

Intercultural relations between Arabs and Israeli Jews as reflected in Arabic translations of modern Hebrew literature

Mahmoud Kayyal

Tel Aviv University, Israel

Contacts between Arabic and Israeli Hebrew cultures have taken place in the shadow of a prolonged and violent political conflict between Arabs and Jews in the Middle East. The intercultural dialogue between them has, therefore, been antagonistic, polemical, and fraught with stereotypes and prejudices. This antagonistic dialogue is also reflected in Hebrew–Arabic translation activity, since the elements involved in this activity and the considerations which guided them both before and in the course of the translation were, first and foremost, political. The translations themselves were not accepted as literary creations, but rather as documents reflecting the culture of the other. Neither the presence of an ethnic Arab minority in Israel nor the peace agreements between Israel and certain Arab states brought about any significant change in the nature of translation activity. Clearly, therefore, in a state of violent national conflict translation activity will produce translations whose purpose is ideological rather than literary.

Keywords: Arab–Israeli conflict, antagonistic dialogue, ideological considerations, isolated translations, refracted texts

o. Introduction

In this paper I shall attempt to trace the influence of intercultural contacts between Jews and Arabs on the translation of Modern Hebrew literature into Arabic. My basic assumption is that in a situation of violent national conflict, antagonistic dialogue, with its implications for the character of translation activity between the two parties, will increase: in effect, translation activity will cease to be a vehicle for fruitful intercultural dialogue, and will become an arena

of struggle between political and ideological viewpoints. The considerations of translators, editors and publishers in the selection, translation and publication of literary works will no longer be purely literary; they will be primarily political and ideological, whether the purpose of the translation is to advance the cause of peace and understanding between the peoples concerned, or whether it is to “know one’s enemy”. Ideological considerations will also influence the translator in the course of the translation process. Thus, the integrity of the translated text, the stylistic level of its language, the degree to which the source language is introduced into the translated text and so forth will, in the main, express the ideology under whose influence the translators work.

It is true that there were some studies about translation in situations of conflict, such as Russian–English translations during the Cold War. But in my opinion, the present paper deals with a more complicated conflict situation, as both source and target literatures are considered as marginal in world literature.

1. Historical background

In many historical periods the relations between Jews and Arabs have been outstandingly good. These relationships are expressed in the cultural flowering of the Jewish community under the aegis of Islam in the Middle Ages (particularly in Moslem Andalusia), and in the involvement of Jewish intellectuals in Arabic culture (Goitein 1974).

From the end of the 19th century the Zionist movement has encouraged Jews from all over the world to immigrate to Palestine, which they considered to be their ancestral Biblical homeland. The Arabs who lived in the Holy Land saw Jewish immigration as a threat to the very existence of their country. Thus, there was created a clear political conflict between Jews and Arabs, which reached its peak with the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948, and the splitting up of the Palestinian people, thousands of whom became refugees in the neighbouring Arab states. The various violent clashes between Israel, the Arab states and the Palestinian organizations, which still continue today, increased the tension and hatred between the two sides. Although over the years Israel has made a number of peace treaties — with Egypt in 1978, with the PLO (Palestinian Liberation Organization) in 1994, and with Jordan in 1995 — these agreements have not led to a drastic reduction of the tension between the two sides.¹

In Israel there remained a large Palestinian Arab population, which today embraces some 20% of the citizens of the state. This population finds itself in a complex socio-political situation in which the ethnic Palestinian minority lives in a state with a Jewish majority, but is related by blood, religion, nationality and culture to the Arab world, which is in ongoing conflict with Israel. Among this minority, therefore, two contradictory tendencies have been at work: on the one hand, there exists an aspiration to become integrated into the political, economic and social life of the state; but, on the other hand, the continual political tension and the feeling of discrimination and lack of equality with the Jewish citizens have strengthened the tendency to alienation from the state, and all its institutions and values (Landau 1993: 119–123).

