

The Neoclassical Bias in Translation

Guest Editor's Note

Yehouda Shenhav-Shahrabani

This is the first of two consecutive issues of *JLS* devoted to language and translation, specifically to the relationship between Arabic and Hebrew. In the current issue we address the limits of the neoclassical model of translation, referring to the redefinition of translation in fifteenth-century Europe and infusing it with the spirit of the Renaissance. In a nutshell, the neoclassical model tends to individualize the translator's identity, to privatize the spatial dimensions of translation, and to eliminate verbal dialogue. Furthermore, it dictates a forward-moving unidirectional formula of translation that usurps the original text and occupies its place; it silences any form of dialogue and replaces conversation and reciprocal dialogue with philology, linguistics, and hermeneutics. Under colonial conditions, the neoclassical model aggravates these limitations, since it reproduces in the translation room the very same asymmetry that typifies the exterior conditions and the power relations between the languages. I begin this discussion by examining the emergence of the effects of the neoclassical model on translation in general, and in particular its predicament in relation to translation between Arabic and Hebrew—past, present, and future.

Translation Prior to the Modern Chronology of Translation

In the course of history, translation was the product of a wide range of people, some of whom were allegedly dubious types, such as prisoners, slaves, deserters, spies, seafarers, refugees, censors, and prisoners of war—not to mention priests, monks, missionaries, tourists, merchants, soldiers, ethnographers, journalists, and diplomats. Over the generations, they played important roles in war and peace, and their chronologies were enveloped in mystery, subterfuge, and revenge. The history of translation is suffused with stories of intrigues, stunts, conspiracies, betrayals,

and lack of trust. As their portraits changed, translators were given diverse titles such as whisperers, interpreters, linguists, go-betweens, commentators, moderators, intermediaries, negotiators, rewriters, decipherers, dubbers, and more.

In the book of Genesis, Joseph deceives his brothers with the help of an incognito *melitz*: “They did not realize that Joseph understood them, since there was an interpreter between them” (Genesis 42:23, King James Version). The term *melitz* is used in the Hebrew text for “interpreter”; it also means an advocate, or intercede. Yet, in Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians, he mentions the interpreters:

If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God. (Corinthians 14:27–28, KJV)

As we move to the First Persian Empire, as reported in the book of Esther, translation workers were termed “the king’s authors,” and “copiers” of the kingdom’s orders into one hundred and twenty-seven different languages. In the Ottoman Empire—which similarly consisted of large populations speaking multiple tongues—translation workers were labeled “dragomans.” The term “dragoman” is a distortion of the word *turgeman* (ترجمان), which originated in Acadian and Arabic, entered the European languages in the Middle Ages, and returned in a circular motion to the Middle East in a distorted title. Certainly, words have a tendency to carry their “distorted” etymologies through time. Indeed, the distorted word endured in lexical use in English into the twentieth century, referring to translators in Muslim countries.¹

I use the term “dragoman,” whose content varies over historical space and time, as a hybrid model—real or imagined—a kind of “muddy” category that existed prior to the modern gardening process. The multiplicity and heterogeneity of dragomans’ translations can be posited vis-à-vis the homogeneity and unification of the neoclassical translation model and its biases. For example, in the nineteenth century, the dragomans’ amalgamated and multiple functions and their work included oral and written traditions, diplomatic and literary texts, team translations, and individual translations.² Their work consisted of a number of tasks that today are not necessarily considered part of translation: interpreting combined with translation, speech and writing, dialogue and correspondence. This hybridity of function allows us to imagine a primeval form in which there was no institutional split or fragmentation between the modern translation tasks. It heightens attention

to the fact that modern translation is a product of ruptures, fragmentations, and institutionalizations that impose a selective gaze on the field of translation.

