

# Exploring Repeated Linguistic Translations in Contemporary Arab Culture: Revisiting Generative Linguistics Translated Works

Hafid I. Alaoui\* and S. A. Alfugara

Department of Arabic Language, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Sharjah University, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

Received: 16 Dec. 2023, Revised: 15 Feb. 2024, Accepted: 13 Mar. 2024

Published online: 1 May 2024

**Abstract:** In this study, our goal is to shine a light on Chomsky's translations and retranslations to the Arabic language. We based our research on a corpus containing seven well-known translations, published on different dates. Our analysis and assessment of these translations are based on a clear Assessment Network. Some of the questions we will try to answer are as follows: what was translated? How was it translated? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these translations? Our aim is to establish a translational practice based on clear methodological foundations that contributes to the progress of Arab linguistic research.

**Keywords:** Translation- retranslations- Chomsky's translations.

## 1 Introduction

Translation has long served as a vital conduit for the exchange of knowledge between cultures. Consequently, it comes as no surprise that it has played a pivotal role in facilitating the dissemination of contemporary linguistic literature within Arab culture.

After the first half of the twentieth century, significant efforts have been made in the field of linguistic translation; however, much work still remains to be done. A significant discrepancy exists between the abundant number of linguistic books published in foreign languages and the limited number of translations available in Arabic. This disparity was emphasized by Abdessalem Mseddi (1989), who noted that, until the publication of his book, the total count of translations available did not surpass eleven.

This is a very modest outcome from a statistical standpoint. However, the emphasis on the quantitative side of these works while neglecting their qualitative nature involves some exaggeration and overlooks certain methodological and scientific pitfalls in translation.

In this article, we contend that the conventional quantitative approach to evaluating translated linguistic works is inadequate and fails to provide a comprehensive assessment of the field. Merely comparing the number of translations into Arabic with those in other cultures falls short in adequately measuring translation activities. Furthermore, it is crucial to question whether every publication from the West merits translation into Arabic. With this in mind, the paper aims to provide a historical overview of translation efforts within Arab culture.

After nearly seven decades of translating linguistic works into Arabic, and approximately four decades of translating works within the Generative school, it is my conviction that there exists an imminent necessity for a thorough and critical evaluation of the advancements made in linguistic translation. Such a review typically begins by posing vital questions to diagnose the present state of translation in Arab culture.

These pivotal questions encompass: What has been translated thus far? How has the translation process unfolded? Are there discernible benefits derived from these translation efforts? What are the strengths and weaknesses inherent in these translations? How can we extract valuable insights from past experiences to improve future translation practices? Moreover, what are the appropriate and practical scientific principles that can serve as guidance for forthcoming endeavors?

Our endeavor will encompass a comprehensive overview of nearly all translations pertaining to generative linguistics. This decision is motivated by the prominent position of this school within contemporary linguistic research and the significant presence of Arabic translations of its literature within the Arab cultural landscape. These translations will be

\*Corresponding author e-mail: [halaoui@sharjah.ac.ae](mailto:halaoui@sharjah.ac.ae)

critically and rationally examined, with a primary emphasis on assessing the level of scientific accuracy and their impact in nurturing linguistic consciousness within the target language culture<sup>1</sup>.

The methodology adopted in this study involves compiling a substantial corpus of translated works authored by prominent generativists. Subsequently, a descriptive analysis is conducted based on established academic translation norms. For instance, scientific credibility dictates that every translation should include an introduction that guides the reader through the translated text, as well as highlight the challenges encountered when translating specialized concepts into the target language. These pieces of information reflect the translator's awareness of the cultural and epistemological risks associated with interpreting and transferring scholarly knowledge (Soudani: 2018, p14).

These aspects are evaluated using a specific assessment framework that focuses on the presentation of the translation, including the introduction, prelude, or foreword. We consider this to be a fundamental requirement and a methodological necessity that sheds light on the translated text and establishes a connection between the translator and the reader. It is also one of the key structural responsibilities that must be carefully addressed to establish scientific rigor and credibility in translation.

When introducing the translated text, it is crucial to pay attention to several technical aspects. These include (a) referencing the title of the source book, (b) specifying the publisher, (c) providing the date of publication, (d) indicating the translation rights, (e) mentioning any previous translations (if applicable), (f) including relevant and explanatory comments in footnotes, (g) clearly distinguishing between the translator's footnotes and those of the author, (h) ensuring the Arabization of illustrations while revealing the methodology behind this process, (i) developing appendices and indexes such as a terminology index and proper noun index, (l) including the bibliography of the original work<sup>2</sup>, and, (m) reviewing the translation itself.

Furthermore, linguistic clarity and style should be prioritized in the translation<sup>3</sup>. By employing methodological and teleological precautions and providing clear clarifications, the process of tracking translations can be significantly facilitated in an efficient and cost-effective manner. The translated text should be presented in a well-organized manner, which would help in the identification of its points of strength and weakness, if any.

The paper is structured into three sections. The first section serves as an introduction to the topic. The second section provides a descriptive account of the degree to which the translations examined conform to the methodological and technical criteria and requirements outlined earlier. The third section comprises a critical analysis of the data under investigation. In addition to the points covered in the previous sections, we also address the issue of the compatibility of modern linguistic terminology with traditional Arabic grammar. The paper concludes with critical remarks that emerge during the corpus analysis.

This research is closely related to the historiography of linguistic research in Arab culture, as it looks into the historical development and progress of translation efforts within this context. Furthermore, it involves the critical examination and monitoring of translated and published works, which are crucial epistemological aspects for the advancement of knowledge.

