy homeland; or standing, whenever Allah so wills it, behind the borders in the same way as they did at Faw and Pinjwin, in a trench here and a trench there, along a battlefield extending over one thousand and two hundred kilometres from Faw and the territory surrounding and protecting it to the south up to the headland of Minshaf in our dear northern part of Iraq.**

Allah is Great..

Allah is Great..

Allah is Great..

Our beloved call.. the voice of our dear Prophet, the voice of Bilal, Abu Bakr, Umar, Ali and Uthman.. of Khalid, Abu Ubayda, Sa'd and Usamah.

The fragrance of the Message, the voice of history, the call of the spirit carrying the body to the destination determined by Allah, to be pure, secure, aromatic, and rosy, as he is a witness to the will of Allah, or a living martyr, so destined by Allah Almighty, whose command is irrevocable, praised He be for all He wills and all He wants.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

There is no God but Allah.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great..

Praise be to Allah Charge on.. Charge on.. Charge on..

The dear chant is raised, as if the men are circumambulating around the Ka'ba [in Mecca], or returning to the place from which Prophet Mohammed, the Messenger of Allah, ascended to God on that Blessed Night, after they cleanse the land of Palestine from Zionist desecration.

Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. Allah is Great.. with millions of gun-barrels, exchanging places on the battle-fronts, or being stationed where they ought to be from the start of the battle until Allah grants His final victory.

Thousands of artillery-guns and tanks and hundreds of aircraft, backed by millions of honourable Arabs and Iraqis and of the faithful who prayed for Iraq to be granted Allah's victory, which the Almighty graced Iraq with.

With victory, came the first expressions of gratitude to Allah, for having cleansed the hearts of the victorious faithful from all hatred, and prevented any grudge or rancour from infiltrating our souls, against the hatred and hard-headedness we had faced throughout eight years of fighting, preceded by an additional period of scheming and abuse, praying to Allah the omnipotent, the Almighty, to spare us any such hatred or any hatred which we don't know.

Victory was born out of all this. Its voice, spirit and breeze of faith were raised high, in the resounding "Communique-of-all-Communiques" on the Day-of-Days which Allah Almighty had destined to be the day of decisive victory, crowned by it on the 8th of August 1988.

Oh God.. Oh God.. Oh.. August.

How hot is your temperature, not only to ripen the date-fruit to be picked by your people, but also to break the spikes that others want to use against your people and thus defeat the unjust aggressors, in the name of Allah.

Brother to July and it link to September!! Dear month, dear day, we extend our greetings to you as we live your dear days one by one, and to every living soul and every soul that has a place in heaven, blessed by Allah, the Almighty.

Greetings

Greetings similar to those we extend to our Iraqi brothers and Iraqi martyrs, to the Arabs in the forefront of whom come the heroic people of Palestine, and to every honourable Mujahid of the faithful who met his God with a pure heart.

Greeting to the people of Palestine, men and women, living and martyrs.

Greetings, Greetings to Iraq

Greetings, Greetings to our Arab Nation, and to everyone of its brave heroes,

Greetings.. Greetings.. Greetings

Allah is Great

Allah is Great

Allah is Great

There is no God but Allah

Allah is Great

Praise be to Allah

Source: INA news agency web site, Baghdad, in English 8 Aug 02.

For assistance, access Dow Jones Customer Support.

---

**(c) 2009 Factiva, Inc. All Rights Reserved.**

## **APPENDIX B1**

**Saddam Hussein Speech of 17 January 2003 (Text B)**  
**(original Arabic source text)**

**pages 245 - 251**



خطاب الرئيس صدام حسين في الذكرى الثانية عشرة للمنازلة التاريخية الكبرى أم المعارك الخالدة

بغداد 2003/1/17

وجه السيد الرئيس صدام حسين خطاباً قومياً وتاريخياً إلى أبناء شعبنا العظيم وقواتنا المسلحة وامتنا العربية المجيدة والخيرين في العالم حيثما كانوا لمناسبة الذكرى الثانية عشرة للمنازلة التاريخية الكبرى أم المعارك الخالدة.

وفي ما يأتي نص الخطاب :

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

((الذين قال لهم الناس أن الناس قد جمعوا لكم فاخشوهم فزادهم أيمتاً وقالوا حسبن الله ونعم الوكيل. فاتقوا الله من الله وفضل لم يمسسهم سوء واتبعوا رضوان الله والله ذو فضل عظيم. إنما ذلكم الشيطان يخوف أولياءه فلا تخافوهم وخافون أن كنتم مؤمنين. ولا يحزنك الذين يسارعون في الكفر إنهم لن يضروا الله شيئاً يريد الله ألا يجعل لهم حظاً في الآخرة ولهم عذاب عظيم))

صدق الله العظيم

أيها الشعب العظيم، في عراق الايمان والجهاد والبطولة والمجد..

أيها النشامى أبناء قواتنا المسلحة الباسلة..

يا أبناء امتنا العربية المجيدة..

أيها الخيرون في العالم حيثما كنتم..

مع خطوط الفجر البهي، ومن شعاع الشمس التي أشرقت بعد غياب طويل، أبت قبله أن تولد من لفقها، ومن أهداب العيون التي جرحها الدمع الهتون، على أحبة غابوا، ليشرقوا مع الشمس الجديدة، وأفق أراده للرحمن أن يكون فسيحاً، بولادة وحياة جديدة في سماتها طيور خضر، ومولود قوي أراده الله أن يكون باراً لامته، تلك هي ثورتكم ومسيرتكم للغراء، ولد عراق جديد فيها، وزاد وعمق أيمانه بعد المنازلة في ليلة 16-17/1/1991 الصفحة العسكرية الكبرى في أم المعارك الخالدة، عطر تلك الدماء السخية، والمعاناة، والصبر الجميل..

ولد العراق الجديد، همة ورؤية، وقلباً زاده التصميم على الارتقاء، وقهر للصعاب، ثباتاً في محبته لامته، وصلابة في مواجهة أعدائها، وعمق فيه أيمانه، الذي أثابه الله عليه، بعد أن عطر الموقف والراية بدماء سخية من أبنائه، فربناً تقبله الله عن الغفلة التي أصابت ولاة الأمور في بغداد، فوجد الأجنبي، بسنابك خيله، طريقه إليها، وغابت إشراقه عينها عن أمتها والإنسانية، بعد أن اصطبغت مياه دجلة فيها بدماء غزيرة، إلى جانب حبر كتبها البلاخة بالعلم والمعرفة، حيث ألقبت فيها هناك عام 1258 للميلاد، عقاباً لتاريخ غابت عنه روحه، وحضارة غاب عنها إيمانها ونواظيرها، فتمقت فيها الغربان

متجاسرة على عينيها اللتين كانت بهما الإنسانية ترى طريقها، لتنهض حضارياً، بعد أن كان لها دورها في تبصير من ابصروا ذلك وتقبلوه منها، كوسيلة لله إليهم، بعد ان آمنت وانتقت.

ولد العراق الجديد على هذه الصورة، وولدت معه بندقيته، بدلاً عن السهم والرمح والسيف، ليكون مسلحاً، فلا تطمع فيه الغربان، وتتجاسر على نخله، وعيون أطفاله..

ولد عراق قوي مؤمن معافى، إلا ان الولادة، مثلما كل الولادات الأخرى التي سبقتها في أفق الإنسانية، وفي امتنا، لم تلغ نعيق الغربان، وفحيح الأفاعي، ولم تلغ عبور التماسيح البعيدة بحار أهلها، لتعين هوام الأرض في هجمتهم على الشمس، أملاً خائباً منهم في ان يحجبوا ضياءها الذي أشرق من بغداد، ويهرقوا نماء أهلها في أمل خائب منهم أيضاً، تصورا معه ان تمنع الدماء الغزيرة الكريمة التي تسيل على ثرى بغداد، وثرى العراق، والنبت والشجر من ان يخضرت عودهما، ويورداء، ويزهرا، ويرسلا مع الأريج لقاهاً، تستطيبه الفراشات، فتقتل مع أخبار الأيمان والهمة الجديدين، والندى والدمع لقاهاً الى كل شجرة يبست أغصانها وأوراقها، أو امتنعت من ان تثمر، بعد ان انقطع الماء عن جذورها.. وبعد ان لم تتق بان هنالك من يرعى الثمر وينظر النبت والشجر والبناء.. مع الولادة الجديدة، كان يليس ورديفه: محالي هذا للزمان، ينفخون النار على الجسد المعافى، ولكن، لان ولادة بغداد من جديد صحيحة وصحيحة، وباركتها السماء بأمر ربها، ولان نواظيرها يقبضون بأيديهم على بنادقهم التي بوركت مع صلاة الفجر في يوم الولادة، بعد ان أستقر ما في صدورهم على يقين عظيم، في ليلة 17/16 كانون الثاني من عام 1991، وما بعد ذلك، بقيت بغداد بأسم العراق تنود.. وتنود.. وتنود، ومعها كل صناديد غيور، وماجدة بهية، دفاعا عن أمر أراده الله لمولودهم الجديد ولم تلتو أرادتهم، فقهروا كل حشود الشر من اكثر من ثلاثين دولة، ومن كان معهم في الإسناد، حتى بلغ عدد من واجهه المجاهدون في جيش العراق ثمانية وعشرين جيشاً، وواجهت دولة العراق عدوان اثنتين واربعين دولة ليلة 17/16 كانون الثاني، واستمرت المواجهة والمعركة مدة شهر ونصف الشهر بهذا الزخم، ومن بعد ذلك استمر الحصار والعدوان طيلة ثلاثة عشر عاماً حتى يومنا هذا.. ذاد العراقيون هكذا، في هذا اليوم وما بعده، واخرون ذادوا بدورهم في ما زرعوا، واقاموا البناء وعطوه، حتى اختلطت مع الحقول، تلك الحدائق الغناء، وغطى الزرع ارض العراق مذكرا بما مضى حيث وصفت أرضه بأرض السواد لكثرة للزرع فيها، بعد ان غابت عن بغداد وريف العراق ومدنه، حتى بدت كأنها لم تكن من قبل إحدى مظاهر عافيتها، واختلطت مع شوامخ البناء، عزيزة مرئية، وسادت فيها شوامخ المنائر، وأقرب وعلامات دور العبادة، ومع كل تكبيرة في ساحات الجهاد والوعى، يعلو التكبير في الجوامع، وتتعالى أصوات العبادة في أماكنها، كل على وفق دينه وطريقته، وصار الزائر يعرف انه في بغداد، حتى لو عصبت عيناه، في محاولة لكي لا يتعرف القادم على موقع قدميه على الخارطة.. وهل ثمة مكان أفضل من بغداد، يولد فيه التسامح الديني.. والمذهبي.. وأراء بناءة، الى جانب، وفي اتجاه، كل ما هو بناء من أفكار أخرى..؟

أعادت الولادة الجديدة روح بغداد من جديد، ومع الولادة ولد موقف، وسيف، وقلم، وراية.. فبارك نداء (الله اكبر) الموقف والراية والسيف والقلم، وصارت الولادة التي نسجتها خيوط الفجر، وباركها الأذان فيه، ولادة عصبة على كل غدار وطامع شرير.. إذ لا يليق ببغداد وبالولادة الجديدة، ولا يقبل الله والناس لها، الا الحياة التي اختارها روادها لها، بعد ان استأذنوا في هذا ربهم الرحيم.. فخشى الخاسئون في عدوانهم، وفي عدوانهم المستمر حتى يومنا هذا.. وسيخسأ كل من يحاول تسوّر سورها، معتدياً، متجاسراً، لثيما غاشماً، وغادراً..

أليس هذا هو وصفكم وموقفكم، أيها العراقيون المؤمنون المجاهدون الغيارى، وأيتها الماجدة البهية؟ أم لن هناك من يتوهم، فيقول، بعد ان يدوس على حظه، أن صدام حسين يتحدث عن تمنياته، وليس عن وصف لحال يعيش وسطه، ويعرفه

روحيا وعمليا بالشمول والتفاصيل؟ بلى، والله، انه وصفكم، وموقفكم، بل واستحقاقكم في ثواب معاناتكم وتضحياتكم وصبركم، أيها النشامى والماجدات.. وان غريان الشر وتماسيح الشر، ما زالت تضمثر شراً، ولم تقطع التواصل مع آمالها الخائبة، رغم كل ما أصابها من جروح غائرة، وعار لا يمحوه الزمن، وان السحالي التي نفخت النار على سيدنا ابراهيم، عليه السلام، على وفق روايات أهلها، ما زالت تلد، لتوكل لكل ولادة على وصفها مهمة ان تنفخ في النار. وفي ظننا انها قادرة لتحرق رغما عن إرادة الله، التي أرادها بردا وسلاما..

