Challenges in Translating Literary Terms
The Example of the Terminology of the Theory of Reading

Ahmad A. Elsheemi (Ph. D.)
Department of English,
Faculty of Arts
Beni-Suef University

- ☒ ليسانس في الأدب الإنجليزي – جامعة أسيوط .عام 1979
- ☒ ماجستير في الأدب الإنجليزي – جامعة أسيوط .عام 1987
- ☒ دكتوراه في الأدب الإنجليزي من جامعتي رايس – القاهرة . عام 1996
- ☒ تعمل حاليًا رئيس قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بكلية آداب بني سويف .عام 2009 ...

المستخلص:

هذه الدراسة محاولة للوقوف على منجز الترجمة العربي في مجال المصطلح الأدبي، مع التركيز على مصطلحات نظرية القراءة، وهي نظرية جديدة قديمة في الوقت نفسه، وقد زاد استقرار هذه النظرية مع ازدهار الدراسات اللغوية التي اتصلت بنظريات ما بعد الحداثة، وما استتبع ذلك من تركيز على دور القارئ في إنتاج النص. وقد رصدت الدراسة اضطراباً في ترجمة المصطلحات المتصلة بما بعد الحداثة عموماً، والمصطلحات المتصلة بنظرية القراءة على وجه الخصوص. وقد رصدت الدراسة أيضاً بعض الغموض في ترجمة هذه المصطلحات، ما يُرْجِعه الباحث إلى أن عملية نقل المصطلحات المتصلة بعملية القراءة لم تواكبها حركة نقدية على مستوى الممارسة تعمل على ترسيخ المصطلح، وفهمه واستخدامه. إن وجود أكثر من ترجمة واحدة للمصطلح الواحد يعني أن المترجمين العرب، وأغلبهم من النقاد، لم يصطلحوا على فهم واحد للمصطلح الواحد، فقد لاحظ الباحث ذلك الاهتمام البالغ بالنظرية على حساب الممارسة النقدية، مما جعل ترجمة المصطلحات الأدبية المتصلة بنظرية القراءة تفتقر إلى التحديد والثبات.

الكلمات الدالة: *الحداثة، ما بعد الحداثة، القراءة، نظرية القارئ، القارئ الضمني، القارئ السوادي، الإنبهام، المقروئي والمكتوبي، نقد استجابة القارئ، نقد التلقي.*

رقم تصنيف ديوي: ٤٢٧

Abstract:

Challenges in Translating Literary Terms
The Example of the Terminology of the Theory of Reading

This study critiques the translation of literary theoretical terms into Arabic, with special concentration on the terms of the theory of reading. This paper investigates more than one problem, the first problem is that literary terms are usually made vague on translating them into Arabic; the translator's understanding of the source text is reflected on his translation, the target text is determined by the translator's culture, learning and familiarity with the theory from which he is translating. The second problem this paper investigates is that

Arabic translators' attempts to translate the terms of the theory of reading are beset with bewilderment, and incomprehension.

The existence of more than one translation of the same term is due to the Arab translators' unfamiliarity with the theory; the theory of reading has not been applied seriously on literary texts in Arabic. The gap between theory and practice in Arabic criticism, and the fact that theory is given priority over practice, thwarts the possibility of identical translation.

Descriptors: *Reading, translation, target texts, source texts, deconstruction, phenomenology, theory, response, Stanley Fish*

Dewey Class. Num.: 427

Citation:

Challenges in Translating Literary Terms

The Example of the Terminology of Reading

Terms should be as clear as possible, and clearly related to the field of study which it expresses. The development of terms refers to a development in knowledge; as terms are keys of understanding. A theory cannot live without its terms, and terms do not live in vacuum; they are related to theories, and both theory and terms are important components of understanding and communication. Literary terminology is relatively recent in appearance. The sixties and seventies of the twentieth century witnessed profusion in literary theory and terms, with the boom of linguistics in this period. Modern Arab critics have been interested in controlling, determining, generating, Arabizing, and translating terms into Arabic.

The efforts of those literary critics and professionals to translate literary terms into Arabic started from the late seventies; Magdy Wahba published his "Dictionary of Arabic Terms in Language and Literature, *Mu'gam Al-mustalahat Al-'arabiya fi 'l-ugati Wa 'l-adab'* in (19740), and Gabbour Abdel Nour published his "The Literary Dictionary" (1979), and Abdel Wahid Lo'loa published his translation of the "Encyclopedia of Critical Terms" (1978, 1982, 1982), and "Modern Literary Terms: A Dictionary" (1996), by M. M. Enani together with the great efforts of El-bazei', Gaber Asfour and others.