## 2. Tracing the Beginnings of Generative Translations in the Arabic Context

Arab researchers have shown a strong interest in the translation and written discourse on Generative Grammar since the late 1970s and early 1980s. Several pioneering works have been published, including:

- Tammam Hassan, "Arabic Grammar and Methods of Analysis" (Hassan, 1976).
- Tammam Hassan, "Grammar Between Theory and Practice" (Hassan, 1997),
- Murtadha Jawad Bakir, "Reflections on Arabic Grammar" (Bakir, 1977),
- Majeed Al-Mashta: "Transformative Generative Grammar" (Al-Mashta, 1978).
- Abdelkader Fassi Fehri, "Phenomena Linguistics and Commentary Aspects" (Fehri, 1981),
- Rashid Abu Bakr, "The Use of Syntactic Transformations in the Study of the Arabic Language" (Abu Bakr, 1982).

The first notable book in this field is (al-'alsunīā al-taūlīdīā wāltahwīlīā waqawā'id al-luġā al-'arabīā) "*Transformational Generative Linguistics and Arabic Language Grammar*" authored by Michel Zakaria in 1983. This pioneering work explores the application of Generative Grammar to Arabic language syntactic structure.

Additionally, an important contribution to Generative Grammar in the Arab context was made through the translation of "Chomsky" by Lyons (1970), into Arabic by Helmy Khalil in (1987)<sup>4</sup>. This translated book provides a comprehensive overview of Chomsky's linguistic theory, tracing its development from its early beginnings in 1957 up until the 1970s.

The above works have played a crucial role in introducing and disseminating Generative Grammar concepts in the Arabic-speaking academic community, contributing to the understanding and exploration of Generative linguistic theory within the Arab context.

Subsequently, numerous writings on Generative Grammar emerged, including both original works and translations. This research will place significant emphasis on repeated translations, particularly two notable books:

1. "Noam Chomsky" by John Lyons.
2. "Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought" by Noam Chomsky.

These two books have been the subject of multiple translations, which helps in making them significant specimens for our analysis. By examining the various translations and their impact, we aim to gain insights into the reception and interpretation of Generative Grammar concepts in different linguistic and cultural contexts.

Lyons' book, which was the first to be translated into Arabic, was published in 1985. On the other hand, the second book is a recent publication (2022). We firmly believe that conducting an analysis of these two books will provide a comprehensive understanding of the developmental process of Generative Linguistics translation into Arabic. These books, spanning a significant time period, offer valuable insights into the evolution, reception, and interpretation of Generative Linguistics within the Arab countries.

### 3. Overview of the Targeted Corpus Books:

The first book elucidates the philosophical and scientific foundations that underpin Chomsky's theory and its perspective on language as a quintessentially human phenomenon. It discusses the definitions of linguistics and highlights the distinctions between modern linguistics and traditional language studies. The book elucidates the scientific and analytical principles that underlie the field of linguistics, as well as the key characteristics that set human language apart from other modes of communication.

Furthermore, the book offers additional insights into Chomsky's perspectives on the nature of human language. Certain chapters explore Bloomfield's theory, which Chomsky studied under his teacher, Harris. Other chapters are dedicated to presenting a simplified version of the Transformational Generative Theory. They explore its psychological and philosophical foundations and introduce its successive theoretical and analytical models developed up until that time.

Due to its popularity and accessible writing style, this book has been translated into Arabic on three separate occasions:

- The first translation, conducted by Helmy Khalil and published in 1987, bears the title "نظرية تشومسكي اللغوية" (Nazāriyat tshūmsky al-lughawīyah) and spans across 299 pages.

The second translation, authored by Mohammad Ziyad Kibbeh and published in 1987, carries the title "تشومسكي" (tshūmsky) but is notably shorter, encompassing only 104 pages.

- The third translation is by Bidaa Al Obydi and Nagham Al-Azzawi, published in 2001, with the same title as the preceding one –i.e. "تشومسكي" tshūmsky - but consists of 166 pages.

Khalil begins with an intriguing prelude, in which he elucidates his approach to the translation process. He states:

"In this translation, my aim has been to maintain accuracy to the author's language to the best of my ability, without excessive interference through deletion or modification of expressions and examples. I have also preserved the syntactic examples provided by the author in their original form, even if they are simple and straightforward, to avoid any potential confusion in their translation into Arabic, the target language. However, I have included corresponding illustrations from the Arabic language in footnotes to supplement the text. Additionally, I have added footnotes with comments that explain certain linguistic phenomena discussed by ancient Arab grammarians, in order to enhance the understanding of analytical aspects within Chomsky's theory" (Khalil 1987: p. 7).

Khalil took care to meticulously reference the original text, specifically the 1977<sup>5</sup> edition, ensuring accuracy and fidelity to all its details. He also included an index of the linguistic terms and special concepts in his translation. Besides, he added an appendix containing information on Arabic writings about Chomsky's theory. However, it should be noted that the list of references was omitted from this particular version of the translation.

In contrast, Kibbeh (1987) introduces his translation with a brief preface (pp. 5-7). However, he says nothing about the original text or make any reference to the previous Arabic translation<sup>6</sup>. His introduction primarily focuses on the developments in the field of linguistic studies, particularly highlighting the significance of Chomsky's contributions. He states that he was motivated to undertake the translation of this book because it provides a concise overview of Chomsky's most notable achievements.

The brief preface also mentions the challenges the translator has encountered in translating the technical terms in the book, which is described as "precise in its expressions and intricate in its terminology" (Ibid. 1987, p. 5).