Translation is a deceptive task that certainly does not have a singular, clear meaning. In the modern context it is associated with linguistics: the conversion of meaning from language to language, or within the same language, as is evident in the curricula of translation studies and their academic affiliations. Translation has a variety of manifestations. It can be conducted orally or in writing, in sequential or simultaneous order, word-by-word or freely, directly or mediated. In the broader sense, translation does not refer only to linguistic conversions; it can also be regarded as an image of intercultural movement and conversion between different forms of representation: textual, visual, vocal, metaphorical, and so on. One of the etymological roots of “translation,” the Latin word *translatio*, refers to the transferal of the remains of saints—such as bones or other parts of the body—from one place to another.³ Before modern times, the concept also referred to spatial action such as the moving of material, the transportation of prisoners and slaves, or the spreading of ideas and ideologies across space. In this vein translation was considered a spatial and collective enterprise.

The history of antiquity and the Middle Ages is replete with collective translation projects composed of teams, families, and partnerships, often without a designated translator’s name. Famous collective translations were the Septuagint or the King James Bible. In many cases translation teams moved from one place to another, engaging with textual and oral dialogues, using multiple languages and dialects, comparing drafts and exchanging versions of translation. Not all of them worked in private studies; they often toiled in diverse spaces such as libraries, scriptoria, churches, ports, transit stations, prison camps, ships, courts, congress halls, laboratories, or government offices. As they moved in space, their translation work was suffused with dialects, accents, sounds, phonetics, and voices.

Hunayn ibn Ishaq al-‘Ibbadi (حنين بن إسحاق العبادي), known as the sheikh of the translators, was the most famous and sophisticated translator in ninth-century Baghdad and the director of Bayt al-Hikma (بيت الحكمة, House of Wisdom), where all the translation activities were concentrated. Ibn Ishaq had command of the five major languages of his time—Greek, Aramaic, Syrian, Persian, and Arabic—and produced many translations in the fields of medicine, philosophy, and astronomy.⁴ According to legend, he received payment in gold according to the weight of his translations from Greek to Arabic. His son, nephew, and a group of students, some of whom were Greek-speaking slaves, surrounded Ibn Ishaq and helped him.⁵

According to documents from the period, translators often met collectively when Ibn Ishaq improved and approved their Arabic to Greek translations.⁶ When Ibn Ishaq began a new project with another group of translators, he would go through their work and correct their mistakes, and he would manage the workshop's output.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Toledo, in al-Andalus, became the meeting point of translators who arrived in the city to learn from the accumulated experience available there; they gathered to translate scientific, religious, and literary texts from Greek and Hebrew into Latin. The translation school in Toledo trained apprentices to translate from Arabic to Latin, French, and English, and contributed greatly to the dissemination of the Arab and Greek cultures. The mobile teams were able to enrich European culture with translations because they had access to great Arabic literature and philosophical, religious, and scientific texts—many of which were translations or adaptations of texts that had been translated into Arabic from Greek. The translation methods in Toledo varied, including teams working in sequence, in parallel, or in a reciprocal relationship, where one translator would convert the Arabic text into one of the Romance languages and the other from the Romance language to Latin. The translator from Arabic was sometimes a Jew (or a converted Jew), and the others were usually Christian clergymen. In the introduction to the Latin version of *De Anima* written by Ibn Sina (ابن سينا), which was translated in Toledo, the work process was clearly specified. It included multiple translators: a Jewish translator known as Ibn Daoud read the book, written in Arabic, aloud (verbatim), simultaneously translating it into the vernacular Spanish dialect, and a second translator named Dominic converted it into Latin. This translation was an important text used by Jewish physicians during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, which was also used by Rabbi Yehuda Halevi (known in Arabic as Abu-al-Hasan Al-Lawi, أبو الحسن اللاوي). Similarly, the translation of the Qur'an in the fifteenth century was based on the work of an Arabic translator who transcribed the text verbatim into Castilian, following which other translators translated it into Latin in three versions presented alongside Spanish and Arabic. The polyglot translations of the Bible were also conducted using collective and oral methods: these included the Hebrew version and its translation into Greek, Latin, and Aramaic, and the New Testament with the Greek original and its translation into Latin and vernacular languages, all of which were presented side by side. This is a crucial point, since it indicates that the translation did not replace the original, as is customary today, but stood side by side with it, particularly since some of the translations were

shorter or longer versions of the original. The translators differed in their linguistic strategies, not because of their loyalty (or lack thereof) to the original but because the texts were adapted to communicate with different audiences. Most important, they did not hide the nuts and bolts of their craft; rather, they discussed them openly in a dialogue as part of the translation process. Although they varied in time and place, most translations made during the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Renaissance were conducted according to these principles.