Be that as it may, ever since the foundation of the State of Israel its Establishment has made every effort to arrest the tendency of this sector of the population to become alienated. Its main apprehension was the possibility that cultural autonomy on the part of the Arab population would result in the creation of a national entity. Therefore, some members of the Establishment believed that it was both possible and desirable to bring about the assimilation of the Arabs into Jewish society. They saw the educational system as the major channel whereby Arab youth could be influenced to increase its knowledge of Jewish culture, and be cut off from the Palestine Arab heritage. Furthermore, during the period of the military government imposed on the Israeli Arab population from 1948 to 1966, Arabic publications and newspapers were kept under strict supervision, and the activities of Arab authors suspected of disloyalty or subversion were stringently controlled.²

In the framework of Establishment-supported cultural activity there developed original Arabic work concerned with Arab–Jewish understanding, good neighbourliness, the elements common to both peoples, and the aspiration to peace (Snir 1990: 248–249). Similarly, there was a great deal of Hebrew–Arabic translation activity in the publications founded or supported by the Establishment (See below). However, Palestinian Arabic culture in Israel began to recover slowly from the crisis it underwent after the events of 1948. Over the years, and particularly after 1967, the direct involvement of the Establishment in Arabic cultural activity diminished, and the estrangement between the two cultures grew stronger as a result of the increasing Palestinization of the Arabs of Israel.

2. Arab attitudes towards Israeli culture

2.1 In the Arab World

Between Arabs and Israeli Jews there came into being an antagonistic cultural dialogue characteristic of situations of violent national conflict: polemical, and replete with stereotypes and prejudices (Horowitz 1985). Many Arab intellectuals characterized Israel and its culture as part of a neo-colonial drive, foreign to the area — a sort of new Crusader presence. They also devoted considerable effort to proving that Hebrew culture is racist and politically committed, and preaches hatred of the Arabs and Islam. Lack of knowledge of Hebrew culture sometimes led them to rely on stereotypes prevalent in Europe, occasionally even on anti-Semitic literature. This is particularly notable in the inclination of Arabic literature — particularly popular literature — to stereotype the Jew/Zionist/Israeli (Somekh 1989), though some Arab scholars have maintained that Western European literature painted an even cruder and more hostile picture of the Jew than did Arabic literature (e.g. Bahī 1986: 208–278).

Even after the signature of the peace agreements between Israel and Egypt, Jordan and the PLO, many Arab intellectuals continued to oppose cultural exchanges with Israeli culture, fearing “cultural invasion” (Somekh 1998: 159). Some even denied the very existence of Hebrew culture, literature, and language, on the grounds that there was no Jewish nation, but only a Jewish religion, and no Israeli nation but only a conglomeration of individuals with little in common (see, e.g., Hījāzī 1995).

Over the years there came about a number of changes in the level of knowledge of Israeli culture and attitudes towards it. For Arab intellectuals the defeat of 1967 was an important turning-point, since it motivated them to get to know Israeli society, and to add many aspects of Israeli culture to their areas of concern (Somekh 1998). Moreover, the peace agreements with Israel increased the number of those who demanded an intercultural dialogue based on mutual respect and trust, particularly with the Israeli proponents of peace; but these voices were still marginal in the Arab world (see, e.g., Baḥrāwī 1994). Further, one must distinguish between studies intended for the broader public, which are usually unrestrainedly hostile, and the more objective work conducted in an academic framework or in research institutes.

2.2 Among the Palestinian Arabs in Israel

Since this population has conducted a complex intercultural dialogue with Israeli Hebrew culture, indications of the rift between the two cultures can easily be found within Israel:

- a. The tendency to stereotype the image of the Arab in Israeli culture and literature, whether he is typified as a savage terrorist or, romantically, as having preserved the ancient heritage of Judaism, at least in its external aspects (see, e.g., Ramraz-Raukh 1989).
- b. The growth of links between Israeli culture and Western — and, particularly, American — culture has created the impression that Hebrew culture has lost its Semitic character, and is thereby becoming increasingly distant from Semitic Arabic culture (Šammas 1985).
- c. Despite its recognition as an official language, the status of the Arabic language is inferior, especially because Israeli Jews have negative stereotypes of Arabic as compared to their own language, Hebrew. This fact is emphasized by the lack of motivation of the Jewish public to learn and employ this language, whereas Arab citizens are obliged to learn Hebrew (Shohamy and Donitsa-Schmidt 1998).
- d. Neither of the two literatures interests the readers and critics of the other side, even though each of them has been translated into the other language (Amit-Kochavi 1999; Kayyal 2000). Moreover, there has been no regular contact between the two literatures: for instance, writers' meetings have been held only occasionally, though they have usually attracted a good deal of attention from politicians and the media.
- e. Over the years, Arab intellectuals in Israel have changed their attitude to the majority Hebrew culture: their dialogue with this culture has become increasingly polemical. This can be seen, for instance, in the research literature published since the eighties (see, e.g., Maz'al 1985). This process may indicate increasing alienation from Hebrew culture and emphasis on the links with the Arabic mother culture. Somekh (1989), for instance, points to the lack of curiosity of Arab writers in Israel about the other side. In his view, one of the expressions of this indifference is the gradual disappearance of the figure of the Jew from their works, from the nineteen sixties onwards. In the fifties, by contrast, Jewish characters still appeared in Arabic literature.