In contrast to Khalil's translation, where the English examples are preserved, Kibbeh's translation takes a different approach by substituting some of the English examples with Arabic examples. He justifies this decision because of the structural differences between the two languages. However, he follows a similar approach in dealing with the syntactic rules by adapting the rules from English to fit the Arabic language structure. Consequently, he introduces illustrative structural rules that he believes are suitable for Arabic syntax. Moreover, Kibbeh includes a set of transformational rules that differ from those mentioned by the author of the original text.

Kibbeh asserts that his approach to the translation of phrase structure rules is valid, as it takes into consideration the grammatical differences between the source and target languages. It is crucial for translators to be mindful of such differences and be able to adapt the rules accordingly. This is particularly important when translating from English to Arabic, given the substantial differences in their grammatical structures. By adapting the phrase structure rules to the target language, the translator ensures an accurate and effective translation.

To maintain the accuracy and integrity of his translation, Kibbeh takes measures to ensure transparency. This includes providing footnotes that contain examples of both the original Arabic and English versions of the text. By including these examples, the translator aims to offer a clear reference for readers. Moreover, the translator incorporates important illustrations from English alongside their Arabic translations to minimize any potential confusion.

Furthermore, the translator appends a list of linguistic terms to the translation, which likely serves as a useful reference for readers. However, it is worth noting that the original book references have been overlooked or omitted from the translation, which could be seen as an obvious limitation in terms of providing proper citation and acknowledging the original sources.

The third translation by Al-Obeidi and Al-Azzawi, which was published many years after the first two, is open to various criticisms. Firstly, it can be faulted for its lack of accuracy, as it deviates from faithfully conveying the intended meaning of the original text. Secondly, it falls short of paying attention to important details, which can impact the overall quality of the translation. The absence of a guiding introduction and a terminology list further minimizes its overall effectiveness. Moreover, the translation lacks a comprehensive list of references, making it challenging for readers to trace and verify the cited sources. Lastly, the retention of English examples in their original form without adaptation of the target language raises concerns about the overall linguistic coherence of the translated text<sup>7</sup>.

The second selected example of repeated translation is "Chomsky, Cartesian Linguistics, A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought".

In this book, Chomsky discusses Port Royal's grammar and explores its philosophical foundations and grammatical analyses derived from those foundations. He extensively references works from the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries to illustrate the profound insights of scholars in language analysis. These references serve as a contrast to the approaches adopted by proponents of "modern linguistics" during the first half of the twentieth century (Chomsky, 1966/2022, as cited in the translator's introduction).

In his book, "Chomsky, Cartesian Linguistics," Chomsky emphasizes that crucial advancements in linguistic theory, particularly concerning cognitive theory, emerged during the seventeenth century. However, he argues that these advancements were subsequently overlooked and forgotten during the early nineteenth century. This oblivion can be attributed to the significant disregard for the historical aspect of linguistics, as it was commonly believed that modern linguistics only emerged in the nineteenth century (Chomsky, 1966/2022, as cited in the translator's introduction).

This book has been translated into Arabic twice by two different translators. Both translations share the same title in Arabic:

"Noam Chomsky, (اللسانيات الديكارتية) (al-Lisānīyāt alddīkārtīyah, faṣl fī Tārīkh al-Fīkr al-‘aqlānī) (Noam Chomsky, Cartesian Linguistics, A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought). The first translation was done by Mohamed Rahhali, published in (2020) and it spans 240 pages.

The second translation was accomplished by Hamza Al-Mozainy published in (2023), and it consists of 337 pages.

In Rahhali's translation, on the inside cover page, immediately after the title, there is a clear reference to the adopted edition of the original book (the third edition containing a new introduction by James McGilvray). It is also mentioned that all rights are reserved to the publisher in agreement with the University of Cambridge Press. Additionally, there is a clear reference to the date in which the book first appeared, which is 1966.

In his introduction to the translation, Rahhali initiates the discussion by delving into the reception of the book within Western culture and addressing the criticisms it has garnered. He provided clarifications regarding the title of the book

and the author's objectives within it. The specific references for these discussions can be found in Chomsky's work from 1966, as cited in the translator's introduction on pages 5-12.

Rahhali offers a comprehensive account of his approach, particularly concerning the key terms that are recurrent throughout the book. He provides detailed explanations and insights to ensure a thorough understanding of these crucial concepts. Additionally, he includes a glossary of Arabic-English terms, located on pages 227-230, which refer to the corresponding page numbers where these terms appear in the book (cf. pp. 231-238). Finally, the translator appends a list of references at the end of the book.

Similarly, in the second translation by Al-Mozainy, the cover page includes a clear reference to the original edition of the book, i.e. the third edition introduced by McGilvray. In addition, there is mention that the translation is licensed by the publisher based on the contract signed between Cambridge University Press and dār knūz al-ma'rifah on 19/08/2021.

In his introduction to the book, Al-Mozainy highlights the revolutionary ideas put forth in Chomsky's Cartesian Linguistics. He emphasizes that these ideas are just as groundbreaking as those presented in Chomsky's first book, 'Syntactic Structures'. Chomsky's book challenges the fundamental principles of the behavioral school in psychology and the structural school in linguistics, offering a critical analysis of their tenets. Al-Mozainy then proceeds to discuss some of the key concepts and ideas presented by Chomsky in the book.

Furthermore, Al-Mozainy draws attention to the significance of the third edition, particularly the extensive introduction written by [James A. McGilvray](#). This introduction provides a comprehensive overview of the history and development of Chomsky's theory, tracing its evolution from its inception in the mid-twentieth century to the first decade of the twenty-first century (Chomsky 1966/2022 cited in the translator's introduction, pp. 9-18).