Oral and collective forms of reading and translation were accepted conventional practice in western Europe as well, at least until the end of the seventeenth century, when they died out.⁷ Writing, reading, and translation were conducted in teams in common spaces such as the scriptorium, which was later replaced by the printing industry. The scriptorium was a writing space usually located near the library of a monastery. Historical documents portray seated young monks carefully and skillfully writing on tables. The teams worked in cooperation with Latin scholars and experts on Greek and Arabic who visited the monastery. They stressed the roles of diction, dictation, and reading aloud (as distinct from silent visual reading) in translations produced in conjunction with several translators. They deciphered the source text together, editing, correcting, clarifying, annotating, interpreting, and indexing it. There were those who read from the source, and there was someone who recorded the new version simultaneously.⁸ Prior to the seventeenth century, the appearance of a translator's name on the binding of the book (as was the case with the author's name) was not taken for granted, especially not before the invention of printing and the development of copyright legislation.⁹ Since then, the neoclassical model has gained popularity and became the accepted model of translation.

When we read a literary translation in print today, we see only the final version. In most cases the translation stands alone, with no actual dialogue and without additional possible translations. Only rarely do translators tell the story of their translation or, more specifically, the labor process behind it. Modern translations present neither previous drafts nor reports on hesitations or unsuccessful attempts. We have no information about the work space, the time it took to complete the translation, or the material and political conditions under which the work was carried out. The shift of translation, from a dialogue-oriented to an individual endeavor and a selective paradigm in the world of literature and linguistics, was not an isolated phenomenon but rather a sociological enterprise that is a result of modern history's national, philological, and religious projects. Rather than looking at the process historically, I want to single out two genealogical ruptures that are associated with the rise of the neoclassical paradigm in translation.

Two Epistemological Ruptures

The first rupture took place in the middle of the fifteenth century with the turn toward individuals as translators. Translation was gradually transformed from a collective enterprise into an individual action organized around the orthography of the translator. The rationales for this break can be learned from a manifesto published in 1426 by Leonardo Bruni, a translator, historian, and chancellor of Florence:¹⁰

I say that the full power of a translation resides in the fact that what is written in one language should be well translated into another. Nobody can do that well unless he has an experience of both languages that is both wide and deep.

. . . he should also know the language he translates into in such a way that he is able to dominate it and to hold it entirely in his power.¹¹

Today, the idea that an individual who is fluent in both languages and can solely transfer the meaning of the source to the other language seems to be taken for granted. However, when it was first proposed in 1426, it was considered revolutionary because it was a paradigm shift in the nature of a Copernican revolution. Bruni's manifesto was probably the first declaration of translation as an individual act of free translation (rather than literal translation) based on the principle of unifying: the unification of different languages into one language, lexical unification within the target language, and the unification of multiple versions into one version. Bruni used the term *reductio ad unum* (reduction to the single), which offers a new trinity: one translator, one version, one language. This change would take place throughout Renaissance Europe and would accompany the literary translations into the vernaculars. Since at least the Renaissance, free and individual translation, as opposed to the exact and literal translation, has become the standard.¹² Bruni marked the beginning of the neoclassical era in translation, which adheres to the principle of methodological individualism, producing the image of the individual translator, of being alone, of myself, of a real self, as Norbert Elias put it. As such, it replaces knowledge of the other with self-knowledge through the other.