On the other hand, certain phenomena appear to indicate normal and fruitful contacts between the two cultures:

- a. The linguistic interpenetration of Hebrew by Arabic and *vice versa*. The strong influence of Hebrew on the Arabic spoken in Israel is conspicuous in most spheres of life. On the other hand, the influence of Arabic on Hebrew remains limited (Amara 1999).
- b. The linguistic/literary dualism of certain Arabic authors, such as Anṭūn Šammas (born 1950) and Naʿīm ʿArāīdī (born 1948), some of whose works were written in Hebrew, and of certain Jewish authors born in Arab countries, such as Sammy Michael (born 1926) and Šimʿon Ballas (born 1930), some of whose works were written in Arabic (Snir 1991, 1995).
- c. Some Arab actors, artists and authors have been accepted into the centre of Israeli Hebrew culture, even though this process has been the subject of prolonged controversy on the part of supporters and opponents in both cultures (see, e.g., Snir 1995).

It is clear from the situation described above why intercultural contacts between Jews and Arabs should have been so deeply influenced by the outbreak of the violent conflict between them. Therefore, despite their common cultural past and the various points of cultural contact in the modern period, the conflict has prevented a fruitful cultural dialogue between the two sides. Contacts served primarily to increase *knowledge* of the other, rather than to *accept* and *understand* him/her. The existence of an ethnic Arab minority in Israel contributes little to changing the atmosphere. True, Israeli Arabs could have served as cultural agents in both directions, but they are still trapped between their national identity, which makes for alienation, and their situation as citizens, which encourages integration. Thus, their contacts with Jewish Israel culture are complex and rather unstable.

3. Translation activity from modern Hebrew literature to Arabic

The intercultural contacts between Jews and Arabs have generated an enormous amount of translation activity. Most of the Hebrew–Arabic translation in the Arab world has been concerned with matters of politics, military affairs and intelligence, whereas in Israel most of the translations served practical ends — textbooks, guides, posters, advertisements and the like (Robinson 1998). Here, however, I shall confine myself to translations into Arabic of modern Hebrew literature from the period of the *Haskala* (the eighteenth-century Hebrew Enlightenment movement) until the present.

Table 1. Translation activity from Hebrew into Arabic by region, period and type of publication

Region	The Arab World (including the Palestinian Authority and Arab publishers in Europe)		Israel	
	Translated novels, collections, etc.	Translations in journals & research books	Translated novels, collections, etc.	Translations in journals & research books
Before 1948	1	1	—	—
1948–1967	—	—	8	575
1968–2000	30	173	42	1112
Total	31	174	50	1687

The above account of intercultural contacts shows how they have been influenced by the different developments in the Arab–Israel conflict, and by the existence of an ethnic Arab minority within Israel. It can, therefore, be assumed that translation activity was also influenced by these factors. In order to give an idea about this activity, I have prepared a table showing its development. (See Table 1.)³

A detailed examination of this table and the list of translations, and an analysis of samples of translation, seem to justify the division of this activity into four categories according to historical-political occurrences:

- a. From the end of the 19th century until 1948.
- b. From 1948 to 1967, in Israel.
- c. From the late 1960s until the present, in Israel.
- d. From the late 1960s until the present, in the Arab world.

3.1 From the end of the 19th century until 1948

During this first period there were almost no translations from modern Hebrew literature to Arabic. In the eyes of the Arab intellectuals, Hebrew literature was a marginal phenomenon which had not yet reached maturity, and therefore had nothing to offer to the reader of Arabic. The only book translated before 1948 was the 1853 novel *Ahavat Tsiyyon* [The love of Zion] by Avraham Mapu (1808–1867), considered by literary historians to be the first Hebrew novel to create a successfully and artistically structured plot based on a Biblical story. It was translated by Salīm al-Dāwūdī (?–1952), who was the secretary of the Jewish rabbinical court in Cairo, under the name *Maḥabat Šihīūn* (1899/1921–1922). The translator emphasized that the purpose of the translation was to

prove to his fellow Jews that Hebrew was a living language (Ben-Dor 1981). It is not surprising that the Arabic translation is replete with grammatical and syntactical errors. It hardly reached a non-Jewish readership.