One interesting point mentioned by the translator is his initial interest in translating the book, which dates back more than four years prior to the actual translation. This interest stemmed from his academic curiosity about the history and origins of Generative Grammar. After translating the introduction of the book, Al-Mozainy decided to postpone pursuing the translation rights until he had completed the translation of the entire book. This approach allowed him to maintain consistency and coherence throughout the translation process. However, it was only then that he discovered the translation rights had already been granted to an Arab publisher. Through his research and investigation, he identified the publishing house and the name of the translator, eventually obtaining a copy of Rahhali's translation. Taking advantage of the opportunity, Al-Mozainy incorporated his observations and comments on Rahhali's version in the introduction to his translation. (cf. Chomsky 1966/2022, p.22).

In his introduction, Al-Mozainy, also emphasizes the importance of translating this book into Arabic, despite the passage of more than half a century since its original publication. He extends his gratitude to Chomsky, the author of the book, for his warm welcome and support towards the translation of the book.

Al-Mozainy made several notes regarding the form of the translation. First, he added clarifications not only to the editor's introduction but also to Chomsky's text. To distinguish these additions from those of the editor, he enclosed them within doubled square brackets [...]. He also transformed active sentences into passive constructions without altering the intended meaning. Additionally, he consistently used the Arabic term "بشر" (bašar) (viz. Human being) and its derivatives to translate the words "Man" or "Men" in the cited examples. Al-Mozainy, the translator, employed well-established linguistic terminology throughout the translation. He included numerous footnotes and comments, clearly indicating them as his own additions. Furthermore, he rectified any errors mentioned in the original book based on his extensive knowledge of the relevant subjects. Al-Mozainy also updated the publication dates of the cited references to reflect current information and included a comprehensive list of Chomsky's translated works in Arabic.

The book encompasses two glossaries: Arabic-English and English-Arabic, found on pages 312 to 321. Additionally, two indexes are provided: a name index (pages 322 to 324) and a term index (pages 325 to 328). Finally, a list of references is included for further exploration.

## 4. A critical analysis of the translated books

### 4.1. On the Translators' introductions:

Introductions to translated books can serve various functions, including affective, educational, referential, ideological, informative, and critical purposes. In the case of the translations of the mentioned books, some introductions were supplemented with an additional introduction by the translator. These additional introductions encompassed all the crucial elements included in the evaluation network, ensuring a comprehensive and thorough examination of the translated works. This comprehensive approach was evident in the translation of the first book, Chomsky, by Khalil, as well as in the translations of Cartesian Linguistics by Rahhali and Al-Mozainy. However, the other two translations of



the first book, by Kibbeh and Al-Obeidi and Al-Azzawi, did not incorporate similarly extensive introductions.

Another noteworthy observation regarding the translations under examination is that certain translations opted for older editions of the source books. For example, Kibbeh relied on the first edition of Lyon's book, *Chomsky*, published in 1966, although the book in its original language had a newer edition published in 1977 with important modifications (Al-Mozainy, 2000). On the other hand, Khalil (1987) chose to use the later edition in his translation.

#### 4.1.1. Intellectual Property Rights:

It is evident that many of the earlier translators did not adequately address the issue of copyrights. However, translators such as Mohamed Rahhali and Al-Mozainy, in their translations of Chomsky's *Cartesian Linguistics*, explicitly referenced the obtained translation rights from the original publisher. Conversely, none of the translators of Lyon's book addressed intellectual property rights. There is no mention in any of their translations about seeking and obtaining the necessary rights from the original publisher(s) to translate the book.

The lack of consideration for translation rights is indeed one of the main reasons why certain books have been subject to multiple translations. Without proper attention to securing the necessary rights from the original publisher, multiple translations of the same book can emerge, leading to fragmentation and potential discrepancies in the translated versions available. Most translators and publishers tend to overlook this important detail. This negligence might explain why some translators were unaware of previous translations of the same book. Indeed, it is worth noting that even in cases where translation rights were obtained, there have been instances where books have been retranslated. This is exemplified in the second book under the current study. One plausible explanation is that the rights are granted for a specific period, and once the previous agreement expires, the publisher signs a new contract with a different translator. This is exactly what happened with the translation of *Cartesian Linguistics*.

#### 4.1.2. Delusion of being the first:

It is evident from the data mentioned above that there is a lack of coordination among the Arabic translation efforts, despite the significant time gaps between the recurring translations. In only one case, a reference is made to a previous translation, specifically in Al-Mozainy's translation of Chomsky's *Cartesian Linguistics*. He acknowledges Rahhali's translation of the book and mentions conducting independent research in which he reviewed that translation.

The neglect of previous translations can sometimes be attributed to the printing process occurring simultaneously with the work of another translator. For example, Kibbeh (1987) did not make reference to Khalil's translation, likely because he had completed his translation before the previous translation was issued. This is especially evident since his introduction was finished and signed in 1985.

#### 4.1.3. Translation Revision and Proofreading:

A review of the translated texts indicates that the translators acknowledge the significance of revision. As a result, the majority of them have sought the assistance of reviewers and proofreaders. With the exception of Kibbeh's translation, all the translations under examination recognize the valuable contributions made by their reviewers. The conducted reviews can be categorized as follows:

**Official reviews:** These are reviews assigned to the reviewer either by the author or the publisher. It is common to find the name of the reviewer mentioned on the cover page. An example of this is the Salman al-Wasti's revision of Baida al-Alkawi's translation of Lyon's Chomsky.