فارفعوا، مع الراية العالية، سيوفكم وبنادقكم، أيها الأعزة، ونكروا من يتوهم، لكي لا يتوهم بموقفكم في الزحف الأكبر، في يوم البيعة الكبرى، ومواقفكم الأخرى، وإذا ما توهم، لتكن بنادقكم له بالمرصاد، يسبقها، ويكون دليلها إشعاع ونور أيمانكم لتحفظوا به العيون، لان غربانهم، ان توهمت، ولم تجد من يردعها، لا سمح الله، مستقر العيون، وتأكّل القلوب، وادمغة وعقول الأيمان والفضيلة والإبداع، وانتخوا برايتكم، راية (الله أكبر).. فلا يصلح غيرها لنخوة تجعل الهمة تنهض، وتعطي الحمية معناها العميق..

قولوا: الله اكبر، أيها الاخوة والأبناء، واستذكروا معاني هذا النداء العظيم على وفق عمق أيمانكم، لتردد صداه، مع قولكم ونخوتكم، كل المدن والأرياف.. في الجبال والسهول، بعد ان يساعد ماء دجلة والفرات، وماء الخليج في نقل صوتكم، لا ليصل إلى كل أصيد أغر وماجدة بهية في عراق الأيمان والجهاد، فحسب، وانما الى كل غيور وماجدة في الأمة، والى كل منصف، وذو موقف شريف في الإنسانية..

وعندما، يكون مع الولادة، موقف، وهمة، وقلم، وسيف وراية، تؤدي الولادة دورها للصحيح في امتنا، بأن الله..

وعندما نقول ان التاريخ كأنه عقيدة، لو استنكره الوارثون بتأمل وتمعن ومسؤولية.. فلأن الصحيح يولد مع هذا ومنه، ويصير تاريخاً جديداً موصولاً، بعد ان يلد ولادة جديدة مع كل مجد وبناء، وليمان عال هو قاعدته الأمينة، فيكون عقيدة عن ماض، ما زالت فيه شروط الولادة الصحيحة، عندما يتذكركه أبنائه بمسؤولية الحاضر، ويتطلعون باستحقاقهم إلى المستقبل..

وهكذا تمخض الماضي، فولد من رحم عقيدته مبادئ الروح الجديدة بثوب ولون جديد وطريق خاص.. وولدت، مع العقيدة الجديدة، سارية وقبضة قوية، فحملت نخوتنا ودليل أيماننا: الله اكبر، ليصمد أمام كل ريح عاتية بأن الله ومحاوله شريرة..

نعم، الله اكبر..

الله اكبر..

أيها الاخوة:

أن مقولة (ان التاريخ يعيد نفسه)، تعني من بين ما تعنيه، ان صور الماضي تتكرر، وان أخذت ألوان واسماء مرحلتها، أنها تتكرر لو أعيد تحليلها وإحيائها وإرجاعها الى عناصرها ومكوناتها الأولية من حيث القوة والضعف، والصعود والهبوط، والارتقاء والانحدار الى هاوية، والجيد والسيئ والارتقاء إلى النزي والانحدار الى هاوية، ومحب الخير والفضيلة والساعي الى الشر والرذيلة، والكارهين للناس، والساعين لإيذانهم، والمحبين للناس والساعين لخيرهم، والمنمرين والمعمرين، والى آخر ما في سلسلة الصور ومضاداتها صعوداً وهبوطاً، قبحاً وحسناً..

نعم ان التأريخ يكرر نفسه، ولكن ليس على أساس مسلمة مطلقة في إمكانية الصعود على قياس ما مضى من غير إيمان ووعي وموقف وهمة، أو الاستسلام لحالة هبوط على قياس ما مضى أيضاً، الا إذا تكررت كل مفردات مكوناته في الحياة والإنسان والطبيعة، مما يصعب تصوره، إلا أن الأيمان الواعي في تصور موجبات ان يكون دور الإنسان فاعلاً صعوداً، والتمسك به وبعوامله واسبابه، ورفض أي حالة تؤثر سلباً في الأيمان، وفي دور الإنسان المؤمن والطبيعي فيه وفي حركته أو التخلي عن كل هذا، هو الحالة الحاسمة في أن يتكرر التأريخ على نفس صورته السابقة هنا أو هناك، في السلب أو الإيجاب..

أيها الاخوة..

لقد مثلت بغداد، في تأريخها المعروف، دور عين العرب والمسلمين الصافية، ورمح الله في الأرض، وجمجمة العرب، وخزين حكمتهم وتراثهم التليد، ومجمع قدرتهم في حضارتهم واشعاعها العظيم، مع من مثل من أحوار رديفة في مراكز أخرى، على سياق ما جرى في بغداد، أو ما سبقها من حيث الزمن.. وعندما صعد المغول والتتار الى أرجحية كفة قوتهم، واحتلوا الصين والهند وبلاد فارس ودولاً ومسيمات أخرى، لم يستطيعوا ان يحولوا صعودهم للقوة بالتخلف وللتدمير إلى قدرة للبناء والحضارة والتمدن، فوجدت القوة التدميرية عقبتها في بغداد الحضارة، ودار السلام، فجعلت هدفها التدميري ينصب على بغداد التي أضعفها ضعف من لم يتمسك بعوامل الارتقاء للقوة بالدور واسبابه وموجباته، وضعف ولاة الأمور، وخيانة الخائنين. فاستباح هولاء وجنوده بغداد مدة أربعين يوماً، ومن ثم دمروا كل شئ حي فيها.. ولان أهل بغداد، واعني بذلك ولاة الأمر فيها، لم يتهيأوا كما يجب، عندما اجتاح المغول والتتار ارض الصين والهند وبلاد فارس وما حولهم.. جاءت غزوتهم لبغداد على وفق ما وصف التأريخ، ومن بعدها بلاد الشام وما يتصل بهما.. ألا ان بغداد لم يتهيأ لها ان تدافع عن نفسها كما ينبغي، ولذلك لم تتفأ عين جيش هولاء على أسوارها لتطفئ بوجهه جراً ان يتجاوز عليها، وتمد بوجهه فرصة ان يمضي، من بعدها، الى آخرين من أبناء أمتها، ليستبيحهم مثلما استباح بغداد، حتى فقتت عين هولاء في دولة المماليك في مصر في معركة (عين جالوت) الشهيرة، بعد ان حضروا النفس لهذا، واستقلوا من دروس الحروب التي سبقتهم، وبعد ان انكشف هولاء في نواياه وأساليبه.. وينبنا التأريخ بان أقولما وجهات وشخصيات من الغرب قد لعبوا، لاسبابهم، دوراً في توجيه هولاء الى الشرق، بل والى الوطن العربي بوجه خاص.. وقد لعب اليهود، مع من يردفهم في هذا، دوراً خبيثاً مشهوداً ضد بغداد في الماضي، ويعود إليهم اليوم والى اليهود الصهانية والمتصهينيين من غير اليهود للدور التأمري العدوانى الخبيث من جديد، وبخاصة من هو منهم في الإدارة الأمريكية وما حولها في الجهة المقابلة للمضادة لامتنا والعراق، وتعود القوة في أمريكا لتكون عاجزة عن تهذيب نفسها، فلم تستطع ان تحول نفسها، إلى قدرة ليكون تأثيرها انساني مبصراً، وقد دفعتها الصهيونية واصحاب الغرض، الى التفتيش عن دور من خلال غريزة وحضية مدمرة، وليس الصعود الى موضع القدرة المسؤولة، ودورها المتمدن والحضاري الذي يناسب هذا العصر، ويناسب أدوار الأمم المتوازنة، ودورها البناء في المحيط والعمل الجمعيين.

ولكن بغداد اليوم، أيها الاخوة، عيناها صافيتان، وعقلها وضميرها قد زال عنهما أي عجز وصدأ وغشاوة وهما ينتخيان للامة ولها، بأسم الله، بعد ان أتكلا على صاحب القدرة، وصارا مستعدين للدور. ومع ان عيوننا وعقولنا، وسط امتنا والإنسانية ما زالت لم تر ولم تع مالها وما عليها في محيط الأمة والإنسانية، فإن بغداد مصممة، شعباً وولاء أمر، على ان تجعل مغول العصر ينتحرون على أسوارها، وتجعل المنازلة، معنى وتضحية، بمستوى يؤدي بعيون وعقول أخرى لان تتفتح على ما حولها، وترتقي الى دورها، وتجعل القوة التي لديها، بعدها، او قبل ان يتورط من يسول له شيطانه لتجاوز على أسوار بغداد، مؤثرة في المحيط الإنساني، وتتحوّل الى قدرة ارتقاء في محيط التنافس البناء، وليس قوة غاشمة تعتمد

غريزة التدمير الوحشية.

على هذا، أيها الاخوة والأصدقاء في محيط امتنا والإنسانية، نعاهدكم، ونشهد القادر العظيم على عهدنا هذا.  
وعلى هذا صممنا خططنا، وأهّلنا قدرتنا، جيوشا وشعبا وقيادة، بعد ان اتكلنا على الله، وما النصر إلا من عند الله.  
والله أكبر..  
الله أكبر..  
أيها الاخوة..

لقد شاخ أولو الأمر في بغداد من قبل، وتخلوا عن الدور الذي يأمر به الله، وما يستلزمه من ايداعات المسؤولين عن شؤون الرعية وفي الحياة وفي الدفاع عنها، عندما اتجه هولاء الى أسوار بغداد عام 1258 للميلاد، وهكذا جاء هولاء مع الغروب، ودالت الدولة التي جعلت بغداد عاصمتها، ونجح المغول، حيث غربت الشمس عن بغداد آنذاك..  
أما الآن، فرغم أن روح هولاء حلت بمن حلت بهم في فعلهم وما قاموا او يقومون به لو ما ينون عليه، مع ما يدفعهم إليه الصهانية المجرمون في أكثر من مكان في العالم، فقد جاؤا ليصطدموا بامتنا، في الوقت الذي يسجل أبناء امتنا داخل أنفسهم، وما تضم صدورهم، حالة إيمان عظيم، وصحوة عظيمة على الدور، وما ينبغي، حتى يصلوا الى ما يجب، لتعود الأمة الى حيث أيمانها الصحيح، وتوفر بجهادها ونضالها صعوداً حقيقياً الى دورها الإيماني والقومي والإنساني العظيم.. وقد جاء جيش هولاء هذا العصر الآن ليصطدم ببغداد بعد ان ولدت بغداد من جديد، مع الشروق، لتسجل بشبابها الجديد مستوى ارتقاء يليق بها، بعد ان غابت عن دورها القيادي ما يقرب من السبعمئة سنة..

بل لقد جنتم بالشمس الى بغداد، أيها العراقيون، واشرقتم فيها، في الوقت الذي اشرفت بكم، فهيهات لهؤلاء جديد ان يتمكن منها، ومن العراق العظيم.. بل هيهات، بعد أن أراد الله لهذه الأمة ان تنهض من جديد، ان يتمكن الغاشمون المبتلون الطامعون من قهر إرادة إخوانكم في فلسطين ايضاً، وحيثما اختمرت أو أزهرت إرادة الحق والصمود والمقاومة في صدر كل مؤمن، وذي يقين عظيم..

أيها الناس

أنكم تعرفون أن أولى الحضارات الإنسانية في التاريخ قد نبتت وأزهرت وأثمرت في العراق، ومنها حمل الهواء بذورها لتصل الى من وصلت إليه، فأجتهد ليضع لونه بعد همته على ما أراد لبلاده، وعلى هذا، فإن أمكم الحضارة في العراق هي التي يتعرض لها هولاء هذا العصر.. فقولوا له بصوت واضح مسموع أن كُفَّ شرك، ليها الشرير، عن لم الحضارات، ومتحفها وشاهدها الأساس، ومهداها ومهد أصل الأنبياء والرسل، ودع الناس، كلا على وفق اختياره الإنساني، تبني وتبني وتبني، ومع ازدهار البناء، والعمل، والتعاون المثمر، ومحبة الناس لبعضها، وتجنب إثارة البغضاء والدفع الى فعل الشر، وتمتع كل ذي حق بحقه كاملاً غير منقوص، يرضي الله على من يرضي عليه، ويحقق له السعادة في الدارين..