Apart from this, there appeared in newspapers and periodicals short translations which served a political purpose — supporting or opposing Zionist activity in Palestine (Uṣṭah 1993).

3.2 From 1948 to 1967, in Israel

After the foundation of the State of Israel, certain circles in the Establishment saw translations from Hebrew literature to Arabic as a means of encouraging the integration of Arab citizens into the life of the state. In this, they were encouraged by the cultural vacuum in the Palestinian population of Israel created by the flight of most of the Arab intelligentsia, and by the separation of the local Arab population from the rest of the Arabic world.

These groups emphasized the importance of translation activity in strengthening the relationships and ties of friendship between Jews and Arabs.⁴ Many of them also represented it as the continuation of the wide-ranging cultural activity of the “Golden Age” of classical Hebrew literature in Muslim Andalusia. In fact, however, this was political activity under the guise of literature: for, in my view, many elements in the Establishment sought by means of this activity to bring about the dominance of the majority Jewish culture over that of the Arab minority (see above).

Officially supported translation activity took place mainly in Establishment frameworks, particularly the newspapers *al-Yaūm* (1948–1968) and *Ḥaḡīqat al-Amr* (1937–1959), which were written in Arabic but unequivocally reflected the views of the Establishment; or in the publications of Arab circles close to the Establishment, such as *al-mujtamaʿ* (1949–1954), published in Nazareth.

Few anthologies of translations (only eight in all) were published in this period, almost all of which by the Establishment-supported publishing house of the Histadrut,⁵ *Dār al-naṣr al-ʿarabi*.

Most of the translators were Jews born in Arab countries who spoke Arabic in their countries of origin and learnt Hebrew on their arrival in Israel. Their command of both languages enabled them to serve as mediators between the Establishment and the Arab population. Some of them were also central figures in various governmental agencies dealing with the Arab sector of the population. Two of them, Benjamin Zakkai (born 1927) and Meir Ḥaddad (born 1910) produced almost half of about 600 translations which appeared during this period in journals and books.

The works chosen for translation were selected from the official literary canon, and expressed the Zionist and Israeli consensus. In the translations themselves, and especially in non-canonical works, there are many deletions, a result of the desire to present the Arab reader with a short, readable text with ideological and social pretensions which suited the basic outlook of the Mapai Establishment.⁶ This is expressed in the tendency to idealize Israel society and the Zionist enterprise. In this context, cultural-linguistic objects inconsonant with this idealization were expunged, and objects extolling Zionist activities were emphasized. Similarly, phenomena illustrating the tensions in Israeli society and arrogant or hostile attitudes towards Arab citizens of Israel were struck out of the texts.

In addition, elements of a high stylistic register in Arabic — particularly those derived from classical literature — were preferred. Specific elements derived from Jewish culture were converted into universal or Islamic expressions, in accordance with the general tendency to emphasize acceptability, that is, to subscribe to norms originating in the target culture (Toury 1995: 57), and unwillingness to add to the reader's difficulties by introducing the unfamiliar elements.

On the other hand, in canonical works, which enjoyed special prestige in the eyes of the Establishment, the complete text was usually translated. Even the original segmentation was preserved, as were elements derived from Jewish and Israeli culture.

However, the status of this group of translations in the Arabic target culture was marginal. It appears that the national renaissance within the Arab population, and the dominance of Establishment elements in the field of translation activity, led to a significant decline in the status of these translations, relatively to their original status in Hebrew literature.

In this context, Rāšid Ḥusīn's (1936–1977) translation of the works of Haim Nahman Bialik (1873–1934), which appeared in 1966, was an exception in several respects:

- a. The translator was an eminent Palestinian poet.
- b. The collection translated was the work of the so-called national Jewish poet.
- c. It was published by an Israeli academic press.
- d. The Arabic translation is linguistically and stylistically interesting.