The neoclassical model of a single translator was well suited to the emerging ideas of individualism during the Enlightenment, to the concentration of the European state apparatuses, and to the formation of national languages, which contributed to political unification by hindering language diversity and different interpretive positions. The individualism of the Enlightenment accelerated the process and made the translator's name public. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the author's and translator's autographs could already be found on the title

pages of books, and during that century it was institutionalized as a criterion that defines a body of work as coherent and unified. The philological revolution that began with translations of the Bible into vernacular languages reached its peak in the nineteenth century with the concept of loyalty to the national language, which led to the flourishing of the free and domesticized translation model, in which the translator represented the national habitus, and the translations were done by swallowing classic texts into the national language and writing them in idiomatic, fluent language.

The second rupture took place between textual translation and oral translation, which found a modern manifestation at the beginning of the twentieth century in the professional split between translation and interpretation. The rationale for this rupture is clearly stated in another manifesto, published in 1952 by Jean Herbert, one of the first simultaneous interpreters. In this fascinating document he warns that the two techniques should not be confused, as they are contradictory methods that could lead to “mutual destruction:”

The work of the translator and that of the interpreter are fundamentally different
and can hardly be combined. Very rare indeed are the people who can do both. . . .
These are in reality two contrary techniques which are mutually destructive.¹³

The split between interpretation and translation is based on the separation between oral dialogue in synchronous reciprocal interaction and the belated written text.

These two epistemological ruptures are partly responsible for the current biases in the neoclassical model of literary translation. Here is the first paradox: at the time when the spoken languages turned their back on Latin and received a life of their own, translation underwent a change in the opposite direction, toward the Latin tradition from which the translators sought to extricate themselves by preferring the spoken languages. Translation has moved toward facilitating the vernacular literature, dialogical communication has been replaced by linguistics, the community has been replaced by the individual, and the knowledge of the other with self-knowledge. The practice of translation shrank and has been transformed from a synchronic dialogue to a diachronic lack of dialogue, performed in seclusion and muteness. These conclusions have dreadful implications for translation in general and the translation between Arabic and Hebrew in particular.

In the Israeli situation there is no dispute about the colonial relations between Hebrew and Arabic, or that the translation is in fact a model of negotiation over colonial relations between languages, since Hebrew and Arabic are linked to one

another in ambivalent relations: on the one hand, etymological friendship, and on the other, political enmity. In the political situation in Israel, the relationship between Arabic and Hebrew is derived from a polar theological-political view that rejects binational existence because it is based on a complete separation between a friend and a foe, and a state of emergency that preserves the relations of hostility.

By Way of Overcoming the Neoclassical Limitations and Biases

Plaza de Sokodovar is the first square one encounters immediately after passing through the entrance gate to the city of Toledo. At the entrance stands a statue of Cervantes, and there are scenes from *Don Quixote* on the stone benches. The seventeenth-century novel marks a twilight zone between the “premodern” and the “modern”—in both literature and translation—as it challenges the main neoclassical assumptions. The plaza reminds us of chapter nine of *Don Quixote*, where it is first announced that the novel is a Western translation of a book written by an Arab historian. It invites us to imagine several authors of the text: the original writer, who was the Arab historian, the author of the Castilian version we read, the Moorish translator, and the translator of the Castilian version, who worked on the final form of the pastiche. A few lines earlier, Don Quixote had told his interlocutor that the translation of his contemporaries was like looking at the back of Flemish rugs, which were filled with loose threads that blurred the picture on the other side. Cervantes emphasizes the seams between the versions and creates narrative disorders, from which we learn that we read a novel with several versions, written by several authors and translators in several languages. Cervantes also reminds us that in his time there were still collective, multilayered, and dialogical translations, as was customary in the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Renaissance. The text expresses multiplicity and fragmentation rather than unity. It allows us to imagine another translation model, in which there is multilingual movement, orality, and polyphony of languages. The texts in this issue of *JLS* undercut the neoclassical bias—or at least address the model in a critical way that accords with these Cervantesque principles.