وسيموت منتحراً عند أسوار بغداد ومدن العراق، مثلما مات عند أسوار جنين ومدن فلسطين، من حل فيه هولاء نية وفعلاً هناك..

وسوف تنهض الأمة كلها دفاعاً عن حقها في الحياة، وعن دورها ومقدساتها..

وستطيش سهامهم أو تترد الى نحورهم ان شاء الله..

وسيكون شهداء الأمة طيوراً خضراً في الجنة، مثلما وعد الرحمن..

وسيخساً الخاسنون.

عاشت امتنا المجيدة.

عاش العراق..

عاش العراق وجيشه المجاهد الأغر..

عاشت فلسطين حرة عربية من البحر الى النهر.. وعاش مجاهدو ومناضلو فلسطين وشعبها البطل..

المجد وعليين للشهداء..

المجد وعليين لشهداء العراق، وفلسطين، وشهداء الامة..

والله أكبر..

الله أكبر..

الله أكبر..



**APPENDIX B2**

**Saddam Hussein Speech of 17 January 2003 (Text B)  
(Iraq News Agency: English version)**

**pages 252 – 258**

**PRESIDENT SADDAM HUSSEIN'S ADDRESS ON THE TWELFTH  
ANNIVERSARY OF THE GRAND BATTLE Um Al-Maarik "MOTHER OF ALL  
BATTLES" IN JANUARY 17-1-2003**

**Baghdad, Jan 17,2003. INA**

**In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful**

...and they were being told: Your enemy has mustered a great force against you and so fear them. They were so tenacious in their faith and replied: Allah's help is all-sufficient for us. He is the Most Gracious. Thus they earned Allah's grace and bounty and no harm befell them. For they hastened to please Allah whose bounty is infinite. It is Satan that prompts men to fear his followers. But have no fear of them. Fear Me, if you are true believers. Do not grieve for those that quickly renounce their faith. They will not harm Allah in the least. He seeks to give them no share in the hereafter. Their punishment shall be terrible indeed.

God speaks the truth

**Great people in Iraq, the land of faith, Jihad, bravery and  
glory..**

**Brave members of the gallant armed forces..**

**Sons of our glorious Arab nation..**

**Men of goodwill in the world, wherever you are..**

**From the bright light of dawn, from the ray of sun which has risen after a long absence, from its horizon, from the lids of the eyes which were wounded by heavy tears for people, dear for all of us, who can no more be seen, but who can become visible with the new sun, and from the horizon which God has ordained to be vast, with a new birth and life in whose skies exist green birds and a strong newborn which God has decided to be faithful to its nation, from all this your glorious Revolution and march, a new Iraq, was born. Its faith has been increased and deepened after the Grand Confrontation on the night of 16/17 1991, the grand military phase of the eternal battle of Um Al-Maarik, by the fragrance of the generous blood, suffering and commendable patience.**

**A new Iraq was born with firm resolution, great power of vision and a heart, which has been increased in strength by a determination for ascent and for overcoming difficulties. It was firm in its love for its nation. Its faith, which God has given it and which the situation and banner was perfumed by generous blood from its sons, has been deepened by a scarifies which God has accepted in compensation for the negligence which took over those who ruled Baghdad, and therefore the foreigners with the horny feet of their horses, found their way towards it. The radiation of its eyes over the nation and humanity has set down, after the water of Tigris was dyed with plentiful blood along with the ink of its books which were filled with science and knowledge, and which were thrown into the water in the year 1258, as a punishment for a history whose soul departed its body and for a civilization whose faith and guards disappeared. Hence, the ravens croaked in it, showing impudence to its eyes through which humanity saw its way to raise in culture after it had played its role and into enlighten those who could see that an accepted from it as a means from God to them as a reward for its faith and fear**

**The new Iraq was born on such a view, and was born with it, its rifle in place of the arrow, spear an**



sword, to be armed so that the ravens could not be so covetous as to venture its palms and the eyes of its children.

A strong, believing and healthy Iraq was born. But the birth, as all other births which came before it in the horizon of humanity and in our nation, was not able to render ineffectual the croak of ravens, nor the hissing of snakes or the crossing of far crocodiles from the seas of their family in order to help the beasts of earth in their attack against the sun, in a desperate hope to obscure its light which radiated from Baghdad or to shed the blood of its people in a fake hope and out of an imagination that the generous blood shed on the soil of Baghdad and on the soil of Iraq could hinder the plants and trees from becoming green, from blossoming and from carrying with its fragrance pollens which might tempt the appetite of butterflies, and thus be able to carry with the news of new faith and resolution, with the dew and tears, a pollen to every tree whose branches and leaves become dry or ceased to give fruit now that the water ceased to reach its roots and was confident that no one could take care of its fruit and guard its plants, trees and growth.

With the new birth, there was Satan and his companion, the lizards of this time, who spit out their fire on the healthy body. But, as the birth of Baghdad was now healthy and proper, blessed by heaven by order of its God, and that its guard were putting their hands on their rifles during the dawn prayer on the day of birth, with great confidence in their breasts, on the night of 16/17 January 1991 afterwards, Baghdad, in the name of Iraq, kept defending itself along with every faithful valiant and noble woman in defense of the command which God has so decided to their new birth. Their will of determination never bent. They defeated all evil troops of more than thirty states together with those who supported them. The number of the army, which the jihadists in the Iraq army had confronted, mounted to twenty-eight. The state of Iraq stood in the face of the aggression of forty-two countries on the night of 16 / 17 January. The confrontation and the battle lasted for a month and a half with such momentum. Afterwards, the sanctions and aggression continued for thirteen years until the present day. Such was the defence of the Iraqis on that day and the days that followed. Others, in their turn, defended the seeds which they sowed and elevated what they had built, to the point that their field were mixed with the spacious gardens. Plants covered the land of Iraq reminding of its past when the land of Iraq was described as the land of the black for the multitude of its plants which disappeared from Baghdad, its countryside and towns, until it appeared as if they did not exist before as one sign of its health. It had mixed with the lofty constructions, dear and visible, and was dominated by the high minarets, domes and signs of the houses of worship. And with every exaltation of "Allah is the greatest" on the battlefields, the same gratification rose high in the mosques together with the voices of worship in their places, each in accordance with his own religion and manner. A visitor could tell that he was in Baghdad even though his eyes were shut, in an attempt that a traveler could hardly recognize his feet on the map... Was there a place much better than Baghdad, where religions and racial tolerance together with constructive views being born, on the side and direction of every constructive thing of other views.....?

The new birth brought back once again the spirit of Baghdad, and with the birth a stand, a sword, a pen and a banner were born. The call of "Allah is the greatest" blessed the stand, the sword and the pen. The birth whose threats were knitted by the dawn and blessed by the call for prayer, was an impregnable birth to every malicious, perfidious and greedy... It could not deserve, nor could Allah allow the people accept for it, but the life chosen for it by its pioneers after they asked the permission of their Lord, the Merciful. The scheming of the attackers backfired in that aggression and in the on-going aggression which they make longer to the present day. Everyone who tries to climb over its wall, be it an aggressor, an insolent, a wicked, a perfidious and an oppressor will fail in his attempt.

Is not this your description and position for the men of Iraq, the believer and loyal jihadists, and for the noble women as well? Or is there anyone who might delude himself into believing to say, after treading down his luck, that Saddam Hussein is speaking about his wishes and not about a description of a condition in which he lives and gets to know, with heart and soul, its comprehensive and detailed nature? By God, this is your description and attitude, or even a reward for your suffering, sacrifices, and patience, O brave men and women.. The evil ravens and evil crocodiles, still foster wickedness and

would never cease their communication with their disappointed hopes, despite the fact that their deep wounds and disgrace can not be rubbed out with the passage of time. The lizards which breathed out fire on our lord, Ibrahim (peace be upon him), as is often related by people, still give birth and still assign for every birth the task of breathing out fire, out of their belief that they are capable of burning away, in defiance of God's will which He chose to be cool and safe.

Hence, with the flying banner, raise high your swords and rifles, oh our dear people, and remind anyone who may still be under a delusion, so that he might not be deluded of your stand in the

( Greatest March ), on the day of the Grand Allegiance and in other attitudes, but if he does so, let your guns waiting in ambush for him, preceded and guided by the radiation and light of your faith necessary for safeguarding your eyes. This is because, if their ravens have a fancy and find no one to deter them, God forbid, then they would peck up the eyes and devour the hearts and brains of faith, virtue and innovation. Hold fast to your banner, the banner of ( Allah is the Greatest ). There is nothing but it that can help motivate the resolution to rise and give to defence its profound connotation

Say :God is the greatest, oh brothers and sons. Remember the meanings of this great call in accordance with the profundity of your faith, so that its echo, along with your words and support, could be sounded by all towns and rural areas, by mountains and by plains. And with the help of the waters of Tigris and Euphrates and the water of the Gulf, your voice can reach not only every brave man and woman in the land of faith and Jihad, but also every loyal man and woman in the nation, every fair-minded and everyone who has an honorable stance in humanity.

When birth is associated with a stance, a determination, a pen, a sword and a banner, then birth can assume its proper role in our nation, God willing.

When we say that history is tantamount to doctrine, and is remembered by those who inherit it with contemplation, consideration and responsibility, this is because everything right is born with it and from it, and becomes a new and constant history after it gives a new birth with each glory and construction. A firm belief is its safe foundation . It becomes a doctrine carried from the past, still possesses the condition of the true birth when so remembered by its sons with the responsibility of the present, and with the due ambition for the future.

Such was the labour of the past. From its womb it begets a doctrine; new in its spirit, in dress and colour and its special path ... And with the new doctrine, a strong flag-post and hand has been born bearing our pride and our guidance to faith: Allahu Akbar, to stand firm in the face of every violent wind, God willing, or evil attempt.

**Yes, Allahu Akbar....**

**Allahu Akbar....**

Brothers :

The saying that (history repeats itself) means, among other things, that aspects of the past could be repeated though they assume the colours and names of their stages... They repeat themselves should they be re-analyzed, revived and dissolved into their primary elements and ingredients as to their strength and weakness, ascent and descent, climbing and falling into abyss , good and bad climbing to peaks and falling into abyss, pursuit of good will and virtue against pursuit of evil and vice, those who hate people and bring harm to them against those who love people and work for their welfare, the destroyers and the constructors and the like in the series of the images and their contrasts, up and down, bad and good.

Yes, it is true that history repeats itself but not on the basis of an uncontested premise of the ability to go up, as compared with the past without faith, consciousness, attitude and determination, or to give up

to a descent case, as compared with the past also, except when all its items in life, man and nature are repeated to the point that it can hardly be conceived. Yet, a conscientious faith in portraying of how the role of man can be effective and ascending, of how can that faith be maintained together with its factors and causes and how can one reject any condition that may have an adverse impact on the faith, of the role of the believing and vanguard man in it and in its movement, or the denouncing of all this, is the decisive case in which history may repeat itself in the same form, here and there, whether negatively or positively.

Brother..

Baghdad in its known history , had played the role of the Arabs' and Muslims' pure eye. It was God's spear on earth, the Arabs' skull, the reservoir of their wisdom and glorious heritage, the focal point of their civilization and great radiation. That was with other supporting roles in other centres in conformity of what had happened in Baghdad or before that time. When the Mongols and Tatars reached the zenith of their strength and occupied China, India, Persia and other countries, they were unable to convert their ascent to strength by backwardness and destruction into a force capable of bringing construction, civilization and culture. The destroying force found its complex in Baghdad; the abode of civilization and peace, and made it its target for destruction which was rendered feeble because of the weakness of those who did not hold firm to the factors of ascent, its causes and results, and also of the weakness of its rulers and the betrayal of the traitors... Hulago and his troops occupied Baghdad for forty days and destroyed every live thing in it.. And because the people of Baghdad, mean the rulers in it, were not quite prepared when the Mongols and Tatars invaded the territory of China, India, Persia and the surroundings, their invasion of Baghdad was in agreement of what history had described, and which later include Syria and the parts connected to it.