Be that as it may, the involvement of Communist and Arab nationalist circles in translation activity contributed little to the acceptability and status of Hebrew

literature in Arabic translation. These circles were interested primarily in providing a forum for Hebrew writers ideologically close to them, even if their work was marginal in the Hebrew source literature.

3.3 From the late 1960s until the present, in Israel

This period was rife with changes and contradictions in the state of Arab society in Israel, as of the Middle East in general. The Arab population of Israel, which was released from the constrictions of military government in 1966, was exposed to processes of modernization and integration into Israeli society. On the other hand, after the conquest of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip by Israel in 1967,⁷ the connection with the Arabic people was restored. On a regional scale, Israel was involved in fierce and bloody wars with the Arab states and the Palestinian organizations, but a number of peace agreements between the sides were gradually signed.

These and other developments led to the cessation of Establishment translation activity in the style which had characterized the previous period: most of the translators and institutions identified with these activities ceased or seriously reduced their work. Most translation activity now took place in independent institutions which were however supported by the Establishment. The active translators were, in the main, young Palestinians who had received their formal education within the Israeli educational system. The weakening of the open involvement of the Establishment in translation activity combined with a crisis of values in Hebrew literature (Shaked 1998: 19–30) tended to increase freedom of expression and allowed the selection of “anti-Establishment” works for translation. In this period, too, there was an emphasis on the importance of translation activity for the promotion of understanding and co-existence between the two peoples. The feeling that translation was a mission in the service of peace prompted several Hebrew authors of fiction and poetry to initiate, and even occasionally give financial support to, the translation of their own work into Arabic. Therefore, during this period the amount of translation activity increased greatly as against the previous period. As has been mentioned, in the 1950s and 1960s there appeared only eight anthologies. In the next period some fifty anthologies were published.

But it does not follow that in these years the status of the translations improved. In fact, they were increasingly thrust into the position of an isolated body of work on the periphery of the Arabic target culture. In this period, too, translation activity was confined to a small number of periodical publications,

primarily *al-Šarq* (founded in 1970) and *Mifgaš/Liqā'* (1964–1970, 1984–1992), in the daily newspaper *al-Anbā'* (1968–1985), and in the publications of the independent publishing house *Dār al-mašriq* (founded in 1979). About half of the translations which appeared during this period were executed by three translators: Maḥmūd ʿAbbāsi (born 1935), Anṭūn Šammas (born 1950), and Muḥammad Ḥamzah Ghanāyīm (born 1953). However, in the late eighties Ghanāyīm and Šammas ceased their activities in this area: it appears that the severe political criticism to which they were subjected in Arab circles within Israel and outside it, combined with the uneasiness resulting from their attempts to bridge the gap between two mutually alienated cultures, brought about their retirement from the field (Šammas 1985; Ghanāyīm 1997). Ghanāyīm, like several of his colleagues, later transferred his main activities in the field of translation to the Palestinian Authority, which began to promote energetically the translation of books dealing with several areas of Israeli culture.

In translations dating from this period the increasing linguistic interpenetration of the Hebrew language into the spoken Arabic of Israeli Arabs, and the bilingualism of certain Arabic translators, led to a marked tendency to remain faithful to the Hebrew original by keeping the text complete and preserving the original segmentation; there is more interpenetration of the source language into the language of the translations; elements derived from Jewish and/or Israeli culture are preserved; and descriptions of intimate details, vulgar language and anti-religious insinuations which appear in the original text often appear uncensored. The language of the translations is varied, and contains elements of both classical and spoken Arabic.

3.4 From the late 1960s until the present, in the Arab world

As I remarked above, the 1967 war brought about an ideological turning-point in Arab culture, and enhanced the necessity to examine the state of the Arabic people and seek ways of improving its condition (Jacquemond 1992: 146).