**Non-official/Informal revision:** This type of revision is based on the collaborative relationship between the translator and the reviewer(s). The translator often expresses gratitude to everyone who assisted in the translation process and helped overcome its difficulties.

#### 4.1.4 Footnotes and Comments

In certain translations, footnotes and comments are included to enhance the translation and aid in the comprehension of certain topics that are discussed in the book. For instance, in Al-Mozainy's translation of *Cartesian Linguistics*, we encounter explanations, additions, and occasionally comparisons with previous works. At times, these additional comments and explanations span more than half a page. The same can be said for Khalil's translation of Lyons' book, which he augmented with numerous testimonies about its quality.

#### 4.1.5 Examples and Illustrations:

Examples and illustrations are necessary in generative writing. They have been employed to validate the accuracy of the proposed theoretical principles and particular analyses. How did the translated books examined in this study handle the presented illustrative examples?

Rahhali and Al-Mozainy incorporated a combination of English and Arabic examples in their translations. On the other hand, Kibbeh replaced certain English examples with Arabic ones. This alteration was justified based on the distinct structures exhibited by the two languages. Similarly, when addressing the structural rules specific to the English language, Kibbeh substituted them with more suitable illustrative phrase structure rules from Arabic. In addition, he included a set of transformational rules that differed from those mentioned by the author, but which would be applicable to Arabic sentence structure, again citing the same rationale.

#### 4.1.6 On the Reference Lists of the Source Books:

Most translations, with the exception of Rahhali's and Al-Mozainy's translations of *Cartesian Linguistics*, have omitted the list of references from the source book. In some cases, the reference list is substituted with a list of works by Arab authors within the generative perspective. This is what we have noticed in Khalil's translation of Chomsky.

The reasons for omitting the reference list may vary depending on the specific translation and the external factors influencing its production. It is possible that the translators or publishers believed that retaining the references in the Arabic translation would not provide significant benefits or that they were deemed less relevant to the target audience. Space limitations, publishing constraints, or editorial decisions could have also played a role in the decision to exclude the reference list. However, without specific information, it is difficult to determine the exact motivations behind this omission in each of the translations under study.

#### 4.1.7. Methodology of Translation:

The methodology of translation serves as a crucial aspect in understanding the nature of translation itself. The translator enters into a systematic commitment between himself/herself and the reader and deviating from this commitment may lead to a failure in achieving the translation goal. This deviation can be a result of an erroneous perception of the requirements of translation, particularly when the translator considers languages to be structurally similar when, in reality, they differ in their functions, the ways in which they convey meanings, and how they represent human experience (Majdoub, 1990, p. 53).

In the books analyzed within the studied corpus, an introduction is typically provided where the translators express their dedication to the translation process. They may explicitly or implicitly discuss their chosen translation approach. This is evident in the works of Khalil (1987), Kibbeh (1987), Rahhali (2020), and Al-Mozainy (2022). However, in the case of al-Obeidi and al-Azzawi's translation of Chomsky, no mention is made regarding their approach to the translation task. It appears that they did not give it significant consideration or chose not to elaborate on their approach in the introduction.

By addressing the translation commitment and expressing their chosen approach, these translators demonstrate a conscious effort to establish a clear framework for their translations. This helps the readers understand the translator's perspective and approach, leading to a more informed reading experience.

#### 4.1.8. Translation Style:

The readers of the translated texts will readily observe significant variation in the accuracy of wording and style. Certain works exhibit meticulous presentation, effectively aiding the reader in comprehending the encoded ideas. However, others appear hastily done and suffer from evident stylistic weaknesses. As an example, it is difficult for the observer to overlook the fact that Kibbeh's translation requires new formulations in many instances. The deficiencies apparent in this translation can be summarized as follows: poor style, translation errors, and grammatical errors (Al-Mozainy, 2000, p. 173).

The differences in the quality of wording and style among the translations highlight the varying levels of proficiency and attention to detail by the translators. While some translations excel in their clarity and linguistic precision, others fall short due to shortcomings in style, accuracy in choosing terminology, and grammar. This variation in quality can significantly impact the reader's understanding and overall experience with the translated texts.

#### 4.1.9. Linguistic Concepts:

Specialized knowledge relies on a specialized vocabulary that systematically includes the various aspects of its epistemological framework. In this sense, linguistic knowledge, similar to other forms of knowledge, strives to manifest its crystallization and clarity through the development and independence of its terminological apparatus. This phenomenon represents a governing principle that applies to knowledge in its diverse domains, and it establishes a temporal law wherein the evolution of terminology is exponentially linked to the advancement of knowledge (Soudani, 2018, p. 22).

The translated book suggests that the terminology used in specialized fields serves as a key component for the organization and communication of knowledge. By condensing complex ideas into precise and specialized terms,

linguistic knowledge strives to achieve clarity and autonomy. Moreover, the book highlights the interconnected relationship between the evolution of knowledge and the growth of its associated terminology, emphasizing that as knowledge expands and develops, so does its specialized vocabulary.

What is regrettable is that, despite the efforts made in the field of terminology and the repeated calls for the standardization of linguistic terminology (as highlighted by Al-Mozainy, 2000, p. 106), the Arabic linguistic dictionary still lacks accurate translation of many concepts. Therefore, the sought goal has not been attained yet. Simply because those efforts need someone to gather pertinent concepts and unify their translation. (Al-Waar, 1989, p. 266).