But Baghdad was not in a position to defend itself properly, and therefore the eyes of Hulago's army were not gouged out on its walls nor was it extinguished in its face the venture of trespassing it, or even to deny it the chance of going ahead to others from the nation to attack them as it attacked Baghdad, till Hulago's eyes were gouged out at the hands of the Mameluke dynasty in Egypt at the famous battle of ( Ain Jalut ),after they were able to get prepared for it and learnt lessons from the war before them and after Hulago's intent and methods were revealed... History tells us that western peoples and circles had played, for their own reasons, a role in directing Hulago to the east, indeed to the Arab world in particular. The Jews and their supporters played a remarkably malicious role against Baghdad in the past and this conspiratorial, aggressive and wicked role is today reverting to them, to the Zionist Jews and to the Zionists who are not of Jewish origin, particularly those who are in the U.S. administration and around who stood in opposite front of our nation and Iraq . The force in America proved itself to be incapable of educating itself. It was not able to change itself into a capability, so that its impact would be humanitarian and instructive. Zionism and prejudicial people had pushed it to search for a role through a devastating brutal instinct instead of ascending to a position of responsible ability and to its civic, cultural role which suits this age and suits the role of balanced nations and their construction role in the collective milieu and work.

Yet, Baghdad today, brothers, has its eyes pure, its mind and conscious clear of any rust or cover, and are proud of the nation and for it, in the name of God, after they have put their trust in the Owner of Potency and gets prepared to the role.

Although some eyes and minds in our nation and humanity are still incapable of seeing or perceiving the pros and cons in the nation and humanity, the people and rulers of Baghdad have resolved to compel the Mongols of this age to commit suicide on its walls and make the confrontation, in terms of meaning and sacrifice, to rise to a level which could lead other eyes and minds to be wide open of what is going around it and get elevated to its role, and make the force which it possesses after or before anyone may take this risk and is deceived by its Satan to trespass the walls of Baghdad, to be effective in the human milieu, capable of converting it into an ascent force in the milieu of constructive competition and not a brute force based on brutal devastating instinct.

Acting upon this, brothers and friends in our nation and humanity, we give our promise and make the Capable and the Great, our witness for our promise.

And acting upon this also, we have prepared our plans and muster our strength at the level of armies, people and leadership after placing our reliance on God . All success is from God.

Allah is the greatest

Allah is the greatest

Brothers..

The rulers of Baghdad in the past grew old. They renounced the role so commanded for them by God and deterred those who were responsible for their subjects from introducing innovations in their life affairs and defence of it when Hulago came to the walls of Baghdad in the year 1258. Thus Hulago came with the sunset and the rule passed to him with Baghdad as its capital. The Mongols succeeded and the sun set down from Baghdad at that time.

But now, despite Hulago's spirit has settled in whomsoever it has settled; in their actions, in what they did, or in what they are now doing, or in what they intend to do, of those who have been incited by the criminal Zionists in more than a place in the world, they have come to confront our nation at a time when the sons of our nation are embracing inside their souls and breasts, a great faith and a great state of consciousness of their role and of how it should be in order that they attain what it must be attained, and thus the nation could revert to its true belief, and could, with its Jihad and struggle, realize a true ascent to its great, faithful, pan-Arab and humanitarian role.

Hulago's army has now come at this age to confront Baghdad after it has born anew with the sunrise, to record, with its new youth, a level of ascent which suits it well after it has abandoned its leading role for about seven hundred years.

O Iraqis, you have indeed brought the sun back to Baghdad, and have shined in it at the time the city has been illuminated by you. But oh, how can a new Hulago destroy the city or the great Iraq, and how can the brutal, the perfidious and the greedy, after God has ordained this nation to rise again, defeat the will of determination of your brothers in Palestine as well or wherever the will of truth, steadfastness and resistance has ripened or blossomed in the breast of every believer who embraces a great confidence.

Oh people..

You know that the first human civilization in history was grown, blossomed and bore fruits in Iraq . From that civilization, the air carried its seeds to reach to whomever it could reach, who, according to his own personal opinion, added colour to it to suit his own country. For this reason, it is the mother of civilization of Iraq which Hulago of this age wants to attack.. So, tell him in a clear, loud voice, oh evil, halt your evil-doings against the mother of civilization, its museum and basic witness, the cradle and the birthplace of prophets and messengers. Tell him to let people, each in accordance with his human choice, to build, and to build and to build which is necessary for rising high the construction, for work, for fruitful cooperation and for the dissemination of love among people. Tell him to avoid provoking hatred and evil doings so that every one can enjoy his rights, full and complete, in such a manner that might please God and bring happiness for him in the two worlds..

Everyone in whose body the Hulago' intent and action has settled down will commit suicide at the walls of Baghdad and Iraq towns, as was the case with those who died at the walls of Jenin and Palestinian towns.

The entire nation will rise up in defence of its right to life, of its role and of anything it holds sacred ...

Their arrows will be on the wrong track or will recoil to their breasts, God willing ....The martyrs of the nation will turn into green birds in paradise as the Merciful has promised.

Let evil be on he who thinks evil..

Long live our glorious nation

Long live Iraq...

Long live Iraq with its brave jihadist army ..

Long live Palestine, free and Arab from the sea to the river... Long live Palestine's freedom fighters and jihadists together with its heroic people...

Glory and heaven be for martyrs....

Glory and heaven be for the martyrs of Iraq, Palestine and the nation....

Allah is the greatest..

Allah is the greatest...

Allah is the greatest....

---

## **APPENDIX B3**

**Saddam Hussein Speech of 17 January 2003 (Text B)**  
***(Guardian Unlimited: English version)***

**pages 259 - 265**

Feed your imagination

Guardian

## Full text: Saddam Hussein's speech (part 1)

Baghdad, January 17, 2003

[Saddam Hussein's speech \(part 2\)](#)

Friday January 17, 2003

**Guardian Unlimited**

In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful

There are those who, on being told: 'Your enemy has mustered a great force against you and so fear them,' they grew more tenacious in their faith and replied: Allah's help is all -sufficient for us. He is the best Protector'. Thus they earned Allah's grace and bounty and no harm befell them. For they had striven to please Allah, whose, bounty is infinite. It is Satan that prompts men to fear his followers. But have no fear of them. Fear Me, if you are true believers. Do not grieve for those that quickly renounce their faith. They will not harm Allah in the least. He seeks to give them no share in the hereafter. Their punishment shall be terrible indeed.

God speaks the truth

Great people in Iraq, the land of faith, Jihad, bravery and glory..

Brave members of the gallant armed forces..

Sons of our glorious Arab nation..

Men of goodwill in the world, wherever you are..

From the bright light of dawn, from the ray of sun which has risen after a long absence, from its horizon, from the lids of the eyes which were wounded by heavy tears for people, dear for all of us, who can no more be seen, but who can become visible with the new sun, and from the horizon which God has ordained to be vast, with a new birth and life in whose skies exist green birds and a strong newborn which God has decided to be faithful to its nation, from all this your glorious Revolution and march, a new Iraq, was born. Its faith has been increased and deepened after the Grand Confrontation on the night of 16/17 1991, the grand military phase of the eternal battle of Um Al-Maarik, by the fragrance of the generous blood, suffering and commendable patience.

A new Iraq was born with firm resolution, great power of vision and a heart, which has been increased in strength by a determination for ascent and for overcoming difficulties. It was firm in its love for its nation. Its faith, which God has given it and which the situation and banner was perfumed by generous blood from its sons, has been deepened by a scarifies which God has accepted in compensation for the negligence which took over those who ruled Baghdad, and therefore the foreigners with the horny feet of their horses, found their way towards it. The radiation of its eyes over the nation and humanity has set down, after the water of Tigris was dyed with plentiful blood along with the ink of its books which were filled with science and knowledge, and which were thrown into the water in the year 1258, as a punishment for a history whose soul departed its body and for a civilization whose faith and guards disappeared. Hence, the ravens croaked in it, showing impudence to its eyes through which humanity saw its way to raise in culture after it had played its role and into enlighten those who could see that and accepted from it as a means from God to them as a reward for its faith and fear.

The new Iraq was born on such a view, and was born with it, its rifle in place of the arrow, spear and sword, to be armed so that the ravens could not be so covetous as to venture its palms and the eyes of its children.

A strong, believing and healthy Iraq was born. But the birth, as all other births which came before it in the horizon of humanity and in our nation, was not able to render ineffectual the croak of ravens, nor the hissing

of snakes or the crossing of far crocodiles from the seas of their family in order to help the beasts of earth in their attack against the sun, in a desperate hope to obscure its light which radiated from Baghdad or to shed the blood of its people in a fake hope and out of an imagination that the generous blood shed on the soil of Baghdad and on the soil of Iraq could hinder the plants and trees from becoming green, from blossoming and from carrying with its fragrance pollens which might tempt the appetite of butterflies, and thus be able to carry with the news of new faith and resolution, with the dew and tears, a pollen to every tree whose branches and leaves become dry or ceased to give fruits now that the water ceased to reach its roots and was confident that no one could take care of its fruits and guard its plants, trees and growth.

With the new birth, there was Satan and his companion, the lizards of this time, who spit out their fire on the healthy body. But, as the birth of Baghdad was now healthy and proper, blessed by heaven by order of its God, and that its guard were putting their hands on their rifles during the dawn prayer on the day of birth, with great confidence in their breasts, on the night of 16/17 January 1991 and afterwards, Baghdad, in the name of Iraq, kept defending itself along with every faithful valiant and noble woman in defense of the command which God has so decided to their new birth. Their will of determination never bent. They defeated all evil troops of more than thirty states together with those who supported them. The number of the army, which the jihadists in the Iraq army had confronted, mounted to twenty-eight. The state of Iraq stood in the face of the aggression of forty-two countries on the night of 16 / 17 January. The confrontation and the battle lasted for a month and a half with such momentum. Afterwards, the sanctions and aggression continued for thirteen years until the present day. Such was the defence of the Iraqis on that day and the days that followed. Others, in their turn, defended the seeds which they sowed and elevated what they had built, to the point that their fields were mixed with the spacious gardens. Plants covered the land of Iraq reminding of its past when the land of Iraq was described as the land of the black for the multitude of its plants which disappeared from Baghdad, its countryside and towns, until it appeared as if they did not exist before as one sign of its health. It had mixed with the lofty constructions, dear and visible, and was dominated by the high minarets, domes and signs of the houses of worship. And with every exaltation of "Allah is the greatest" on the battlefields, the same gratification rose high in the mosques together with the voices of worship in their places, each in accordance with his own religion and manner. A visitor could tell that he was in Baghdad even though his eyes were shut, in an attempt that a traveler could hardly recognize his feet on the map... Was there a place much better than Baghdad, where religions and racial tolerance together with constructive views being born, on the side and direction of every constructive thing of other views....?

The new birth brought back once again the spirit of Baghdad, and with the birth a stand, a sword, a pen and a banner were born. The call of "Allah is the greatest" blessed the stand, the sword and the pen. The birth whose threats were knitted by the dawn and blessed by the call for prayer, was an impregnable birth to every malicious, perfidious and greedy...It could not deserve, nor could Allah and the people accept for it, but the life chosen for it by its pioneers after they asked the permission of their Lord, the Merciful. The scheming of the attackers backfired in that aggression and in the on-going aggression which they make longer to the present day. Everyone who tries to climb over its wall, be it an aggressor, an insolent, a wicked, a perfidious and an oppressor will fail in his attempt.

Is not this your description and position for the men of Iraq, the believer and loyal jihadists, and for the noble women as well? Or is there anyone who might delude himself into believing to say, after treading down his luck, that Saddam Hussein is speaking about his wishes and not about a description of a condition in which he lives and gets to know, with heart and soul, its comprehensive and detailed nature? By God, this is your description and attitude, or even a reward for your suffering, sacrifices, and patience, o brave men and women.. The evil ravens and evil crocodiles, still foster wickedness and would never cease their communication with their disappointed hopes, despite the fact that their deep wounds and disgrace can not be rubbed out with the passage of time. The lizards which breathed out fire on our lord, Ibrahim (peace be upon him), as is often related by people, still give birth and still assign for every birth the task of breathing out fire, out of their belief that they are capable of burning away, in defiance of God's will which He chose to be cool and safe.