This paper investigates the process of translating literary terms into Arabic, and how Arab translators, sometimes blunder, and in other times gain success in translating terminology. The paper concentrates on translating the terms related to the theory of reading; as it is the most dominant theory from the seventies to present.

The ability of any language, including Arabic, to be translated to and from is unquestionable; especially languages which are supported by cultures deeply rooted in history. Arabic was, and still, a vivid language, not incapable to receive terms of modernism and postmodernism, as it had received many terms

from other languages through translation, which is an effective means of communication. Terms of Reader Response Criticism pose a special challenge to translators into Arabic; as Arab theorists are not supported by an established theory of reading in spite of their huge critical achievement. One encounters brilliant pages in the writings of Al-Jahiz and Abdel-Kahir el-Jorjani, and even in the writings of some of their successors, in which they dealt with the receiver, or the reader. In their ardent interest to preserve texts (especially the holy), and rescue them from extinction or loss, the Arabs' obsession with the objectivity of texts is comprehensible.

Also the lack of attention to the reader in Arabic Criticism is due, on one hand, to the fact that Arabic Literature is more oral than written, on the other hand to the fact that the first traces of literary criticism in Arabic dates back to Ibn al-Mu'tazz and Qudamah ibn Ja'far in the third/ninth century, and the first quarter of the fourth/tenth, Qudamah died in 337/948. ' While western interest in the reader is as ancient as Plato and Longinus,' the Arabs' interest in the reader is hardly noticed. This unease with the translation of the terms of reading is the cause of this bewilderment, and sometimes mystification, in translating terms of reading. In addition, terms are necessarily related to theorizing, where Arabic criticism, especially in the last four centuries, is treading slowly in the land of theory.

Arabic criticism in the twentieth century did not pay attention to the beginnings of this theory in the writings of I. A. Richards, T. S. Eliot, and even John Craw Ransom, and Arabic translators did not find time or enthusiasm to translate terms like: the *affective fallacy*, the *intentional fallacy* or the *objective correlative*, which were familiar in western criticism in the twenties and thirties of the twentieth century. Louisa Rosenblatt spoke of the response of the reader in the thirties of the twentieth century. Reviewing literature does not reveal any mentioning of these terms in the critical essays of such great critics like Abbas el-Akkad or Taha Hussein or even a more professional critic like Mohammad Mandour.

Translating terms of the theory of reading, which belongs essentially to post-modernism, has witnessed a real confusion since the appearance of these terms in the early seventies so far. The reader cannot find any translation of any of these terms during the seventies and the eighties or even the nineties of the twentieth century. Our most famous critics were not interested to present modernism and postmodernism than presenting nineteenth century western thinking and some of the traditional twentieth century literary creations and theories. Some of strained translations of modernist terms appeared in the critical works of Abbas el-Akkad, like his translation of "homosexuality" as "shozoz الشذوذ", and on feeling of its inaccurateness he offered another explanatory one: "preferring males to females' إيثار الذكران على الإناث".[٣] In the same place, he translates "genes" as "nasilat ناسلات", and suggested two translations of the term "identification": "التلبيس والتشخيص",[٤] which mean that el-Akkad and his contemporaries were not taking translating terms seriously, and that they left translating these terms to individual endeavor.

One finds serious interest in the translation into Arabic of modernist literary terms, and the role of this translation in the process of modernization. Some intellects understood that translating modernist and postmodernist terms is inevitable; because of its role in transmitting knowledge, and building up identity. Without this transactional process which translation realizes, identity becomes in real danger of annihilation. Translation into Arabic means the existence of a desire to relocate knowledge in to the Arabic soil.[٥] One of the factors which cause perplexity in translating literary terms is the learning of the translator; this is what Hammady Sammod has discussed when he deals with the translation of "*writing degree zero*", the term coined by Roland Barthes, the title of one of his books:

It has been settled in the minds of students, scholars and even critics that Barthes refers in his book to the duality of speech: literary / and non-literary or the ordinary, and refers also to this kind of speech rich with metaphor versus this kind of

speech that is devoid of metaphor, and free from any artistic ornament. They thought that Barthes is talking about the ordinary speech which does not bear any figurative dimensions, and does not exceed the functional everyday usage. Actually Barthes is not dealing with any of these things, but he is talking about deep issues in the history of French literature, and introducing his readers to the dramatic changes in world literatures. He meant those writers who came up with new kinds of writing, and thought that they reached to a new basis of language usage. In short, Hammady Sammod wants to say that: "translating the term without taking into consideration its usage, its semantic and conceptual fields related to it, makes this translation vague. The situation becomes as one who possesses an instrument without knowing its source or its culture which made it.ˈ

Abdel-Wahid Lo'loa, in his article published in the same place, under the title: "The Crisis of Critical Terms: A Personal Experience", an example of the catastrophic outcome which results from the inability to translate even one term:

Translating "tragedy and comedy" as "panegyric and satire المدح والهجاء" was a catastrophic endeavor in the history of Arabic translation; because most Arabic literary achievement was of either kind. This starts the first problem of terminology; the translator's culture, were the translators who translated Artistle's poetics acquainted with the Greek culture, religion, and myths, they would have familiarized those very important arts: Comedy and Tragedy, and they would have put the seeds of dramatic literature in Arabic, to be developed in our modern ages.ˇ

The inaccurateness of translating modern literary terms causes confusion in understanding concepts of literary criticism, and contributes, albeit indirectly, in diminishing the nation's ability to cope with modernization, and globalization as happened

in translating the two terms: 'comedy and tragedy'. In this current age, the reader notices that translators do not agree in translating modernist and postmodernist literary terms. This paper gathers enough examples to refer to this disagreement and confusion in translating literary terms. The first notice about these translations is that the Arab translators are sometimes doubt the competency of their translations into Arabic. This is evidenced by their inclination to introduce alternatives as Al-Akkad did when he translated the term "homosexuality", these alternatives may be one word or a phrase, or a lengthened sentence that takes the term away from its reductionist nature.

There are many examples which explain this idea; the reader encounters various translations for the term 'hermeneutics', Gaber Asfhour translates it *'elm elta'weel* علم التأويل', which means the "science of interpretation", Mohammad Enani translates it into 'التفسيرية/المذهب التفسيري/الهرمانيوطيقا', the term 'phenomenology' is translated by Asfour as 'فلسفة الظاهرات' which means the "the philosophy of appearances", the term 'formalism' is translated by Sa'ad Maslouh and others as: *'el-Shaklania* الشكلانية' which adds the letter 'n ن' to the term without knowing its origin in the infinitive.^ The term 'competence' which the reader encounters in the texts which deal with the theory of reading (literary competence, linguistic competence) is usually translated by many critics and translators as '*elza'ka* الذائقة', we hear of the 'literary competence الذائقة الأدبية' and 'linguistic competence الذائقة اللغوية' as Asfour and others do, whereas Maslouh translates it as '*elkafa'a* الكفاءة' and translates the term 'competent reader' as 'القارئ الكفء', which literally means the able reader. The term 'historicism' is sometimes translated as 'التاريخانية' by M. Enani, or 'التاريخية' by Asfour, is a perplexing term because of the complexity of its meaning which mixes with hermeneutics, and rejects immutability of interpretation.

Most literary terms modern Arab critics currently use in their literary discourse articulate the particularity of the western culture, which finds its roots in philosophy as Abdel Ghani Bara

writes: "the separation of these terms from their cognitive context, to express literary terms of certain cultural idiosyncrasies different from the context in which the term prospered, leads to falling into confusion and mystification to the point of crisis."⁹ The translation-al crisis reaches new heights in translating the terms of the theory of reading, which mostly deals with the activity of reading starting from the seventies of the twentieth century to present.

The theory of reading gives the reader a central role in dealing with literary texts, and gives the meaning which this reader constructs a priority over other meanings, declaring, at the same time, the end of the text as an independent object subject to certain critical standards. This notion led to the deterioration of the idea of the individual author, and reading became one of the main constituents of the text, the critic's claims of being a mediator between the text and the reader, the arbiter of appreciation, and the source of all judgments on texts. The author lost his status, and writing became orphan as Derrida wrote, even Roland Barthes declared the death of the author, and the birth of the reader. It is the complete change from the text and author to the reader and text; the text does not gain its existence from its author, but it takes its existence from the reader's activities and his experience of it. The meaning became the result of this negotiating relationship between the reader and the text, which has nothing to do with the author and his intentions. The concentration becomes on the effect of the text on its reader. It is easy to divide the terms related to the theory of reading into two parts: the first revolves around the reader himself, and the second around the process of reading which the reader performs or produces.¹⁰