In the translations being examined, the terminological aspect has received significant attention. In fact, most of these works specifically addressed and discussed this aspect. They even included an appendix that presented the translated concepts from the source language to the target language, particularly Arabic. However, it is worth noting that the translation of Lyons' *Chomsky* by Al-Obeidi and Al-Azzawi is an exception to this approach, as it does not include any appendix of terms.

The focus on the terminological aspect in the translations indicates a conscientious effort by the translators to ensure accurate and consistent rendering of specialized terms. By including such an appendix, they provide readers with a valuable resource to navigate and comprehend the terminology used in the translated work. Its absence in the translation of *Chomsky* by Al-Obeidi and Al-Azzawi may pose a challenge to readers in terms of understanding and clarifying the translated concepts.

Some of the translators chose to address the challenges they faced in translating linguistic terms. In his introduction, Kibbeh provided an explanation: there is an unfortunate dearth of accurate translations for numerous contemporary linguistic terms in the Arabic dictionary. Despite the endeavors of specialized professors to render these terms into Arabic, the desired objective has not been realized. This can be attributed to the absence of coordination and unity among individual efforts, as each person adheres to their own approach and diligence in addressing this matter." (cf. Lyons, 1970/1980, as cited by the translator).

The account highlights the challenge of accurately translating modern linguistic terms into Arabic. It suggests that despite the efforts made by specialized professors, the existing Arabic dictionary falls short of providing precise equivalents for these terms. The lack of coordination and unified guidelines among individuals working on Arabizing these terms further hampers the progress in this area. As a result, the translation of modern linguistic concepts into Arabic continues to face difficulties and inconsistencies.

Certain translations have incorporated comments specifically addressing the translation of concepts, such as the work of Al-Mozainy (2020). In his translation, Al-Mozainy has included footnotes highlighting important terms.

Recognizing the challenges in translating certain Arabic terms, Rahhali (2020) has taken a different approach by adding numerous explanations to facilitate comprehension. He clarifies his method by stating, "To aid understanding, I would like to explain the basis for Arabizing some of the frequently used terms in the translated book. I have utilized the terminology from Arab Islamic philosophy, particularly as established by Ibn Sina.

These translators have taken proactive measures to assist readers in understanding the translated text by providing additional annotations or explanations related to concept translation. Al-Mozainy's inclusion of supplementary notes draws attention to significant terms, while Al-Rahali's approach involves offering clarifications and utilizing terminology from Arabo-Islamic philosophy, particularly from Ibn Sina. These efforts reflect the translators' commitment to enhancing comprehension and ensuring accurate representation of the concepts within the translated work.

For instance, in the translation process, the Arabic term (الذهن) (al-thihn') was suggested to correspond to 'mind' in English and 'esprit' in French. These terms, in all three languages, encompass similar ideas related to the existence of perceptions, their composition and arrangement, and the process of thinking and knowledge-building. The same choice of terminology can be found in the works of Avicenna, who also considers (al-thihn') to be a "force for the soul" (Chomsky, 1966/2020, pp. 9-10).

Similarly, the Arabic term 'jism' (الجسم) (al-ğism) was proposed as the translation for 'body', drawing from its usage in Arabo-Islamic philosophy, particularly in the context of discussing the mind-body problem.

Lastly, the Arabic term (العقل) (al-'aql) was suggested as the equivalent of 'reason' or 'intellect' (Chomsky, 1966/2020, pp. 9-10).

These translation choices aim to align the Arabic terms with their corresponding concepts in English and French, considering their similarities in meaning and usage. Additionally, the influence of Arabo-Islamic philosophy, as exemplified by Avicenna, played a role in guiding the selection of appropriate Arabic cognates for the original terms.



In a similar manner, Al-Mozainy justified his decision to use (الذهن) (al-thihn'), as the Arabic equivalent for the term 'mind', instead of using a term (العقل) (al-'aql) that may imply the connotations related to wisdom and moral knowledge in the Arabic language. He states that his colleagues pointed out to him that the term (العقل) in Arabic typically refers to matters associated with wisdom and moral knowledge. However, Chomsky's discussion in the book highlights different cognitive systems arising from the brain, which are not necessarily connected to wisdom and moral knowledge. Rather, they pertain to how the brain functions in its interaction with the external world (Chomsky, 1966/2022, pp. 57-58).

By opting for (الذهن) (al-thihn'), as the Arabic equivalent, Al-Mozainy aims to align with Chomsky's concept of cognitive systems and their relation to brain functionality, rather than invoking the specific connotations of wisdom and moral knowledge associated with the Arabic term (العقل) (al-'aql). This decision underscores the translator's careful consideration of the specific meaning and context of the terms being translated, ensuring an accurate representation of the original ideas in the target language.

Although considerable efforts were made in the current compared corpus, it is evident that certain translations have significant shortcomings. Kibbeh's choices, in particular, have been subject to criticism, as highlighted in two critical reviews by Al-Mozainy (2000) and Al-Waar (1989).

The afore mentioned reviews point out flaws and inadequacies in Kibbeh's translation work, indicating that his choices and execution were not successful in accurately conveying the intended meaning and maintaining the quality of the original text. The specifics of these criticisms are not provided. However, it can be inferred that they shed light on significant issues or concerns within Kibbeh's translation.

These critical reviews reflect the importance of rigorous assessment and evaluation of translation works, emphasizing the need for translators to be meticulous in their approach and ensure that the translated text faithfully captures the essence and nuances of the original. Such feedback serves as a means of improvement and encourages translators to continually refine their skills and techniques.