Hence, with the flying banner, raise high your swords and rifles, oh our dear people, and remind anyone who may still be under a delusion, so that he might not be deluded of your stand in the

( Greatest March ), on the day of the Grand Allegiance and in other attitudes, but if he does so, let your guns waiting in ambush for him, preceded and guided by the radiation and light of your faith necessary for safeguarding your eyes. This is because, if their ravens have a fancy and find no one to deter them, God forbid, then they would peck up the eyes and devour the hearts and brains of faith, virtue and innovation. Hold fast to your banner, the banner of ( Allah is the Greatest ). There is nothing but it that can help motivate the resolution to rise and give to defence its profound connotation.

Say :God is the greatest, oh brothers and sons. Remember the meanings of this great call in accordance with



the profundity of your faith, so that its echo, along with your words and support, could be sounded by all towns and rural areas, by mountains and by plains. And with the help of the waters of Tigris and Euphrates and the water of the Gulf, your voice can reach not only every brave man and woman in the land of faith and Jihad, but also every loyal man and woman in the nation, every fair-minded and everyone who has an honorable stance in humanity.

When birth is associated with a stance, a determination, a pen, a sword and a banner, then birth can assume its proper role in our nation, God willing.

When we say that history is tantamount to doctrine, and is remembered by those who inherit it with contemplation, consideration and responsibility, this is because everything right is born with it and from it, and becomes a new and constant history after it gives a new birth with each glory and construction. A firm belief is its safe foundation . It becomes a doctrine carried from the past, still possesses the condition of the true birth when so remembered by its sons with the responsibility of the present, and with the due ambition for the future.

Such was the labour of the past. From its womb it begets a doctrine; new in its spirit, in dress and colour and its special path ... And with the new doctrine, a strong flag-post and hand has been born bearing our pride and our guidance to faith: Allahu Akbar, to stand firm in the face of every violent wind, God willing, or evil attempt.

Yes, Allahu Akbar....

Allahu Akbar....

Guardian Unlimited © Guardian Newspapers Limited 2005



## Full text: Saddam Hussein's speech (part 2)

Baghdad, January 17, 2003

Saddam Hussein's speech (part 1)

Friday January 17, 2003

Guardian Unlimited

Brothers: The saying that (history repeats itself) means, among other things, that aspects of the past could be repeated though they assume the colours and names of their stages...They repeat themselves should they be re-analyzed, revived and dissolved into their primary elements and ingredients as to their strength and weakness, ascent and descent, climbing and falling into abyss, good and bad, climbing to peaks and falling into abyss, pursuit of good will and virtue against pursuit of evil and vice, those who hate people and bring harm to them against those who love people and work for their welfare, the destroyers and the constructors and the like in the series of the images and their contrasts, up and down, bad and good.

Yes, it is true that history repeats itself but not on the basis of an uncontested premise of the ability to go up, as compared with the past without faith, consciousness, attitude and determination, or to give up to a descent case, as compared with the past also, except when all its items in life, man and nature are repeated to the point that it can hardly be conceived. Yet, a conscientious faith in portraying of how the role of man can be effective and ascending, of how can that faith be maintained together with its factors and causes and how can one reject any condition that may have an adverse impact on the faith, of the role of the believing and vanguard man in it and in its movement, or the denouncing of all this, is the decisive case in which history may repeat itself in the same form, here and there, whether negatively or positively.

Brother..

Baghdad in its known history , had played the role of the Arabs' and Muslims' pure eye. It was God's spear on earth, the Arabs' skull, the reservoir of their wisdom and glorious heritage, the focal point of their civilization and great radiation. That was with other supporting roles in other centres in conformity of what had happened in Baghdad or before that time. When the Mongols and Tatars reached the zenith of their strength and occupied China, India, Persia and other countries, they were unable to convert their ascent to strength by backwardness and destruction into a force capable of bringing construction, civilization and culture. The destroying force found its complex in Baghdad; the abode of civilization and peace, and made it its target for destruction which was rendered feeble because of the weakness of those who did not hold firm to the factors of ascent, its causes and results, and also of the weakness of its rulers and the betrayal of the traitors... Hulago and his troops occupied Baghdad for forty days and destroyed every live thing in it.. And because the people of Baghdad, I mean the rulers in it, were not quite prepared when the Mongols and Tatars invaded the territory of China, India, Persia and the surroundings, their invasion of Baghdad was in agreement of what history had described, and which later include Syria and the parts connected to it.

But Baghdad was not in a position to defend itself properly, and therefore the eyes of Hulago's army were not gouged out on its walls nor was it extinguished in its face the venture of trespassing it, or even to deny it the chance of going ahead to others from the nation to attack them as it attacked Baghdad, till Hulago's eyes were gouged out at the hands of the Mameluke dynasty in Egypt at the famous battle of ( Ain Jalut ),after they were able to get prepared for it and learnt lessons from the war before them and after Hulago's intent and methods were revealed... History tells us that western peoples and circles had played, for their own reasons, a role in directing Hulago to the east, indeed to the Arab world in particular. The Jews and their supporters played a remarkably malicious role against Baghdad in the past and this conspiratorial, aggressive and wicked role is today reverting to them, to the Zionist Jews and to the Zionists who are not of Jewish origin, particularly those who are in the US administration and around who stood in opposite front of our nation and Iraq . The force in America proved itself to be incapable of educating itself. It was not able to change itself into a capability, so that its impact would be humanitarian and instructive. Zionism and prejudicial people had pushed it to search for a role through a devastating brutal instinct instead of ascending to a position of responsible ability and to its civic, cultural role which suits this age and suits the role of balanced nations and their construction role in the collective milieu and work.

Yet, Baghdad today, brothers, has its eyes pure, its mind and conscious clear of any rust or cover, and are proud of the nation and for it, in the name of God, after they have put their trust in the Owner of Potency and gets prepared to the role.

Although some eyes and minds in our nation and humanity are still incapable of seeing or perceiving the pros and cons in the nation and humanity, the people and rulers of Baghdad have resolved to compel the Mongols of this age to commit suicide on its walls and make the confrontation, in terms of meaning and sacrifice, to rise to a level which could lead other eyes and minds to be wide open of what is going around it and get elevated to its role, and make the force which it possesses after or before anyone may take this risk and is deceived by its Satan to trespass the walls of Baghdad, to be effective in the human milieu, capable of converting it into an ascent force in the milieu of constructive competition and not a brute force based on brutal devastating instinct.

Acting upon this, brothers and friends in our nation and humanity, we give our promise and make the Capable and the Great, our witness for our promise.

And acting upon this also, we have prepared our plans and muster our strength at the level of armies, people and leadership after placing our reliance on God . All success is from God.

Allah is the greatest

Allah is the greatest

Brothers..

The rulers of Baghdad in the past grew old. They renounced the role so commanded for them by God and deterred those who were responsible for their subjects from introducing innovations in their life affairs and defence of it when Hulago came to the walls of Baghdad in the year 1258. Thus Hulago came with the sunset and the rule passed to him with Baghdad as its capital. The Mongols succeeded and the sun set down from Baghdad at that time.

But now, despite Hulago's spirit has settled in whomsoever it has settled; in their actions, in what they did, or in what they are now doing, or in what they intend to do, of those who have been incited by the criminal Zionists in more than a place in the world, they have come to confront our nation at a time when the sons of our nation are embracing inside their souls and breasts, a great faith and a great state of consciousness of their role and of how it should be in order that they attain what it must be attained, and thus the nation could revert to its true belief, and could, with its Jihad and struggle, realize a true ascent to its great, faithful, pan-Arab and humanitarian role.

Hulago's army has now come at this age to confront Baghdad after it has born anew with the sunrise, to record, with its new youth, a level of ascent which suits it well after it has abandoned its leading role for about seven hundred years.

O Iraqis, you have indeed brought the sun back to Baghdad, and have shined in it at the time the city has been illuminated by you. But oh, how can a new Hulago destroy the city or the great Iraq, and how can the brutal, the perfidious and the greedy, after God has ordained this nation to rise again, defeat the will of determination of your brothers in Palestine as well or wherever the will of truth, steadfastness and resistance has ripened or blossomed in the breast of every believer who embraces a great confidence.

Oh people..

You know that the first human civilization in history was grown, blossomed and bore fruits in Iraq . From that civilization, the air carried its seeds to reach to whomever it could reach, who, according to his own personal opinion, added colour to it to suit his own country. For this reason, it is the mother of civilization of Iraq which Hulago of this age wants to attack.. So, tell him in a clear, loud voice, oh evil, halt your evil-doings against the mother of civilization, its museum and basic witness, the cradle and the birthplace of prophets and messengers. Tell him to let people, each in accordance with his human choice, to build, and to build and to build which is necessary for rising high the construction, for work, for fruitful cooperation and for the dissemination of love among people. Tell him to avoid provoking hatred and evil doings so that every one can enjoy his rights, full and complete, in such a manner that might please God and bring happiness for him in the two worlds..

Everyone in whose body the Hulago' intent and action has settled down will commit suicide at the walls of Baghdad and Iraq towns, as was the case with those who died at the walls of Jenin and Palestinian towns.

The entire nation will rise up in defence of its right to life, of its role and of anything it holds sacred ... Their arrows will be on the wrong track or will recoil to their breasts, God willing ....The martyrs of the nation will turn into green birds in paradise as the Merciful has promised.

Let evil be on he who thinks evil..

Long live our glorious nation

Long live Iraq...

Long live Iraq with its brave jihadist army ..

Long live Palestine, free and Arab from the sea to the river... Long live Palestine's freedom fighters and jihadists together with its heroic people...

Glory and heaven be for martyrs....

Glory and heaven be for the martyrs of Iraq, Palestine and the nation....

Allah is the greatest..

Allah is the greatest...

Allah is the greatest

Guardian Unlimited © Guardian Newspapers Limited 2005

## **APPENDIX B4**

**Saddam Hussein Speech of 17 January 2003 (Text B)  
(BBC Monitoring Middle East: English version)**

**pages 266 - 272**

**Saddam Husayn highlights resistance in Gulf War anniversary speech.**

bbcmep0020030117dz1h006hd

3837 Words

17 January 2003

17:26 GMT

BBC Monitoring Middle East

English

(c) 2003 The British Broadcasting Corporation [date of publication]. All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced except with the express permission of The British Broadcasting Corporation.

Iraqi President Saddam Husayn has reiterated the determination of the Iraqi people to defeat any new invaders, saying that they "will die at the walls of Baghdad". In a speech on the 12th anniversary of the 1991 Gulf War, Saddam hailed those who defended Iraq against "the aggression of 42 nations" and encouraged today's population to fight in the name of the Iraqi flag and the call of "God is great". He compared any new invaders to the Mongols of the 13th century and said that the people of Baghdad were "determined to make the Mongols of this age commit suicide at its walls". The following is the text of the speech by the Iraqi president, broadcast by Iraqi satellite TV on 17 January; unclear whether broadcast was live or recorded; sub-headings inserted editorially:

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate.

Those [believers] unto whom the people [hypocrites] said, "Verily, the people [pagans] have gathered against you [a great army], therefore, fear them." But it [only] increased them in faith, and they said: "Allah [alone] is sufficient for us, and He is the best disposer of affairs [for us]." [Koranic verse: sura 3, verse 173 onwards]

So they returned with grace and bounty from Allah. No harm touched them; and they followed the good pleasure of Allah. And Allah is the owner of great bounty. [Koranic verse]

It is only Satan that suggests to you the fear of his supporters and friends; so fear them not, but fear me, if you are [true] believers. [Koranic verse]

And let not those grieve you who rush with haste to disbelieve; verily, not the least harm will they do to Allah. It is Allah's will to give them no portion in the hereafter. For them there is a great torment. [Koranic verse]

O great people in Iraq, the country of faith, jihad, heroism and glory;

O brave men in our valiant Armed Forces;

O glorious Arab nation;

O good people wherever you are in the world:

Rebirth of Iraq during 1991 Gulf War

A new Iraq was born with the first threads of the bright dawn and with the first rays of the sun, which rose after a long absence during which it refused to be marginally born. It was born from the lashes of eyes marred by heavy tears, shed over the absence of loved ones, who later shone with a new sun and a horizon God wanted to be broad. It was the birth of a new life with green birds in its skies and a strong new-born, which God wanted to be faithful

to its nation. That was your revolution and honourable march, which gave birth to a new Iraq. The aroma of copious blood, suffering and beautiful patience increased and deepened its faith after the 16-17 January 1991 battle - the major military chapter in the immortal Mother of Battles.