One of these important terms in the theory of reading is 'The Implied Reader' which was coined by Wolfgang Iser in his book entitled: 'The Implied Reader' (1974), and in another book entitled: "The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response" (1978), and which many critics and translators in the Arab world translate as: 'القارئ الضمني'. It was meant that the text determines

the response of the reader, but – in the same time – this reader contributes in producing the meaning, and takes up the process of the *constituency building*', building on Wayne Booth's theory of the implied author in the novel or the story, in his famous book: "The Rhetoric of the Story" (1961)." This term is usually translated by "'القارئ الضمني', and Professor Enani mentions three translations, in an attempt to explain the term: ' القارئ الموحى به، القارئ المفترض، القارئ المضمر', to me the last translation '*el-Kari' el Modmar* القارئ المضمر' is the easiest and most meaningful of the four translations, for its great explanatory aptitude and instructiveness.

The term "mock reader" is translated by Hasan Nazem and Ali Hakim as "*el-Kari' elsory* القارئ الصوري"'' and M. M. Enani translates it as 'el-Kari' elwahmy القارئ الوهمي', and does not differentiate between him and the reader whom the author postulates, he writes: "All these descriptions are directed to readers (plural), and not to a single reader"." According to Walker Gibson, "the mock reader is an artifact, controlled, simplified, abstracted out of the chaos of the day to day sensation"," this leads us to understanding that the mock reader is a construct in the writer's mind, which differentiates him from the implied reader who is a construct in the reader's mind, or which the reader abstracts from the text, it is - after all - an element in the structure of the text. The implied reader is not a passive receiver; he - according to Iser - participates in interpreting the text; because he is entitled to fill the gaps in the text, and reveal indeterminacies which the texts poses. It is different from the average reader.

The average reader is a reader postulated by Michael Riffaterre, sometimes translated by Enani as '*el-Kari' el-Muta*wasit القارئ المتوسط'," and by Said Ibrahim as '*el-Kari' el-Sawadi* القارئ السوادي' '' which is vague and perplexing; and to reveal this vagueness and perplexity, the writer himself explained it in a footnote. The same writer translates all the readers imagined by Michael Riffaterre (the mock reader, the average reader, the composite reader, and the super reader,) as

'el-Kari' elrifateri القارئ الريفاتيري' in one hit. The Term "ideal reader" refers to an imagined reader, separated from any social or historical context, more able to understand the text than the actual reader imbued with subjectivity.'⁹ One feels that translating this term in *'el-Kari' elmitahli* 'القارئ المثالي is not competent though easier; as it is confused with the 'implied reader القارئ الضمني' with whom the ideal reader does not correspond; because the implied reader is a possession of the reader, whom he extracts from the text, it is not an 'inscribed reader القارئ المنقوش في النص', whom Umberto Eco calls "the model reader", Enani comments: "If the author wants to enhance the communicating capacity of the text, he may postulate that the set of codes on which he depends are the same set of codes used by the expected reader, the model reader."²⁰

The term 'informed reader' poses a challenge to translators into Arabic, it is the reader determined by Stanley Fish in his famous essay entitled: "Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics":

1- is a competent speaker of the language out of which the text is built up. 2- is in full possession of "the semantic knowledge that a mature .. listener brings to his task of comprehension". This includes the knowledge (that is, the experience, both as a producer and comprehender) of lexical sets, collocation probabilities, idioms, professional and other dialects, etc. 3- has literary competence. That is, he is sufficiently experienced as a reader to have internalized the properties of literary discourse, including everything from the most local of devices (figures of speech, etc.) to whole genres.²¹

This definition makes this reader closer to the "ideal reader القارئ المثالي *el-kari' el-mithali*", which makes the confusion.

The same confusion inflicts the translation of the terms of the theory of reading itself; terms like: affective fallacy, intentional fallacy, deconstruction, reader-response criticism, narratee, indeterminacy, literary competence, defamiliarization,

Hermeneutics, interpretation, 'readerly and writerly', meta-criticism, meta-poem, meta-fiction, intentional fallacy, competent reader, pragmatics, meta-fiction, defamiliarization.