We begin with the protocol of a conversation conducted with the famous Lebanese writer **Elias Khoury**, who addresses languages, literatures, and translation. Khoury discusses the relationship between Arab writers—such as Tawfiq al-Hakim, Suyahl Idris, or Tayeb Salih—and European literature; the relationship between Hebrew and Arabic; and the reinvention of the Palestinian language after the

destruction resulting from the 1948 war. He describes the relevance of Mahmoud Darwish's poetry to the metaphor of silence as a root metaphor that prevails in Khoury's novel *Children of the Ghetto*. Khoury argues that the literature of the Palestinian Nakba is a universal literature, not least because it entertains intricate relations between silence and language. Aside from these significant issues, the conversation with Khoury can be read as an attempt to recreate a dialogue between a particular translation and its "source," which is usually missing in the neoclassical model. The dialogue can be seen as an attempt to bring fluency of speech back to the fixed text and create a zone of continuity between them. In contradistinction to the linear sequence between source, translation, and lack of reciprocity, this dialogue brings the translation back to the author's doorstep. Khoury opens the door wide for such a dialogue when he admits that he wanted to have two of his novels "translated into Hebrew immediately": *Bab al-Shams (Gate of the Sun)* and *Children of the Ghetto*. In fact, the first translation of *Gate of the Sun* was published simultaneously in French and in Hebrew, and the first translation of *Children of the Ghetto* was published in Hebrew before French and English. The next novel to appear in Hebrew will be *Stella Maris*, where the narrator is no longer Adam telling the story in the first person but rather a narrator speaking in the third person. When asked about the change in voice, Khoury explains that it is the voice of the absent. In *Children of the Ghetto* Adam tries to speak but fails to do so, and when he realizes that he is a "present absentee," he tries to transform himself into the third person. Khoury writes into the credo of Hebrew literature and identifies its Achilles' heel, particularly the repeated metaphor of the Palestinians' amputated tongue. In *Stella Maris* he rewrites a scene from A. B. Yehoshua's *The Lover*, providing a counterfactual narrative by placing it in the 1960s (as opposed to Yehoshua, who places the story in the 1970s) and inviting the Hebrew writer who invented the metaphor to be a character in his novel. The Hebrew writer can no longer hide behind the author's orthography, producing a literary episode in which the writer is dragged involuntarily into the plot and wrestles with the portrait he has created.

Anton Shammas's essay "The Drowned Library" beautifully depicts the symbiosis between Arabic and Hebrew. The drowning library is a linguistic slide freely skating between the two languages. When Shammas sat down to write his novel *Arabesques* in Hebrew, he thought of the language of grace rather than the language of the decrees and the state of emergency: "The . . . virtual Palestinians for whom Hebrew has been, for more than a century, the language of power and de-territorialization, of dispossession, of lethal interrogations." Shammas cradles

Hebrew with Arabic and seeks to distinguish between the sovereign Hebrew language, the language of the orders and military instruction, and the language of grace that the Babylonian Talmud calls “euphemism” (*tractate Pesahim*) because words that need to be silent are said in other languages. While in *Arabesques* Shammas performs a cultural translation, he was also one of the few Palestinians who translated from Arabic to Hebrew, and obviously the most prominent of all. This went against the grain: prior to the 1960s, there were no Palestinian translators who translated from Arabic to Hebrew, and since then, their number has remained small. From a political point of view, under the conditions of colonial relations between languages, it is inconceivable that the practice of translation from Arabic to Hebrew can take place in a singular model and as a monopoly of Jewish translators. It is comparable to European anthropologists who study indigenous societies and report on them in the etic language that represents “scientific” logic by claiming cultural neutrality and ignoring the emic—that is, native—language used by the subject of ethnographic reporting. Shammas assures the reader that he will always be trapped inside his “miniature Babel,” which comprises confused and scattered tongues.