The new Iraq was born with determination, vision and heart. Determination to advance and overcome difficulties increased its love for its nation and its firmness in confronting its enemies.

It also strengthened its faith, for which God has rewarded it, after it scented the stand and the banner with the blood of its sons, which it offered as a sacrifice to God to atone for the negligence of the rulers in Baghdad. This negligence allowed the foreigner, riding on his horses, to find his way to Baghdad and deprive it of the brilliance of its eyes, which were shining to illuminate the road for its nation and humanity. Then, the waters of the Tigris were coloured by massive amounts of blood, in addition to the ink of its books, which were packed with science and knowledge. In 1258 AD, these books were thrown in the Tigris as punishment for a history that lost its spirit and a civilization that lost its faith and protectors. Then, too, ravens began to croak, attacking Baghdad's eyes, with which humanity was seeing its way to achieve civilization. Baghdad also played a great role to educate those who wanted to learn and who accepted this from Baghdad after it believed in and had faith in God.

The new Iraq was born, as such, with a rifle that replaced the arrow, the lance and the sword, so that it would be armed and so that the ravens would not dare to covet it or its palm trees and the eyes of its children.

It was born a strong, faithful and healthy Iraq. This birth, however, like all other births in the history of humanity and our nation, did not stop the croak of ravens and the hiss of snakes. Nor did it stop the distant crocodiles, which came from faraway seas to aid the pests of earth in their attack against the sun, which shines from Baghdad, in the futile hope of covering it. It did not stop them from shedding the blood of its people, thinking, incorrectly, that the precious blood that flows generously on the soil of Baghdad and Iraq would stop the plants and trees from getting greener, from flourishing, from flowering, and from sending delicious pollen into the wind. Butterflies would then carry this pollen - together with the news of the new faith and zeal, with the dew and with tears - to every tree, which stopped flourishing after it had lost its branches to dryness because water failed to reach its roots and it was unable to find anyone it could trust to care for the fruit and guard the plant, the tree and the building.

Newly born Iraq defeated "over 30 countries"

With the new birth, Satan and his companion, the lizards of this age, were blowing fire at the recovering body. Because the rebirth of Baghdad was healthy, correct and blessed by heaven and by the will of God, however, and because the guardians of Baghdad were holding fast to their rifles, which were blessed with the dawn prayers at the time of this rebirth - with these guardians making up their minds and consolidating their resolve on the night of 16-17 January 1991 - Baghdad continued, in the name of Iraq, to put up its defence, supported by all splendid men and glorious women, to protect their new-born child, as God willed.

Their determination never faltered and they defeated all the concentrations of evil from over 30 countries, along with their supporters. The mujahidin in the Iraqi army confronted 28 armies. The Iraqi nation confronted the aggression of 42 nations on the night of 16-17 January.

The confrontation and the battle continued for one and a half months with the same momentum. It was followed by the blockade and aggression, which have been ongoing over 13 years. Thus, on this and subsequent days, the Iraqis put up their defence. Others also put up their defence, in their own way, by tilling the land and erecting the great structure, spreading beautiful gardens and plantations across the land of Iraq, and reminding the beholder of the past when the Iraqi land was described as Ard al-Sawad [black earth, the

name given by Muslim conquerors of Iraq in early Islamic days due to the fertility of the land] because of its immense plantation areas.

Before that, Baghdad, the Iraqi countryside and the Iraqi towns looked devoid of plantations as though these plantations had never been part of healthy Iraq. The plantations merged with the great structure in glory for all to see. Minarets and domes of houses of worship multiplied. With the shouts of "God is great" in the fields of combat, other shouts also reverberated in mosques. Prayers were heard in all places of worship, each in accordance with his religion and methods. The visitor would have known that he was in Baghdad even if he had been blindfolded, unable to know where his feet actually were on the map.

Is there any place better than Baghdad, where religious and denominational tolerance is born and where you have constructive ideas that augment and go along with all other constructive ideas?

Anyone climbing Baghdad walls to be "driven away"

The new birth revived the spirit of Baghdad. A position, sword, pen and banner were born with this new birth, and these were blessed by the call of God is great. The birth, which was knitted by the threads of dawn and blessed by the call to prayer, became impregnable to all the wicked, perfidious and covetous ones. Nothing befits Baghdad and the new birth other than the life chosen for it by its pioneers. Neither God nor people accept otherwise. The pioneers did so with the permission of their merciful God. The lowly ones were defeated in their aggression - an aggression continuing to date. Anyone who tries to climb its [Baghdad's] walls to commit an insolent, vile, criminal and treacherous aggression will be driven away.

Is this not your characteristic and position, O zealous, faithful, and mujahid Iraqis and glorious women?

Can anyone, after cursing his luck, be deluded into saying that Saddam Husayn is talking about his wishes and not the situation in which he is living and which he knows spiritually and practically in a comprehensive and detailed manner? Yes, by God, it is your characteristic and position, and even the reward for your suffering, sacrifices and patience, O brave men and women. The ravens and crocodiles of evil continue to harbour evil. They have not severed links with their failing hopes despite all their deep wounds and the disgrace, which cannot be erased by time.

The lizards, which breathed out fire at our Lord Abraham, peace be upon him - in accordance with the stories told - continue to give birth to siblings in order to give every new-born the task of breathing out fire. By doing so, they imagine that they can burn [others] despite the will of God, who wanted it to be coolness and safety.

O dear people, raise your swords and rifles, along with the high banner. Remind others not to be deluded about your position in the great march on the Great Allegiance Day and your other stands. If they are deluded, let your rifles lie in wait for them. Let them [your rifles] be guided by the radiation and light of your faith with which to preserve eyes. If deluded and not deterred, God forbid, their ravens will peck eyes and eat up the hearts, minds and brains of faith, virtue and creativity. Be proud of your banner, the banner of God is great. None else is fit to promote determination and give fervour its deep meaning.

Say God is great, O brothers and sons, and remember the meaning of this great slogan in accordance with your deep faith, so that it will be echoed by all towns and villages, over hilltops, and on plains. The waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates and the waters of the Gulf will help carry your voice to reach not only the splendid men and the glorious women in faithful and Jihadist Iraq, but to reach every zealous man and glorious woman in the Arab nation and all fair-minded and noble men worldwide.

When the rebirth is bolstered by a solid position and resolve, and by the pen, the sword and



the banner, the rebirth will play its role in our Arab nation, God willing. We say that if history is recalled by the people with contemplation, understanding and a sense of responsibility, it will be like a creed. It is because the truth is reborn and becomes a continuous and new history. It will be reborn again after each element of glory, each structure, and with a high faith that constitutes its true base. It will be a creed about a past that bears the seeds of correct rebirth. The sons will recall it with the responsibility of the presence and will look to the future for its realization.

Thus, the past brings forth the principles of the new spirit from its deep roots, clad in a new garment and with new colours and exclusive methods. The new creed that is reborn will be accompanied by a banner and a firm grip that raises aloft our zeal and the sign of our faith; namely, the [Iraqi] banner of God is great. Thus, this banner will hold fast in facing all strong winds and evil attempts, God willing.

Yes, God is great, God is great.

#### History repeats itself

Brothers, the saying that history repeats itself means, among other things, that the pictures of the past are repeated even when they come under contemporary names and colours. They are repeated if they are analysed once again and if they are revitalized and broken up into their elementary components in terms of strength, weakness, ups and downs, its soaring to the highest points and its plummeting to the lowest point, the good and the bad, those who love good and virtue and those who seek evil and vice, those who hate people and those who want to harm them, those who love people and those who seek to benefit them, the builders and the destroyers, and so on and so forth in terms of the series of pictures and their opposite numbers, high and low, the ugly and the beautiful.

Yes, history repeats itself but not on an absolute or a stereotypical basis. Progress on the level of the past cannot be made without faith, awareness, proper stand and resolve, or by succumbing to a state of degeneration in accordance with what happened in the past, unless all the elements of history's components in life, in humanity and in nature are repeated - a situation that is unimaginable. A decisive factor in making history repeat itself, however, is a deep faith in man's ability to progress by adhering to his faith, its components and reasons, and by rejecting and abandoning any situation that negatively affects faith and the role of the faithful and pioneering men. This deep faith is the decisive factor that makes history repeat itself exactly as it was in the past, here or there, positively or negatively.

Brothers,

Throughout its well-known history, Baghdad was the transparent eye of the Arabs and Muslims, God's spear on earth, the skull of the Arabs, the reservoir of their wisdom and great heritage, and the store of their resources and great civilization. Other cities played a similar role to Baghdad, and some even before it.

When the Mongol and Tatars reached the zenith of their power and occupied China, India, Persia and other countries and lands, they could not turn their rise to power through backwardness and destruction into a capability for construction, civilization and modernization. That destructive power found its complexity in Baghdad, the city of civilization and the city of peace. They vented their destructive power on Baghdad, which was weakened by those who did not adhere to the factors needed to rise to capability by playing the necessary role and understanding its requirements and reasons, the weakness of the rulers, and the treachery of traitors.

Hulago [grandson of Genghis Khan who sacked Baghdad in 1258 AD] and his soldiers looted Baghdad for 40 days and then destroyed every living thing in it. The people of Baghdad, and I mean the rulers, did not prepare as they should have, when the Mongols and the Tatars invaded the lands of China, India, Persia and the nearby areas. History has recorded their

invasion of Baghdad, and then of Bilad al-Sham [Greater Syria] and the nearby areas. Baghdad, however, did not have the opportunity to defend itself, as it should. Baghdad was unable to gouge out the eye of Hulago on its walls to punish him for daring against it and to deny him the opportunity to go beyond it to other people of the same nation to ransack them as he did with Baghdad.

The Mamluk rulers of Egypt gauged out Hulago's eye in the renowned Ayn Jalut Battle [in 1260 AD] after they prepared themselves for this goal, after they learned from the lessons of previous wars, and after Hulago's methods and intentions were exposed. History teaches us that certain groups, parties and individuals from the West have, for their own ends, played a role in encouraging Hulago to move eastwards, and to the Arab homeland, in particular.

The Jews, and those who supported them, have played a well-known malicious role against Baghdad in the past. Today, the Jews, the Zionist Jews and the non-Jewish Zionists are reassuming the same malicious, conspiratorial and aggressive role. This is especially the case with those inside the US administration and those who stand close to it on the opposite side to our nation and Iraq.

**People of Baghdad determined to make US "commit suicide at its walls"**

Power in the United States is once again unable to tame itself. This power failed to change into a capability that can play an enlightened humanitarian role. Zionism, and those who have their own schemes, has encouraged it to search for a role with a destructive, savage instinct, not by turning into a responsible capability, with a progressive and civilized role that befits this age and the responsibility of the balanced nations and the constructive part they should play in the shared environment and collective action.

But now, O brothers, Baghdad's eyes are clear, and any impotence, rust, or blurring has been removed from its mind and conscience. In the name of God and after counting on the Omnipotent and readying themselves to perform their role, Baghdad's mind and conscience are acting chivalrously towards the nation and towards Baghdad.

Even though the eyes and minds of people from among the ranks of our nation and mankind are still unaware of their roles, duties and rights vis-a-vis the nation and mankind, the people and guardians of Baghdad are determined to make the Mongols of this age commit suicide at its walls and raise the confrontation in terms of significance and sacrifices to levels that will enable other eyes and minds to open up and wake up to what is around them, live up to their responsibilities, and make resources available after the fact or even before those who are entertaining the notion of encroaching on Baghdad's walls become embroiled, so that these resources are influential on the human level and, thus, achieve a potential that would bring about a resurgence in terms of constructive competition and not a brutal force that is anchored in the instinct of savage destruction.

Based on this, O brothers and friends within the ranks of our nation and mankind at large, we make our pledge to you. May the Omnipotent and All-Powerful God be a witness to our pledge.

After relying on God, and victory can only be granted by God, we have determined our steps and organized our capabilities - armies, people and leadership.

God is great. God is great.