Arab intellectuals sometimes spoke of the need to get to know Israeli society, which had been victorious in the war. Hebrew literature was seen as one of the best means to learn about this society (Baḥrāwī 1977: 11). Interest in Hebrew literature, which at first relied on intermediate English translations, was expressed both in research on this literature and in the opening of Hebrew departments in the universities, particularly in Egypt. But most of the scholars and translators of this literature did not hide their reservations about this literature, which was considered politically committed, racist, and lacking

in aesthetic or artistic value. The translations were generally accompanied by explanations which usually reflected the ideological and political standpoint of the translator, rather than those of the original work. In fact, most of the activity which dealt with Hebrew literature was research work rather than translation: the translations were a by-product of the research, intended to provide proof of the scholar's views. The choice of material for translation also tended to support the scholar's assertions about Israeli society. So these translators ascribed only marginal importance — if any — in the source culture to the original status of the works selected. The translators — and, even more, literary critics and the target audience — did not consider the product of their translation activity to be literary translations: at the most, they were seen as translations of literary texts;⁸ and the literary corpus to which they were ascribed was not literature translated into Arabic, but a special body of work which concentrated on increasing knowledge of Israel, Judaism and Zionism.

These translations, most of which were incomplete and fragmentary, are marked by stylistic unity, as well as a tendency to preserve the elements derived from Jewish and/or Israeli culture; apparently because of the desire to emphasize the foreignness of the translated text, and its unacceptability as a literary creation. In addition, one can discern many errors in translation, stemming from lack of knowledge of Israeli culture and spoken Hebrew, from excessive reliance on Hebrew–Arabic dictionaries,⁹ and from prejudice, such as the misunderstanding of an Egyptian translator who thought that a main motorway in Israel (Geha Road) is a military supply way (Baḥrāwī 1977: 190). These errors, however, have grown rarer over time.

In recent years, especially before the beginning of the second Intifada¹⁰ in 2000, we have witnessed cooperation between Israeli translators and publishers in the Arab world. This activity brought forth a special body of translations. It is still too early to define its place in the totality of existing translations; but it is obvious that this group of works, which is quantitatively very limited, cannot make a significant difference to the status and nature of Hebrew literature in Arabic translation.

4. Translation as an antagonistic dialogue

The above discussion has shown that translations from modern Hebrew literature into Arabic have suffered from an inferior status, and have been isolated from other literatures translated into Arabic. As I have pointed out, this state of

affairs results from the ongoing alienation between Hebrew and Arabic culture, on the background of the Israel–Arab conflict.

This isolation was the result of the involvement of political elements and non-literary considerations in translation activity, ranging from the primary decisions about whether to translate from Hebrew literature in the first place to decisions connected with practical methods of translation — although, because of the part played by contradictory elements in this activity, the considerations which swayed the translators have been extremely varied. The process of isolation of this sector in the Arab world dates from the start of Hebrew–Arabic translation activity. It resulted from the denial of the aesthetic value of this literature, the unwillingness of the translators to make the translated texts acceptable as literary creations, their preference for standard but mediocre language, and their dominant prejudices. As against this, the conspicuous engagement of elements in the source culture in translation activity in Israel led to the isolation of this corpus of work from the Arabic target culture. Moreover, it enforced the acceptance of translation norms which express the hegemonic relationship of the Hebrew source culture to the Arabic target culture, and thereby increased the isolation and confinement of this body of work within Palestinian literature in Israel.

This research shows, therefore, that in a situation of violent national conflict translation activity results in “refracted texts”,¹¹ whose purpose is ideological rather than literary. These texts will never constitute an integral part of the body of translated literature, but will be a separate, isolated section which contributes nothing to the target literature. Moreover, it is possible to say that whenever translation activity takes place within an ethnic minority community whose language is used as a majority language in another community, the status of translated literature will be influenced not only by the relationship between source and target languages but also between the two communities.¹²

Notes

1. On the history of the Arab–Israeli conflict see, e.g., Morris 1999; Said 1992.
2. See, e.g., the testimony of the eminent Palestinian poet Maḥmūd Darwīš (Darwīš 1979: 27–28).
3. I would like to emphasize that translations published in journals and research books are normally short, mainly poems. Moreover, there is an objective difficulty to find all translations in such stages. Therefore the numbers of translations given here are not exact and final.