These words echo the argument that **Gil Anidjar** makes about Maimonides contemplating translation, where “he stages a truly fantastic scene that, ostensibly pedagogical, might also be described as dialogical, even theatrical.” Most important is the border crossing between Hebrew and Arabic, writing and orality, and the language games arising from his “miniature Babel.” Anidjar reflects on the question of language and translation, based on an unanticipated juxtaposition between two texts: Maimonides’s twelfth-century *Guide of the Perplexed* and Houria Bouteldja’s *Whites, Jews, and Us* (*Les Blancs, les Juifs et nous*). He provides a penetrating discussion on Maimonides’s perception of language and translation and shows how reading means to read between and across the Hebrew and the Arabic and simultaneously between and across the written and the spoken language. Anidjar problematizes the distinction between the Jew and the Arab, points to its historical roots, and searches for a place in which the “we” makes the Jews and the Arabs a multitude, where the speaker and the one who hears create a new frame. This place is found in the ghetto, the place in which “we” are all located. Thus, Anidjar restores not only the broken link between the Jew and the Arab but also the modern fragmentation between the oral and the textual tradition. At the end of the day, this paper brings home the necessity for dialogue in translation, which was so natural in the past but is ejected from modern translation.

Yuval Evri explores al-Andalus as a history, an ideal type, and an objective possibility. The Andalusian model mirrors the weaving of speech and writing, and shows greater flexibility in the relationship between origin and source. Evri's article focuses on two translation works selected from a wide and varied corpus of late nineteenth-century translations: *Yaldey Arav* (Children of Arabia), a collection of biblical tales from the Arab Palestinian oral tradition by Yosef Meyouhas; and *Mishley Arav* (Proverbs of Arabia), a comprehensive collection of Arabic proverbs by Isaac Benjamin Yahuda. Both of these works are translations of oral tales and proverbs from the Arabic and Judeo-Muslim literary tradition. While they were among the first modern translations from Arabic into Hebrew, and can thus be considered an integral part of the development of Modern (and national) Hebrew literature, the article explores the ways in which they fundamentally challenged the perception of a distinct and confined Modern Hebrew literature. Meyouhas's and Yahuda's translation methods exemplify a weak distinction between spoken and written textual traditions, translation without a stable original, and translation as an act of dialogism.

Nabih Bashir's article re-presents the Andalusian model of Toledo in the context of today's contentious relations between Hebrew and Arabic. Bashir is the most recent translator of *Sefer ha-Kuzari* from Judeo-Arabic to Arabic. Originally, Yehuda Halevi (also known as Abu al-Hasan al-Lawi, أبو الحسن اللاوي published كتاب الحجة والدليل في نصر الدين الذليل (*Kitab al-hujjah wal-dalil fi nusr al-din al-dhalil*; The book of refutation and proof in support of the abased religion) in 1140 in Toledo. The book was translated into Hebrew for the first time by Yehuda ibn Tibbon in approximately 1160, under the title *Sefer ha-Kuzari*. The book is divided into five parts and takes the form of a dialogue between a rabbi and a pagan, who is mythologized as the king of the Khazars. The third essay of these dialogues is devoted to the refutation of the teachings of Karaism and to the history of the oral tradition in Judaism. Using excerpts from the Bible, Bashir shows that the reading is dependent on the oral tradition, as there were no vowels or accents in the original text. Nabih Bashir's article tells us, in the first person, the amazing story of the book's translation into Arabic and the resulting bizarre consequences in the context of the Jewish state standing against the Andalusian vision. Bashir's story has enormous implications for the function of translation, since the book was written in Arabic in Hebrew transliteration and was translated/copied/transferred by Bashir to Arabic letters.

Against this Andalusian backdrop, **Yonatan Mendel** describes the characteristics of the Arabic language that was conceived as a product of the Jewish Zionist project and ideology, focusing on the developments that took place during the British Mandate in Palestine. The Arabic of the Jews in the country has become like Latin—that is, a language that is heavily oriented toward the study of grammar and that is used to translate but not to speak. Like Luther, who expropriated the Bible from the Jews, Jewish Zionist European Orientalists confiscated Arabic from the Arabs. Yet, while Luther translated Latin into a vernacular language, in the Jewish community the Arabic language was turned into a language like Latin. Looking at two central institutions in which the discourse surrounding Arabic studies in the Jewish community was shaped—the Institute of Oriental Studies at the Hebrew University and the Hebrew Reali School in Haifa—Mendel shows the detrimental role played by German philologists in forging the field of Arabic studies in Palestine. The philological model that followed the model prevalent in German universities produced an Arabic that is not so much a language of speech as it is a classical language of texts based on grammar and syntax as an intermediary between the speaker and the recipient—far removed from the region's lingua franca.