O brothers: The ancient guardians of Baghdad grew old and abandoned the role ordained to them by God and what it required of the officials' creativity in the various walks of life and what it required of them in defending Baghdad when Hulago headed for its walls in 1258 AD. Thus, Hulago's invasion coincided with a sunset. As a result, the state that made Baghdad its capital disappeared and the Mongols' scheme succeeded. Then, the sun set on Baghdad.

They have come to clash with our nation, now, that the spirit of Hulago has been lodged in their minds and permeated their actions and the things that they are doing or that they intend to do, in addition to the deeds that the criminal Zionists are instigating them to perpetrate in more than one place in the world.

Meanwhile, the sons of our nation are overwhelmed by a state of deep faith and a great awakening in terms of the role they have to play so that they might realize their aims and so that the nation will return to its genuine faith and realize genuine progress by its jihad and struggle to enable it to return to its religious, national and humanitarian position.

The army of Hulago of this age has come to clash with Baghdad after it was reborn with the sunrise. With its new youth, worthy Baghdad will realize a high level after it abandoned its leading role for 700 years.

"This nation will rise again"

O Iraqis, you have brought the sun to Baghdad. You are shining in Baghdad and Baghdad shines by you. The new Hulago will never be able to defeat great Iraq. Moreover, now that God has willed that this nation will rise again, the aggressors, the ambitious and evil ones will not be able to defeat the will of your brothers in Palestine, as well as in all places where the spirit of steadfastness and resistance fills the hearts of all the faithful people.

O mankind, you are aware that the first human civilization in history grew and bore flower and fruit in Iraq. The air carried the pollen to reach everywhere. Everyone then added their colours in accordance with what they wanted for their countries.

Therefore, Hulago of this age is attacking your mother, the Iraqi civilization. Tell him in a loud, clear voice: Stop your evil against the mother of civilizations - the civilizations' primary museum, landmark and cradle, the cradle of messengers and prophets.

Let people, each according to his own choice, build, build and build. With the progress of construction, work and fruitful cooperation, and when people show love towards each other, avoid hatred and evil, and when each party enjoys his rights in full, God will be pleased with those who do what pleases Him and grant them happiness in this life and the hereafter. Those who epitomize the actions and intentions of Hulago will die at the walls of Baghdad and other Iraqi cities, as they died on the walls of Jenin and the other Palestinian towns and villages. The entire nation will rise to defend its right in life, and to defend its role and sacred places. Their arrows will either err or boomerang and return to their own chests, God willing. The martyrs of the nation will be green birds in paradise, as God promised. The lowly ones will be accursed.

Long live our glorious Arab nation. Long live Iraq and long live Iraq's mujahid and glorious army. Long live Palestine, free and Arab from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea. Long live the Palestinian mujahids and strugglers and heroic people.

Glory and paradise for the martyrs. Glory and paradise for the martyrs of Iraq and Palestine and for the Arab nation's martyrs.

God is great, God is great, God is great.

Source: Iraqi Satellite Channel, Baghdad, in Arabic 0804 gmt 17 Jan 03.

For assistance, access Dow Jones Customer Support.

---

(c) 2009 Factiva, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdul-Raof, H. (2001a). *Arabic Stylistics: A Coursebook*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2001b). *Qur'an Translation. Discourse, Texture and Exegesis*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2004a). *Qur'anic Stylistics: A Linguistic Analysis*. Munich: LINCOM GmbH.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2004b). *The Qur'an: Limits of Translatability*. In S. Faiq (ed.) (2004) *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd; pp 91-106.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005a). *Consonance in the Qur'an: A Conceptual, Intertextual and Linguistic Analysis*. Munich: LINCOM EUROPA.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005b). *Cultural Aspects in Qur'an Translation*. In L. Long (ed.) *Translation and Religion. Holy Untranslatable?* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd; pp 162-172.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2006). *Arabic Rhetoric. A Pragmatic Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Abu Al-Sha'r, A.M. and M.R. Zughoul (2009). *Arabic-English-Arabic Online Machine Translation: An analytical and evaluative study*. In *Turjumān* 18 (2); pp. 33-83.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005). *English/Arabic/English Machine Translation: A Historical Perspective*. In *META* 50 (3).
- Abu-ssaydeh, A. (2006). *English Equivalents of جداً and تماماً : A Study in Inter-Linguistic Intensification*. In *Turjumān* 15 (1); pp. 11-38.
- Ahmad, A. A. (2005). *آليات التناص النوعي في شعر الحداثة* [Intertextuality in Modernist Poetry]. Al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah, KSA: Dār al-Zamān for Publishing and Distribution.
- Ali, A. Y. (2003). *The Meaning of the Holy Qur'an*. Leicester, UK: The Islamic Foundation.
- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Alpert, M. (1998). *Torah translation*. In M. Baker (ed.) (1998); pp. 269-273.
- Álvarez, R. and C. Vidal (eds.) (1996). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Amouzadeh, M. (2008). *Language as social practice: Persian newspapers in post-revolutionary Iran*. In *Journal of Language and Politics* 7:1 (2008); pp. 53-70.

Atrissi, T. (2008). *Arab and Iranian Images of Each Other*. In T. Labib (ed.) (2008); pp. 316-356.

Aziz, Y. Y. (1995). *The Problem of Emotive Language in Translation*. In *Turjumān* 4(2); pp. 79 – 94.

Badawi, E., M.G. Carter and A. Gully (2004). *Modern Written Arabic: a Comprehensive Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

\_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (1998). *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (1st edition)*. London and New York: Routledge.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2006a). *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London and New York: Routledge.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2006b). *Translation and activism: Emerging patterns of narrative community*. In *The Massachusetts Review* XLVII(3); pp. 462-484.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2007). *Reframing Conflict in Translation*. In M. Baker (ed.) (2009); pp. 189-208 (originally in *Social Semiotics* 17(2) (2007); pp. 151-169).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2009). *Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics (Vol IV)*. London and New York: Routledge.

\_\_\_\_\_ and S.F. Hanna (2009). *Arabic tradition*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 328-337.

Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009). *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (2nd edition)*. London and New York: Routledge.

Barkho, L.Y. (1987). *Cultural Problems of Arabic-English Political Translation*. In *Babel* 33 (3); pp. 143-151.

Barnstone, W. (1993). *The Poetics of Translation: history, theory, practice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bassnett, S. (1997). *The translation of literature (1)*. In *The Linguist* 36(2); pp. 38 – 41.

\_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (2007). *Influence and Intertextuality. Forum for Modern Language Studies* 43 (2). Oxford: Oxford University Press (for the Court of the University of St Andrews).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2007). *Influence and Intertextuality: A Reappraisal*. In S. Bassnett (ed.) (2007); pp. 134-146.

- Bassnett, S. and A. Lefevere (eds.) (1990). *Translation, History and Culture*. London and New York: Pinter.
- Bauman, R. (2004). *A World of Others' Words: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Intertextuality*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Beard, A. (2000). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Beaugrande, R. de and W. Dressler (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Beaugrande, R. de, A. Shunnaq and M. Heliel (eds.) (1994). *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bell, R. T. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.
- Bengio, O. (1998). *Saddam's Word: Political Discourse in Iraq*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bettaher, B. (2001). *الدور الحضاري للعربية في عصر العولم* [The Cultural Role of Arabic in the Age of Globalization]. Sharjah, UAE: University of Sharjah College of Arts and Sciences (for the Society for the Protection of the Arabic Language).
- Bielsa, E. and S. Bassnett (2009). *Translation in global news*. London: Routledge.
- Boussofara-Omar, N. (2006). *Learning the 'linguistic habitus' of a politician: A presidential authoritative voice in the making*. In *Journal of Language and Politics* 5:3 (2006); pp. 325-358.
- Bush, G. W. (2004). *We will persevere*. Guardian Unlimited, 25 May 2004. Available online at: [www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4931886-103550,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4931886-103550,00.html) (accessed 16/07/2005).
- Campbell, S. (1998). *Translation into the Second Language*. London: Longman.
- Carbonell, O. (1996). *The exotic space of cultural translation*. In R. Alvarez and Vidal, C. (eds.) (1996); pp. 79-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2004). *Exoticism, Identity and Representation in Western Translation from Arabic*. In S. Faiq (ed.) (2004); pp. 26-39.
- Casagrande, J.B. (1954). *The Ends of Translation*. In *International Journal of American Linguistics* 20 (4); pp. 335 – 340.
- Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The Basics (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)*. London: Routledge.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Clark, U. (1996). *An Introduction to Stylistics*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.
- Connolly, D. and A. Bacopoulou-Halls (2009). *Greek tradition*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 418-426.
- Copeland, R. (1991). *Rhetoric, hermeneutics and translation in the Middle Ages: academic traditions and vernacular texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coughlin, C. (2002, revised edition 2005). *Saddam: The Secret Life*. London: Pan Books.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2003a). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (5<sup>th</sup> edition)*. Malden, MA: Blackwell's.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2003b). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunico, S. and J. Munday (eds.) (2007). *Translation and ideology: encounters and clashes*. Special issue of *The Translator*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2007). Manchester: St Jerome.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007a). *Encounters and Clashes: Introduction to Translation and Ideology*. In S. Cunico and J. Munday (eds.) (2007); pp. 141-149.
- Dagut, M. B. (1976). *Can "Metaphor" Be Translated?* In *Babel* 22 (1); pp. 21-33.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1978). *Hebrew-English Translation: A Linguistic Analysis of Some Semantic Problems*. Haifa: The University of Haifa.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1987). *More About the Translatability of Metaphor*. In *Babel* 33 (2); pp. 77-83.
- Davies, E.E. (2007). *Leaving it out: on some justifications for the use of omission in translation*. In *Babel* 53 (1); pp. 56-77.
- Daykin, V. (1972). *Technical Arabic*. London: Lund Humphries.
- Deheuvels, L., B. Michalak-Pikulska and P. Starkey (eds.) (2006). *Intertextuality in Modern Arabic Literature since 1967*. Durham: Durham University.
- Dickins, J. (2005). *Two models for metaphor translation*. In *Target* 17 (2); pp. 227-273.

- Dickins, J., S. Hervey and I. Higgins (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Arabic to English*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dickins, J. and J.C.E. Watson (1999). *Standard Arabic: An Advanced Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1991, revised edition 2007). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London and New York: Verso.
- Ellis, R. and L. Oakley-Brown (2009). *British tradition*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 344-354.
- Emanatian, M. and D. Delaney (2008). *What message does 'send a message' send?* In *Journal of Language and Politics* 7:2 (2008); pp. 290-320.
- Emery, P.G. (1987). *Aspects of Arabic-English translation: a contrastive study*. In *The Linguist* 26 (2); pp. 62-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2004). *Translation, Equivalence and Fidelity: A Pragmatic Approach*. In *Babel* 50 (2); pp. 143-167.
- Faiq, S. (1995). *A Semiotic Solution to the Intricacies of Translating from Arabic*. In *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Linguistics*, Bucharest, 1995; pp. 145 – 165.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (2004). *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2008). *Source...Where Art Thou? Translation and the Transcreation of Cultural Reality*. In *Translation Watch Quarterly* 4 (1); pp. 29-42.
- Farahzad, F. (2008). *Translation as an Intertextual Practice*. In *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* Vol.16 (3&4), 2008; pp. 125 – 131.
- Fareh, S. (2006). *Some Textual Problems in Translating Arabic into English*. In *Turjumān* 15 (2); pp. 99-115.
- Farouk-Sluglett, M. and P. Sluglett (1990). *Iraq Since 1958: From Revolution to Dictatorship*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and J. Munday (2009). *Ideology*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 137-141.
- Federici, E. (2007). *The Translator's Intertextual Baggage*. In S. Bassnett (ed.) (2007); pp. 147-160.
- Firestone, R. (2003). *The Qur'an and the Bible: Some Modern Studies of Their Relationship*. In Reeves, J. C. (ed.) (2003); pp. 1-22.