4. See, e.g., the opening articles of the first issues of the periodicals *al-mujtama'* (1954) and *Mifgaš/Liqā'* (1964).
5. Histadrut: founded in 1920, originally as an overall organization of the Jewish workers in Palestine. After 1948 it became a comprehensive body comprising trade unions and various workers' organizations, controlled by Mapai, the dominant party in the state (see note 6 below).
6. Mapai: the dominant party in Israeli politics from 1948 to 1977, as the biggest party or as the leading element in government coalitions.
7. The West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip were parts of Palestine under the British mandate (1917–1948). After the 1948 war and the foundation of the State of Israel in part of mandatory Palestine they were incorporated into Jordan and Egypt, respectively. In 1967 they were conquered by Israel, which signed an agreement with the Palestinian leadership in 1994, according to which an autonomous Palestinian authority was set up in these areas.
8. More details about this distinction between literary translations and translation of literary texts, see Toury (1993).
9. Modern Hebrew–Arabic dictionaries have been published since 1911 (Kayyal 2000: 136).
10. Intifada: Arabic word meaning “insurrection”. It has become current in Arabic, Hebrew and other languages as a term for the violent clashes between the Arabs of the West Bank of the Jordan and Gaza and the Israeli army.
11. Texts adapted to a particular readership (e.g., children) or in accordance with a specific poetics or ideology (Lefevere 1981: 72).
12. Compare the results of Toury's research (Toury 1985).

References

- Amara, Muhammad Hasan. 1999. *Politics and sociolinguistic reflexes: Palestinian border villages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Amit-Kochavi, Hannah. 1999. *Tirgum sifrut 'aravit le-'ivrit: ha-reqa' ha-histori-tarbuti šelahem, me'afyenehem u-ma'madam be-tarbut ha-maṭara* [Translations of Arabic literature into Hebrew: Their historical and cultural background and their reception by the target culture]. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University. [Unpublished PhD dissertation. Hebrew.]
- Bahī, 'Iṣām. 1986. *al-Šakhṣiyah al-širrirah fī al-adab al-masraḥī* [The evil character in dramatic literature]. Cairo: al-Haī'ah al-Miṣriyah al-'āmah lil-Kitāb. [Arabic]
- al-Baḥrāwī, Ibrahim. 1977. *al-Adab al-sihūnī baīn harbīn: huzayrān 1967 wa-tiṣrīn 1973* [Zionist literature between two wars: June 1967 and October 1973]. Beirut: al-Mu'asasah al-'Arabiyah lil-Dirāsāt wal-Našr. [Arabic]

- al-Baḥrāwī, Ibrahim. 1994. *al-Thaqāfah al-ʿarabīyah wa-thaqāfat al-sirāʿ al-isrāʿīlīyah* [Arabic culture and the Israeli conflict culture]. Cairo: Dār al-Zahrā. [Arabic]
- Ben Dor, Israel. 1981. "Tirgum *Ahavat Tsiyyon* le-ʿaravit le-rabbi Salim (Šalom) al-Dāwūdī z"l be-sof ha-me'ah ha-qodemet" [The translation of *Ahavat Tsiyyon* into Arabic by Salim (Šalom) al-Dāwūdī at the end of the 19th century]. *Ba-maʿrakah* 21:250. 26–27. [Hebrew]
- Darwiš, Maḥmūd. 1979. *Yaūmiāt al-ḥuzn al-ʿādī* [Diaries of the usual sadness]. Akko: al-Aswār. [Arabic]
- Ghanāyīm, Muḥammad Ḥamzah. 1997. "Aṣṭuḥ thaqāfīyah sākhinah" [Hot cultural roofs]. *al-Karmil* (Ramallah) 50. 246–250. [Arabic]
- Goitein, Shelomo Dov. 1974. *Jews and Arabs: Their contacts through the ages*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Ḥijāzī, Aḥmad. 1995. "Thaqāfat ummah... am thaqāfat afrād?" [Culture of nation... or culture of individuals?]. *Ibdāʿ* 12:1. 4–5. [Arabic]
- Horowitz, Donald L. 1985. *Ethnic groups in conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jacquemond, Richard. 1992. "Translation and cultural hegemony: The case of French–Arabic translation". Lawrence Venuti, ed. *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. 139–158.
- Kayyal, Mahmoud. 2000. *Normot šel tirgum ba-tirgumim min ha-sifrut ha-ʿivrit ha-ḥadašah la-safah ha-ʿaravit ben ha-šanīm 1948–1990* [Translational norms in the translations of modern Hebrew literature into Arabic 1948–1990]. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University. [Unpublished PhD dissertation. Hebrew.]
- Landau, Yakov. 1993. *Ha-miʿuṭ ha-ʿaravi be-Yisraʿel 1967–1991, hebeṭim poliṭiyim* [The Arabic minority in Israel 1967–1991: Political aspects]. Tel-Aviv: Am Oved. [Hebrew]
- Lefevère, André. 1981. "Translated literature: Towards an integrated theory". *Bulletin: Midwest MLA* 14:1. 68–78.
- Mazʿal, Ghānim. 1985. *al-Šakhšīyah al-ʿarabīyah fī al-adab al-ʿebrī al-ḥadīth* [The character of the Arab in modern Hebrew literature]. Akko: al-Aswār. [Arabic]
- Morris, Benny. 1999. *Righteous victims: A history of the Zionist–Arab conflict, 1881–1999*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Ramraz-Raukh, Gilah. 1989. *The Arab in Israeli literature*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Robinson, Abraham. 1998. "Israeli market needs for Arabic translations". *Meta* 43:1. 95–97.
- Said, Edward. 1992. *The question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage books.
- Shaked, Gershon. 1998. *Ha-Siporet ha-ʿivrit 1880–1980 V: be-harbeh ešnabim be-knisot tsdadiyyot* [Hebrew narrative fiction 1880–1980 V]. [Tel-Aviv]: Ha-Kibbutz ha-Meuchad and Keter. [Hebrew]
- Šammas, Anṭūn. 1985. "ʿal yamin u-smol ba-tirgum" [On right and left in translation]. *ʿiton* 77 64–65. 18–19. [Hebrew]
- Shohamy, Elana and Smdar Donitsa-Schmidt. 1998. *Jews vs. Arabs: Language attitudes and stereotypes*. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, The Tami Steinmetz Center for Peace Research.
- Snir, Reuven. 1990. "Petsaʿ eḥad mi-ptsaʿavʿ: ha-sifrut ha-ʿaravit ha-falestīnit be-Yisraʿel" [One of his wounds: Arabic Palestinian literature in Israel]. *Alpayim* 2. 244–268. [Hebrew]