In his article **Amer Dahamshe** offers a critical reading of the linguistic landscape of welcome signs in localities of the Palestinian Arab minority in Israel. He examines the formal visual aspect of the Arabic, Hebrew, and English languages as they appear on these signs: the order of their placement and their content, including the normative messages, translation, and transliteration, names. These analyses shed light on the links between the linguistic landscape and the sociopolitical and socioeconomic status of the Palestinian minority, as well as on the perceptions of Palestinian citizens regarding their relationship with the Jewish majority. The contents of the welcome signs to Arab towns, as Dahamshe shows, reflect and reproduce the colonial dimension in the relationships between Hebrew and Arabic.

In addition to these articles, we have included in this volume four short stories written by contemporary Palestinian women writers. Three of them live in Israel (**Sheikha Hlewa**, **Tamara Naser**, and **Atheer Safa**), and one, **Sama Hasan**, lives in Gaza. As a way of mitigating some of the biases of the neoclassical model described above, the translations were made in binational teams, including Jewish and Palestinian translators in reverse roles in the different stories: Shoshana London

Sappir, Serene Husni, Maisalon Dallashi, and Kifah Abdul Halim. This model of binational team translations will be the focus of the next issue of *JLS*.

We conclude this special issue with a book review by **Iris Agmon**: Beshara B. Doumani's *Family Life in the Ottoman Mediterranean: A Social History*, which is an extensive study on family history in the Ottoman Middle East.

I thank the authors and the anonymous reviewers for their contributions. Many thanks to the wonderful team that worked together on this issue: Duygu Atlas, who managed the entire process, Deborah Schwartz, our devoted linguistic editor, and Shoshana London Sappir, for her translations. Many thanks to Tal Kohavi, the head of the Van Leer Institute Press, for her wise suggestions, and to Shai Lavi, the head of the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute, for his invitation to edit this issue and unhesitating support, intellectually and otherwise.

Notes

- 1 Franz Pöchhacker, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies* (Oxon: Routledge, 2015).
- 2 S. G. Marghetitch, *Étude Sur Les Fonctions Des Drogmans Des Missions Diplomatiques Ou Consulaires En Turquie* (Istanbul: Kessinger Legacy Publishers, [1898] 2010).
- 3 Marsha L. Dutton, "Saints Refusing to Leave: Aelred of Rievaulx's *The Saints of Hexham* as an Inverted *Translatio*," in *The Medieval Translator / Traduire au Moyen Age*, vol. 15, ed. Alessandra Petrina (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).
- 4 Ghada Osman, "The Sheikh of the Translators': The Translation Methodology of Hunayn ibn Ishaq," in *The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2014), 41–56.
- 5 Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth, *Translators through History* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995), 113.
- 6 "Hunayn ibn Ishaq wa-makanatuhu fi al-hadara al-Islamiyya," *Atida*, accessed June 5, 2019, www.atida.org/forums/showthread.php?t=2085.
- 7 Belén Bistué, *Collaborative Translation and Multi-Version Texts in Early Modern Europe, 1400–1700* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).
- 8 Roger Chartier, *Forms and Meanings: Texts, Performances, and Audiences from Codex to Computer* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).
- 9 Pieter J. J. Botha, "Authorship in Historical Perspective and Its Bearing on New Testament and Early Christian Texts and Contexts," *Scriptura* 102, no.1 (2009): 495–510.
- 10 Leonardo Bruni, "Leonardo Bruni, called Aretino, from 'The Right Way to Translate,'" in *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*, ed. André Lefevere (London: Routledge, 1992), 81–86.

11 Ibid., 82–83.

12 Ibid., 81–86.

13 Jean Herbert, *The Interpreter's Handbook* (Geneva: Librairie de l'Université, 1952), 6.