- Fowler, D. (2000). *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geisweiller, B. F. (2010). *Hate 2.0*. Common Dreams.org, 20 February 2010. Available online at [www.commondreams.org/print/53018](http://www.commondreams.org/print/53018) (accessed 24 February 2010).
- Gentzler, E. (2001). *Contemporary Translation Theories (2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition)*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Ghazala, H. (2004). *Stylistic-semantic and grammatical functions of punctuation in English-Arabic translation*. In *Babel* 50 (3); pp. 230-245.
- Gregoriou, C. (2009). *English Literary Stylistics*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hardwick, L. (2000). *Translating Words, Translating Cultures*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Hatim, B. (1997a). *English-Arabic / Arabic-English Translation. A Practical Guide*. London: Saqi Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1997b). *Communication Across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1997c). *Intertextual Intrusions: Towards a Framework for Harnessing the Power of the Absent Text in Translation*. In K. Simms (ed.) (1997); pp. 29-45.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. London and New York: Longman.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007). *Intervention at text and discourse levels in the translation of 'orate' languages*. In Munday, J. (ed.) (2007a); pp. 84-96.
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London and New York: Longman.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. and J. Munday (2004). *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-Oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2009). *Translatability*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 300-303.

- Hervey, S. and I. Higgins (1992). *Thinking Translation: A Course in Translation Method*. London: Routledge.
- Higgins, I. (2008). *Where the Added Value Is: On Writing and Reading Translations*. In *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 44 (3). Oxford: Oxford University Press (for the Court of the University of St Andrews).
- al-Hilali, M.T. and M.M. Khan (2002). *The Noble Qur'an. Transliteration in Roman Script with Arabic Text and English Translation*. Riyadh, KSA: Dārussalām Publishers and Distributors.
- Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and intertext: Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hiro, D. (1989). *The Longest War: The Iran-Iraq Military Conflict*. London and Glasgow: Grafton Books.
- Hodge, R. and G. Kress (1979, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.1993). *Language as Ideology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Holes, C. (2004). *Modern Arabic. Structures, Functions, and Varieties* (revised edition). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Holt, M. (2004). *Translating Islamist Discourse*. In S. Faiq, (ed.) (2004); pp.63-74.
- Hourani, A. (1991). *A History of the Arab Peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Hung, E. and D. Pollard (2009). *Chinese tradition*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 369-378.
- Hussein, Saddam (1977). *Saddam Hussein on Current Events in Iraq*. London: Longman.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2001). *America Reaps the Thorns its Rulers Sowed in the World*. Baghdad: Ministry of Information, Republic of Iraq [Facsimile edition published in May 2005 by The Ministry of Peace, 139 Vauxhall Street, London SE11 5LL, following the destruction of the original Iraqi Ministry of Information during the invasion of March 2003].
- Irving, T.B. (1985). *The Qur'an: The First American Translation*. Brattleboro: Amana Books.
- Jakobson, R. (1959/2000). *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*. In L. Venuti (ed.) (2000); pp. 113 – 118.
- Jayyusi, S.K. (1977). *Trends and Movements in Modern Arabic Poetry (Vol.2)*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

- Kaleigh19 (2007). *Intertextuality and Literary Evolution*. Available online at: <http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/exchange/node/414> (accessed 6 February 2009).
- Kelly, L.G. (1969). *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1979). *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2009). *Latin tradition*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 477-486.
- Kenny, D. (2009). *Equivalence*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 96 – 99.
- 'al-Khalil, S.' [Kan'ān Makīyya] (1989, new edition 1991). *Republic of Fear*. London: Hutchinson Radius.
- al-Khūry, S. (1988). *Al-Tarjamah Qadīman wa Ḥadīthan* [Translation Past and Present]. Sousse, Tunisia: Dār al-Ma'ārif.
- Kishtainy, K. (translator) (1979). [Saddam Hussein speeches on] *Social and Foreign Affairs in Iraq*. London: Croom Helm.
- Kittel, H. and A. Poltermann (2009). *German tradition*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 411-418.
- Koller, W. (1979). *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft* [Introduction to the Science of Translation]. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (edited by Leon S. Roudiez; translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez). New York: Columbia University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1984). *Revolution in Poetic Language* (translated by Margaret Waller, with an Introduction by Leon S. Roudiez). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Labib, T. (ed.) (2008). *Imagining the Arab Other; how Arabs and Non-Arabs view each other*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Lazar, A. and M.M. Lazar (2008). *Discourse of global governance: American hegemony in the post-Cold War era*. In *Journal of Language and Politics* 7:2 (2008); pp. 228-246.
- Lefevere, A. (1990). *Translation: Its Genealogy in the West*. In Bassnett, S. and A. Lefevere (eds.) (1990); pp.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Leppihalme, R. (1997). *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Lewis, B. (2000). *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*. London: Phoenix Press.
- Long, L. (ed.) (2005). *Translation and Religion. Holy Untranslatable?* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mansfield, P. (1982). *Saddam Husain's political thinking: the comparison with Nasser*. In T. Niblock (ed.) (1982); pp. 62-73.
- Marr, P. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2004). *The Modern History of Iraq*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Mason, I. (1994). *Discourse, Ideology and Translation*. In R. de Beaugrande, A. Shunnaq and M. Heliel (eds.) (1994); pp. 23-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007). *Revisiting the Classics: Critical Linguistics, Language and Ideology*. In S. Cunico and J. Munday (eds.) (2007); pp. 341-346.
- Mazid, B.M. (2007). *Politics of Translation. Power and Ideology, Culture and X-phemism in Translation between Arabic and English*. Munich: LINCOM GmbH.
- Mazraani, N. (1997). *Aspects of language variation in Arabic political speech-making*. Richmond, UK: Curzon Press.
- McGregor, W.B. (2009). *Linguistics: an introduction*. London: Continuum.
- Megrab, R. A. (1997). *Standards of Textuality and the Translation of Hadith*. In K. Simms (ed.) (1997); pp. 231-238.
- Meinhof, U. and J. Smith (eds.) (2000). *Intertextuality and the media: from genre to everyday life*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Minkoff, H. (1988). *Concern for the text versus concern for the reader*. In *Bible Review* Vol.4, Part 4; pp.34-40.
- Munday, J. (2001, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2008). *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (2007a). *Translation as Intervention*. London: Continuum.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007b). *Translation and Ideology: A Textual Approach*. In Cunico, S. and J. Munday (eds.) (2007); pp. 195-217.
- Mustapha, H. (2009). *Qur 'ān (Koran)*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 225-229.

- Naji, N. I. (1998). *Functional Equivalence: Dimensions and Importance in Literary Translation*. In *Turjumān* 7(1); pp. 39 – 58.
- Nasser, Gamal ‘Abdel (1951 – 1961). *المجموعة الكاملة لخطب واحاديث وتصريحات جمال عبد الناصر* [Speeches, Statements and Declarations by Gamal Abdel Nasser: the complete collection, edited by Aḥmad Yūsuf Aḥmad, assisted by Mirfat ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and Aḥmad al-Sayyid], Vol.2 (1955-1957). Beirut: Markaz Dirāsāt al-Waḥdah al-‘Arabiyyah [Centre for Arab Unity Studies].
- Netton, I.R. (1996). *Text and Trauma: An East-West Primer*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Neubert, A. and G. M. Shreve (1992). *Translation as Text*. Kent State University Press.
- Neuwirth, A. (2008). *Two Views of History and Human Future: Qur’anic and Biblical Renderings of Divine Promises*. In *Journal of Qur’anic Studies* X (1), 2008; pp. 1-20.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York and London: Prentice Hall.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998). *Paragraphs on translation – 54*. In *The Linguist* 37(2); pp. 60 – 62.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2006). *Translation now – 37*. In *The Linguist* 45(1); pp. 30 -31.
- Niblock, T. (ed.) (1982). *Iraq: the contemporary state*. London and Canberra: Croom Helm, New York: St Martin’s Press.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1994). *Translation: Possible and Impossible*. In *Turjumān* 3(2); pp. 147 – 163.
- Nida, E. A. and Taber, C. R. (2003). *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (4th impression). Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill.
- O’Hagan, M. and D. Ashworth (2002). *Translation-mediated communication in a digital world: facing the challenges of globalization and localization*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1937/2000). *The Misery and the Splendor of Translation*. In L. Venuti (ed.) (2000); pp. 49 – 62 (translated by E.G. Miller).
- Palmer, J. (2009). *News gathering and dissemination*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 186-189.
- Peled-Shapira, H. (2009). *From conventional to personal, or: what happened to metaphor under the influence of ideology – the case of Ghā’ib Tu’ma Farmān*. In *Journal of Semitic Studies* LIV/1 (Spring 2009); pp. 227-251. Oxford: Oxford University Press (on behalf of the University of Manchester).

- Porter, J.E. (1986). *Intertextuality and the Discourse Community*. In *Rhetoric Review* 5 (1); pp. 34-47.
- Pym, A. and H. Turk (1998). *Translatability*. In Baker, M. (ed.) (1998); pp. 273-277.
- Reeves, J. C. (ed.) (2003). *Bible and Qur'an: Essays in Scriptural Intertextuality*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Riffaterre, M. (1990). *Compulsory reader response: the intertextual drive*. In Worton and Still (eds.) (1990); pp. 56-78.
- Robinson, D. (1997, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2002). *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Sa'adeddin, M. A. (1989). *Text Development and Arabic-English Negative Interference*. In *Applied Linguistics* 10 (1); pp. 36-51.
- Salama-Carr, M. (2009). *French tradition*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 404-410.
- Schaffner, C. (ed.) (1998). *Translation and Quality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2004). *Translation research and interpreting research: traditions, gaps and synergies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Shamma, T. (2005). *The Exotic Dimension of Foreignizing Strategies: Burton's Translation of the Arabian Nights*. In *The Translator* 11 (1); pp. 51-67.
- Sharifian, F. (2009). *Figurative language in international political discourse: the case of Iran*. In *Journal of Language and Politics* 8:3 (2009); pp. 416-432.
- Shunnaq, A. (1993). *Lexical Incongruence in Arabic – English Translation Due to Emotiveness in Arabic*. In *Turjumān* 2(2); pp. 37 – 63.
- Shuttleworth, M. and M. Cowie (1997). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Simms, K. (ed.) (1997). *Translating Sensitive Texts: Linguistic Aspects*. Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, ideology and point of view*. London: Routledge.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1995). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- St. André, J. (2009). *History*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 133-136.
- Starkey, P. (2006). *Modern Arabic Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Steiner, G. (1975, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 1998). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. London, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stokes, K. (2010). *Ahmadinejad's letter to Bush opens dialogue in Middle Eastern rhetorical style*. In *Journal of Language and Politics* 9:1 (2010); pp. 96-114.
- Torresi, I. (2008). *Advertising: A Case for Intersemiotic Translation*. In *META* 53(1), 2008; pp.62-75.
- Toury, G. (2009). *Hebrew tradition*. In Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.) (2009); pp. 427-435.
- Tripp, C. (2000, 2002, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 2007). *A History of Iraq*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Uwajeh, M.K.C. (2007). *Translation Equivalence: An Essay in Theoretical Linguistics*. Munich: LINCOM GmbH.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Venuti, L. (1997). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.) (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Versteegh, K. (2001). *The Arabic Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wales, K. (2001, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Wehr, H. (1974). *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, Cowan, J. M. (ed.), 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- Whitaker, B. (2000). *Saddam who?*
- Available online at [www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4066868,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4066868,00.html) (accessed 22/09/2009).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002). 'Selective MEMRI', in *The Guardian*, 12 August 2002. Available online at [www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4480174,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4480174,00.html) (accessed 22/09/2009).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2003). *Email debate: Yigal Carmon and Brian Whitaker*. Available online at [www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/jan/28/israel2/print](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/jan/28/israel2/print) (accessed 22/09/2009).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005). 'Arabsats Get the MEMRI Treatment'. Available online at: [www.tbsjournal.com/Archives/Spring05/printerfriendly/whitakerPF.html](http://www.tbsjournal.com/Archives/Spring05/printerfriendly/whitakerPF.html) (accessed 22/09/2009)

- Widdowson, H.G. (1984). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics (2)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilss, W. (1982). *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Woodsworth, J. (1998). *History of Translation*. In Baker, M. (ed.) (1998); pp. 100-105.
- Worton, M. and J. Still (eds.) (1990). *Intertextuality: theories and practices*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Yapp, M.E. (1991). *The Near East Since The First World War*. London and New York: Longman.
- el-Yasin, M.K. and M. H. Salih (1995). *The Translatability of Arabic Greetings into English*. In *Babel* 41 (3); pp. 140-148.