- Snir, Reuven. 1991. "We were like those who dream': Iraqi-Jewish writers in Israel in the 1950's". *Prooftexts* 11. 153-173.
- Snir, Reuven. 1995. "Hebrew as the language of grace': Arab-Palestinian writers in Hebrew". *Prooftexts* 15. 163-183.
- Somekh, Sasson. 1989. "Cold, tall buildings: The Jewish neighbor in the works of Arab authors". *The Jerusalem quarterly* 52. 111-125.
- Somekh, Sasson. 1998. "Nirmul 'im mah še-eno normali: tarbutah šel Yisra'el be-^cenayim mitsriyyot" [Normalization with the abnormal: Israeli culture in Egyptian eyes]. *Al-payim* 16. 158-177. [Hebrew]
- Toury, Gideon. 1985. "Aspects of translating into minority languages from the point of view of Translation Studies". *Multilingua* 4:1. 3-10.
- Toury, Gideon. 1993. "Translation of literary texts' vs. 'literary translation': A distinction reconsidered". Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit and John Laffling, eds. *Recent trends in empirical translation research*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Arts, 1993. 10-23.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ušah, 'ādil. 1993. *al-Adīb al-Filastīnī wal-adab al-sihūnī* [The Palestinian author and Zionist literature]. Bāqah al-Gharbiyah: Manšūrāt Šams. [Arabic]

Résumé

Les contacts entre les cultures arabe et israélienne ont eu lieu sur la toile de fond d'un long et violent conflit entre Arabes et Juifs au Moyen Orient. Aussi le dialogue interculturel y a-t-il été antagoniques, polémique, grevé de stéréotypes et de préjugés. Ce dialogue antagonique influençait également l'activité traductive de l'hébreu en arabe, puisque tant les éléments concernés par l'activité traductive que les considérations qui l'accompagnaient avant et pendant le processus de la traduction avaient une valeur surtout politique. Les traductions elles-mêmes n'étaient pas considérées comme des créations littéraires, mais comme des documents qui reproduisaient la culture de l'autre. Ni la présence d'une minorité ethnique arabe en Israël, ni les accords de paix signés entre Israël et certains pays arabes n'ont apporté de changements significatifs à la nature de l'activité traductive. En conséquence, en cas de violents conflits nationaux, celle-ci produira des traductions dont la portée est idéologique plutôt que littéraire.

Author's address

Mahmoud Kayyal
Department of Arabic Language and Literature
Tel-Aviv University
P.O.B. 39040
TEL AVIV 69978, Israel
email: kayyalma@post.tau.ac.il