According to Al-Mozainy, what is noteworthy about Kibbeh's translation of Chomsky is that it exacerbates the terminological confusion mentioned by the book's author, Lyons. Kibbeh, under the pretext of the absence of established Arabic equivalents for certain linguistic terms, translated the English terms haphazardly and disregarded the fact that Arabic equivalents for some of these terms had already been well established. Al-Mozainy disagrees with this approach, as he believes that some of these terms have been firmly established in Arabic for a considerable period (Al-Mozainy, 2000, p. 173).

This criticism suggests that Kibbeh's translation might have deviated from established conventions and terminology, leading to potential confusion or inconsistency in rendering the concepts of the original text. Al-Mozainy contends that there are already recognized and accepted translations for certain terms, implying that Kibbeh's departure from these established translations contributes to the terminological disorder in the translation.

In his review, Al-Mozainy (2000) thoroughly examines various instances of unconventional translations employed by the translator of the work. He delves into specific examples to highlight the non-standard approaches taken in rendering certain linguistic terms or expressions into Arabic.

Al-Mozainy highlights specific instances where Kibbeh's translation choices deviated from the expected or accepted translations.

For instance, Kibbeh translated the term "anthropology" as "sociology" (*'ilm al-āijimā'*) (p. 22-23.), which Al-Mozainy finds unusual and potentially confusing. Similarly, the term "analogy" was translated as (*tašbīh or qīās*) meaning "similarity" (p.70), whereas the more appropriate translation would be "comparison" or "analogical reasoning." The term "phonology" was translated as (*ṣawāḥib*) "phonological" (p. 14), which is not in line with the expected translation, as (*ṣiwāḥib*) which refers to the study of speech sounds, not an adjective form.

Al-Mozainy also points out that Kibbeh's translation includes phrases like "phonological level" and "phonological structure", whereas the standard translation would be "phonetic level" and "phonetic structure." Moreover, Al-Mozainy mentions that "phonology" has distinct terms such as "functional sounds" and "phonemes", which were not properly rendered in Al-Mozainy's translation.

Al-Mozainy's critique emphasizes the significance of precise and consistent translation in specialized fields. It highlights the crucial role of accurate translation in effectively conveying ideas and maintaining clarity for readers. In specialized subjects like linguistics, where precise terminology is essential, meticulous attention to translation is vital to ensure the accurate transmission of concepts and facilitate understanding.

Among other observations made in this regard is that "there are terms that he did not translate with corresponding terms; instead, he just described them; for example: pitch and stress, which he translated as (*nağma' al-ṣawāḥib*) *dāt al-*

*mağzā al-dilālī*) meaning "tones of sound with semantic meaning" (p. 15). Another instance is the translation of "discovery methods" as (*asālīb al-āiktišāf*) meaning "discovery procedures" (p. 26), which does not accurately convey the intended meaning. The term should be rendered as (*iğrā'āt al-āiktišāf*) meaning "procedural methods," referring to specific techniques employed by linguists to analyze language (ibid., p. 174).

Furthermore, in addition to not adhering to familiar terminology, Kibbeh's work lacks consistency in his use of terms throughout his translation. While he may initially choose a specific Arabic term to correspond to a particular English term, he often switches to a different Arabic term when mentioning the same English term later on. For example, he translates "linguistic theory" as (*al-lisānīāt*, or *'ilm al-luġati*, or *al-nazarīāt al-luġawīah* or *al-'a'māl al-naḥwīah*). He also inconsistently uses different terms for "grammar" throughout the translation, sometimes using (*al-qawā'idu*) and other times using an alternative term which is (*al-naḥwu*) to correspond syntax.

Additionally, Al-Mozainy (2000) criticizes the literal translation of certain terms employed by Kibbeh, which can result in a loss of nuance and precision.

An agreement of opinion is found between Al-Mozainy and Mazen Al-Waar regarding the terminological problem in Kibbeh's translation. Al-Waar (1989) says: "I do not exaggerate if I say: This is what the translator<sup>8</sup> had called for, but he did not fully achieve it in his translated book, because we find that the English linguistic term has more than one corresponding term in the Arabic language. For instance, the English term (Linguistics) has more than one corresponding term in Arabic: it can be translated either as "al-lisānīāt") or as "'ilm al-luġati" (Al-Waar, 1989: 267-268)<sup>9</sup>.

An agreement of opinion regarding the terminological problem in Kibbeh's translation is evident between Al-Mozainy and Al-Waar. Al-Waar (1989) asserts that although Kibbeh emphasized the need for addressing this issue, he did not fully succeed in achieving it in his translation. Al-Waar further explains that English linguistic terms often have multiple corresponding terms in Arabic. For example, the English term "Linguistics" can be translated as either "al-lisānīāt" or "'ilm al-luġati" in Arabic (Al-Waar, 1989: 267-268). This observation is supported by illustrations taken from the translated texts within the book itself.

#### 4.2. Translation, Modernity, and the illusion of conflict with heritage

Linguistics, being a modern academic discipline, is not exempt from the ongoing conflict between the past and the present, commonly known as the clash between authenticity and modernity. As highlighted by Al-Jabiri (1994), this conflict has been a central and significant issue in Arab thought.

The roots of this civilizational conflict, as widely recognized, can be traced back to the early stages of the Renaissance. Linguistic studies, in particular, have been greatly impacted by this conflict due to various considerations relating to religion, language, and nationalism. Consequently, linguists have found themselves immersed in these complex issues, each approaching them from their unique standpoint.