'Affective fallacy' is translated by Hasan Nazim as *'el-moghalata el-atifiya* المغالطة العاطفية', and el-Bazi'e translates it as *'elmoghalata elta'theriya* المغالطة التأثيرية and by El-Sayed Ibrahim as *'Okzobat el kari*' أكذوبة القارئ', as he translated the term 'intentional fallacy' as 'أكذوبة المؤلف'[٢] which does not realize the aim of intelligibility, Sa'd Masloh translates as 'خداع القصد'[٣] which is vaguer, others translate it as 'الوهم القصدي' which does not reflect the real meaning of the term, perhaps 'وهم المقصد' wich I suggest is more informative. 'Affective fallacy' is usually translated as 'الوهم العاطفي' which is distant from understanding. One thinks that Arab critics have a rich tradition of the interest in the author's intention; they see that authorial intention is not a fallacy; it is an essential component of the text, and an important tool of understanding.

The term 'deconstruction' is frequently translated as *'el-tafkikiya* التفكيكية', however, some prominent critics and linguists like Sa'd Masloh adopts the translation of elbazie', and translates it as '*el-taqwediya* التقويضية' which sounds out of the ordinary to the ears familiar with the first translation. In his translation of Gentzler's book, Maslouh insists on this translation '*taqweediya*' instead of *'tafikikiya'* which is more familiar and widespread.[٤] The same term is translated by Abdullah El-Ghazami, a prominent Saudi critic, as *'tashrihiya* تشريحية' which does not gain any success in critical usage. The same critic also failed to make famous his translation of the term 'poetics' which is usually translated as *'shi'riaa* شعرية' when he translates it as *'shai'ria* شاعرية', whereas his translation of the term 'horizons of expectation' invented by ... , as *'ofok el-tak'o* أفق التوقع' instead of *'ofok -el-intizar* أفق الانتظار'.[٥] El-Massaddy, another prominent critic, justified el-Ghazzami's *'tashrihia'* for its generatability, which is not correct; because whereas 'tashrih تشريح', which means 'anatomy' is a process which does not entail construction,

'tafkik تفكيك' is a process which entails construction, and rebuilding."[1]

The term 'reader-response criticism' has also been subject to more than one translation; it is usually translated as 'Naqd Istijbit el-qari نقد استجابة القارئ', and Professor Enani translates it as 'el-Naqd el-Qaim ala Istigabit el-qari النقد القائم على استجابة القارئ' with two additional words 'el-qai'm ala القائم على or depending on' which is more accurate than the first translation; because the first translation suggests that the response of the reader is what should be criticized; however, the spread of the first translation refers to a fact which cannot be denied in the world of terminology: that terms sometimes have minds and lives of their own. El-Sayed Ibrahim translates the same term as '*Naqd el-Istigaba* نقد الاستجابة' omitting the world 'reader' with its possessiveness, perhaps suggesting that the reader is implicitly known.

The 'Narratee', a term coined by Gerald Prince[v] in his dictionary, refers to an addressee the reader constructs from the text; the most widespread translation is '*el-marwi alaihi* المروي عليه', many critics, however, translate it in more than one translation '*el-mahki laho* المحكي لـه' or '*elmaksous alaihi* المقصوص عليه'[28], this perplexity refers to the fact that the term is newly introduced to Arab critics who have, initially confused it with the receiver or addressee.

One of the most controversial terms, as well as perplexing for translators is the term 'indeterminacy', which is both a philosophical and linguistic term that means uncertainty, in literature it is, according to Encyclopedia Britannica, indeterminacy, it is the multiplicity of possible interpretations of given textual elements. The term was given its literary meaning by deconstruction theorists. Indeterminacy is similar to ambiguity as described by the New Critics, but it is applied by its practitioners not only to literature but also to the interpretation of texts."[v] There are many translations of the word: Enani translates it as '*adam el-tahdid* عدم التحديد'[v] and el-Sayyed Ibrahim as '*inedam mahsomiat el-logha* انعدام محسومية اللغة'[v] which gets the

term away from the nature of terminology: to be brief, easy to use, and easy to spread', Hasan Nazim translates it as '*allatahdod* اللاتحدد'[32], Sa'd Maslouh translates it also as '*allataeon* اللاتعين.'[33] Any of these translations has not been circulated among critics and translators, the most common translation now is '*alibham* الإبهام', and sometimes '*alinbiham* الانبهام' which has some linguistic cadence.

Another challenging term is 'literary competence', invented by Jonathan Culler in his book entitled *Structuralist Poetics* (1975), Ibrahim and others translate it as '*elzai'ka eladabeia* الذائقة الأدبية',[34] noting that he prefers to another commoner translation '*elmakdira eladabia* المقدرة الأدبية', or '*elkafa'a eladabia* الكفاءة الأدبية', whereas Enani translates as '*alkodra* القدرة' which means the ability to read and understand literary texts.[35] The term 'competence' is translated by Maslouh as '*elkafaa* الكفاءة', and thus he translates 'literary competence' as '*elkafaa el-adabia* الكفاءة الأدبية'[36]

Another controversial term is 'defamiliarization' which confuses Sa'd Maslouh to render it in two ways, the first is '*elta'jeeb* التعجيب', the second is '*nazi'elolfa* نزع الألفة', or even '*mokhalaft el-ma'louf* مخالفة المألوف' no one of them gained success[37]; as they are poor renditions suggesting the translator's confusion of understanding. The same term is translated by el-Sayyed Ibrahim as '*Ighrab, or nafi'elolfa* الإغراب أو نفي الألفة'[38] which suggest, also, a hopeless attempt to reach to accurateness of meaningfulness. Enani poses three translations of this term: '*eltaghreeb* التغريب', '*nazi'elolfa* نزع الألفة', and '*kasr eltawod* كسر التعود', all are accurate translations, but this confusion and bewilderment in translation causes problems in dealing with these terms.[39]

The term 'Hermeneutics', which is very close to the theory of reading, suffers also from different renditions; as reading, after all, is an attempt towards understanding, explanation and interpretation. Critics render it in more than one translation; Gaber Asfour keeps it as it is in English, and puts (*Elm elta'weel* علم التأويل) between brackets, he writes in justifying this point of

view: "It is a Greek term that refers to the process of interpretation (its roots lie in the myth which relates knowledge to the god 'Hermes' who discovered language and writing, and provided humans with tools with which they understand and communicate meanings. The term is related to the science of explaining and interpreting religious texts, and then expanded to refer to phenomenology, until it became a wide range of knowledge".⁴⁰ Here, the combination of explanation and interpretation is achieved in one word, but M. Enani likes to keep the English *'Hermeneutics* الهرمانيوطيقا', and he writes in justification: "The accurate meaning of this term is the art of explaining texts or 'interpretation', which means determining their meanings, especially through an established set of rules, and techniques: grammar, structures of rhetoric of a certain language, in addition to a literary, legal and religious theory governing the process of interpretation."⁴¹

Thus the reader finds that translators are sometimes ignore the difference between *'ta'weelliya* التأويلية' and *'el-tafiseria* التفسيرية', in spite of the fact that Arabic tradition differentiates between 'explanation' and interpretation, el-Zarkashy comments: "As if the agreement among them on the difference between *'el-tafiseer and el-ta'weel*, explanation and interpretation', or between the imparted and the deduced, to suggest the existence of the two methods."⁴² Magdy Wahba and Kamel el-Monhandes in their dictionary translate it as *'elm ilta'weel* علم التأويل' or *'elm itakhreej* علم التخريج' with its pre-requisites: (1) Understanding the methodological principles of interpretation of texts, (2) Interpreting a text, albeit religious, decoding and revealing its ambiguities, (3) interpretation linguistic symbols as cultural specific.⁴³

Of the terms which blundered Arab translators is 'readerly and writerly' coined by Roland Barthes to suggest that the relation is a consumer-producer relationship, Sayyed Ibrahim translates it as *'el-makroi and el-maktobi* المقروئي والمكتوبي', he justifies: "the 'readerly' is like a commodity, different from the 'writerly' which is in permanent production, the reader and the

writer, or the viewer and creator, the 'writerly' challenges these differences; because it enforces the reader to be a real participator in writing, and this is what Barthes means in his "death of the author".‟ Whereas Enani Translates it as ' نصوص المشاركة السلبية، ونصوص المشاركة في الكتابة ' and he writes: "the text which depends on established conventions common among readers, like the traditional literary works, like classical novels, with their stable and closed meanings, whereas writerly is the text which transcends, or violates these conventions, and enforce the reader to produce meaning, or meanings which cannot be ultimate or final."‟

The prefix 'meta-' sometimes added to some terms like: meta-criticism, meta-fiction, and met-poem, is also a source of perplexing; as some critics feel confused about its rendition into Arabic. The majority of translators think that the best way is to repeat the word next to it as when they translate meta-criticism as "*nakd el-nakd*, criticism of criticism', '*el-nakd ala el-nakd*', as Maslouh says‟, he prefers also to say '*el-kasida ala elkasida*, meta-poem', or '*elkisa ala elkisa* for meta-fiction' or '*el-kas alizi uhil ela zatih* القص الذي يحيل إلى ذاته ', which takes the term away from the demanded brevity. Professor Enani prefers to reserve the prefix 'meta- ' in all cases to say: '*el-meta nakd* الميتا نقد ', or *el-meta-kisa* الميتا قصة for Meta-fiction', and '*el-meta-shir* الميتا شعر ' for 'meta-poetry'. To me, this is the best way to render the term in Arabic; as it is easy to derive, easy to use and easy to circulate.

The term 'pragmatics' is also a victim of un-intelligible translations, Sa'd Maslouh translates it as '*el-makamatic* المقاماتية ' which is far from the familiarity which a term usually invites. It is usually translated as '*el-tadawilleia* التداولية ', or '*elm el-takhtob* علم التخاطب ', or '*el-nafi'ya* النفعية ', or '*el-zaraei'ya* الذرائعية ', thinking that 'pragmatics' and 'pragmatism' are the same. 'Pragmatics' is the use of language in certain contexts, the best translation of it, therefore, is 'isti'mal الاستعمال '. ‟ "One of the most important aspects of the translator's job is the management of terminology; being exposed to it, evaluating its correctness or appropriateness in specific contexts, storing and retrieving it."‟

Translating the terms of the theory of reading are sometimes difficult to render unless by interpretation, this is what translators-critics like Sa'd Maslouh and M. M. Enani sometimes do. The crisis stems from the fact that translators do not convene to systematize their work, and organize their efforts. Translation conferences are not frequent in the Arab world, even when they are held, they do not concentrate on terminology; simply because interest in translating terminology is usually based on a theoretical and critical activity which is not available in the academic institutes of the Arab world; as they are more interested in non-academic bureaucratic distractions.

Translating the terms of the theory of reading into Arabic is a difficult task, and cannot be rendered individually; it needs the efforts of the official institutions, the universities and the academic institutes. It needs a co-operation among the literary critics and writers in the Arab world, to understand the theory of reading, together with the theory of translation itself, with the goal of finding equivalence: "The goal of translation theory is to help find the most effective techniques and the soundest strategies to achieve what is called 'equivalence.' The difficulty of achieving a very high level of equivalence is, in fact, due to many factors, among which are the cultural differences between one language and another, the differences in lexicon, phonetic systems, syntactic features and structures, word order, and style".[۹]

Achieving 'equivalence' in translating terminology can be realized if the owners of the target language could possess an equivalent ability to produce knowledge, universal knowledge accepted by the international community; because terminology is, by nature, a transcontinental unit of knowledge because of its universal nature, and because of its universal function as a means of communicating culture and science. The theory of reading has not been well established in Arabic criticism on the levels of theory and practice. Criticism itself is facing a real crisis in Arabic, only a handful of critics have tried reading texts according to the categories of the theory of reading: Mostafa

Nasif, El-Sayyed Ibrahim, Abdullah El-Gahzami, and some brilliant graduate students in the Egyptian Universities. It still needs a lot of practice to habituate this terminology in Arabic Criticism and literature.

Conclusion

Investigating the challenges facing translators on translating literary terms into Arabic, with special concentration on the terms of the theory of reading, the writer of this paper thinks that he has more than one result:

- That the perplexity facing the translation of literary terms of modern and post-modern criticism is due to the fact that Arab critics are newly introduced to these terms, which means that they do not have enough amount of practice that allows them to inhabit these terms in their defined contexts.

- That rendition of the terms of the theory of reading into Arabic needs a wide knowledge of its roots in structuralism, post-structuralism, as well as the philosophy.

- That literary terms are like living things, live with usage, and die with ignoring and neglect.

Bibliography and Notes

[1] Julia Ashtiany, etal. (ed.), *Cambridge History of Arabic Literature, Abbasid Belles-Lettres* (Cambridge University Press, 2008)

[2] For more information read the important essay written by Jane Tompkins in the book she edited and entitled: *Reader-Response Criticism from Formalism to Post-structuralism* (Johns Hopkins University, 1980), p. 201.

[3] Abbas M. el-Akkad Abu-Nawaas: el-Hasan ibn Hani' (Publications of the Modern Library, Beirut, Lebanon, 1968), p. 50.

[4] Ibid. p. 66.

[5] Alamat, No. 8, 2., (1993), p. 5-6

[6] Hammady Sammod, "Traslating Literary Terms: the example of the Diminution of the Semantic Field" (*Alamat*, 8, 2, Jeddah Literary Club, June 1993), pp: 150-157.

[7] Abdel Wahid Lo'loa': "The Crisis of Critical Terms: A Personal Experience, *Alamat*, p: 164-165.

[8] Mohammad Enani, Modern Literary Terms: A Dictionary, (Longman, 1996), p: 68.

[9] Abdel Ghani Bara, *The Problem of Modernism in Contemporary Critical Arabic Discourse: A Dialogic Approach in Epistemological Conceptions* (General Egyptian Book Organization, 2005), p, 314.

[10] See my translation of Stanley Fish's book: "Is There a Text in this Class? *The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cairo, The National Translation Project, 2004), 8-9.

[11] A. Cuddon, Dictionary of Literary Terms and Theory (Penguin, 1999), p, 446.

[12] M. M. Enani, *Dictionary of Literary Terms*, op.cit, p, 84.

[13] See Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, translated by M. Mo'tasim and etal.(NTP, 2000), and *Reader – Response Critiicism from Formalism to poststructuralist*, (trans.) Hasan Nazim and Ali Hakim (NTP, 1999), Gerald Prince, *Dictionary of Narratology*, (Trans. Abed Khazindar, NTP, 2003).

[14] Hasan Nazim, Ibid, p, 44.

[15] M. M. Enani, op.cit., 84.

[16] Jane P. Tompkins, *Reader Response Criticism, From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), p. 2.

[17] M.M. Enani, op.cit, 85.

[18] El-Sayed Ibrahim, *Horizons of Literary Theory* (Arabic Civilization Centre, 2007), 197.

[19] Ibid., 212.

[20] M. Enai, op.cit., pp: 84-85.

[21] Tompkins, op.cit., pp. 86-87.

[22] El-Sayed Ibrahim, op.cit., p: 38.

[23] Edwin Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories* (Clevedon, UK. 2001) Sa'd Masloh (Trans.) Arab Organization of Translation, 1st Edition, 2007), 155.

[24] Ibid.

[25] M. Hammoudy, "Literary Terms in the Writings of Abullah el-Ghazami" (Nazwa Magazine, no.66, available in the web from 1/5/2011, http://www.nizwa.com/articles.php?id=3645). S ee also M. M. Enani, op.cit., p: 15.

[26] Ezzat Hammad, *Theory of the Literary Term* (Egyptian Book Organization, 2002), p. 304.

[27] Gerald Prince, Dictionary of Narratology, Abed Khazindar (trans.), p. 142.

[28] M. M. Enani, op.cit., 59.

[29] *Encyclopedia Britannica on line*,
http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/285153/indeterminacy, 16/4/2013

[30] Enani, 44.

[31] el-Sayyed Ibrahim, op.cit., 292.

[32] Hasan Nazim etal. p, 25.

[33] Maslouh, op.cit., 498.

[34] el-Sayyed Ibrahim, op.cit, 210.

[35] M. M. Enani, op.cit., 11.

[36] Maslouh, op.cit., 164.

[37] Maslouh, op.cit., 13, 209.

[38] El-Sayyed Ibrahim, op.cit., 221.

[39] Enani, op.cit. p. 15.

[40] Gaber Asfour (trans.) Edith Croswell, *The Age of Structuralism* (Dar So'ad el-Sabbah Publishing, 1993), p. 388.

[41] Enani, op.cit. p. 112.

[42] Badr el-Ddin Zarkashy, *Evidence in the Science of the Qur'an* (Issa el-babi: Aleppo, nd), p. 172.

[43] Magdy Wahba and Kamel el-Mohandis, *Dictionary of Arabic Terms in Language and Literature* (Library of Lebanon, 1984), p. 255.

[44] El-Sayyed Ibrahim, op.cit., pp: 215-216.

[45] Enani, *Dictionary of Modern Literary* Terms, p. 83.

[46] Masloh, op.cit. 426.

[47] http://takhatub.blogspot.com/2009/07/1-pragmatics.html, 20/4/2013.

[48] Douglass Robinson, *Becoming a Translator: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Translation* (Routledge, 2007), 128.

[49] Qusai. A. Al-Thebyan, etal. "A Critique of Jabra's Arabic Translation of Shakespeare's the Tempest", *Canadian Social Science*, Vol. 7, No. 6, 2011, p: 65.