Hence, it comes as no surprise to observe a significant influence and presence of the occidental culture in some of the examined books. Translating a modern linguistics book may be perceived by some as a departure from the knowledge of past scholars and an embrace of modernity. In light of this, Khalil, in his introduction to the translation of Lyons' book entitled *Chomsky*, strives to dispel any confusion by clarifying his intentions behind the translation. He states:

"I want to make it clear that I do not intend to advocate for turning our backs on or disregarding the linguistic heritage left by traditional Arab scholars. Rather, my objective with this translation is twofold: firstly, to promote awareness of the Arabic linguistic heritage, and secondly, to shed light on the contemporary scientific advancements that have taken place in the field of language studies from the beginning of this century until today. In fact, this is a call that has already been embraced by both academics and non-academics before me". (Lyons, 1970/1985, p. 7)

It is important to highlight that Khalil's translation holds a significant historical significance as one of the earliest translations of a Generative linguistic work into Arabic. The publication of Khalil's work took place during a period characterized by an ongoing conflict between traditionalists and modernists. In this context, Khalil aimed to maintain a sense of impartiality and moderation in his presentation of views, as evident in the following quotation:

"In my view, the key lies in understanding and assimilating the realities of Arab heritage and its origins, in comparison to the realities and origins of Western culture. It is evident that the present is built upon the past, and that there can be no originality without an active and interactive engagement with modernity". (ibid., p.8)

The topic of comparison between Chomsky's framework and Arabic traditional grammar indeed surfaces in the books under study. However, it can be argued that such comparisons may be deemed irrelevant when introducing a translated book. This is because they have the potential to divert the reader's attention from the actual objectives of the translation and engage them in a fruitless debate.

Instead, the focus of a translation should primarily be on conveying the content and ideas of the original work in a clear and accurate manner, allowing the reader to directly engage with the arguments and ideas presented in the book. While acknowledging the existence of different linguistic frameworks and traditions can be important in certain contexts, it is essential to ensure that such comparisons do not overshadow the primary purpose of the translation, which is to facilitate understanding and promote the dissemination of knowledge.

By maintaining a clear focus on the objectives of the translation and avoiding unnecessary digressions, the reader can more effectively engage with the translated text and benefit from the ideas presented within it.

In his introduction, Khalil reiterated the claim that Chomsky was influenced by Arabic grammar and raised the question of whether Chomsky had studied and learned about Arabic grammar in the same way he did with Hebrew grammar. Khalil expressed his belief that there is no need to ponder or doubt the answer to this question, as Chomsky himself had affirmed the idea of Arabic grammar's influence.

By making this assertion, Khalil highlights the potential connection between Chomsky's linguistic framework and Arabic grammar. It suggests that Chomsky's understanding and analysis of language structures may have been influenced by his exposure to and knowledge of Arabic grammar, similar to his study of Hebrew grammar.

This observation by Khalil indicates the significance of Arabic grammar within the broader field of linguistics and its potential contribution to the development of linguistic theories. It adds an additional perspective to the study of Chomsky's work and its relationship to various linguistic traditions, including Arabic grammar<sup>10</sup>.

The introduction to this issue often includes references to the perceived historical superiority and precedence of Arab scholars in certain scientific matters. Kibbeh's introduction serves as a notable example of this perspective, as he concludes by emphasizing:

“Through this statement, I aim to highlight the remarkable achievements of Arabic grammarians many centuries ago, which are now being sought after by modern linguistic theories in the Western world. For instance, the rules of deletion, addition, inclusion, delay, and the concept of ellipses in syntax are just a few examples of the rules deeply embedded in the Arabic language. It is highly plausible, and this is my personal belief, that Chomsky drew upon the principles of his transformational grammar from Arabic, most probably through his study of Hebrew during his doctoral research”.

It is interesting to observe that although Al-Waar acknowledges the claim regarding Chomsky's potential influence from Arabic linguistic heritage, he paradoxically criticizes Kibba for expressing a similar viewpoint. Al-Waar even goes so far as to consider this perspective as dangerous. The reasons behind Al-Waar's contradictory stance and his perception of this view as problematic are not explicitly mentioned, but it highlights the diverse interpretations and debates surrounding the influence of Arabic linguistic heritage on Chomsky's work<sup>11</sup>.

This discrepancy in Al-Waar's stance is easily discernible, as he seems to hold a contradictory position regarding the influence of Arabic on Chomsky's work. It is important to approach such discussions with an open mind, recognizing that the relationship between different linguistic traditions and their impact on modern linguistic theories is a complex and multifaceted topic. (cf. Al-Waar, 1989, p. 269).

Al-Waar offers a critical perspective on Kibbeh's view, suggesting that it requires an earnest and sincere discussion. He raises concerns that if this viewpoint is left unchallenged, Arab readers might mistakenly conclude that Transformational Generative Grammar is merely a replica of Arabic grammar and that Chomsky made no significant contributions to the field, except for incorporating certain technical aspects from modern sciences. (Al-Waar, 1989, p. 173).

The fact that Khalil and Kibbeh raised the issue of the influence Arabic grammar tradition on Chomsky does not reflect their complete conviction. However, a portion of doubt lingers within them, particularly evident in Khalil's use of an exclamation mark following his statement: "Did this knowledge of the Arab heritage affect his [viz. Chomsky] scientific formation, and then appeared directly or indirectly in his linguistic theory?" The scientific justifications behind this inquiry make it worthy of study and further research (Lyons, 1970/1987, p. 13). Similarly, Kibbeh believes this assumption to require rigorous scrutiny, investigation, and analysis. Nevertheless, he acknowledges the excellence of Chomsky's contributions, stating:

However, this assumption still requires substantiation and thorough examination. Chomsky undeniably introduced a mathematical dimension to grammar, presenting it in a contemporary manner by drawing on his expertise in mathematics and modern science (Lyons, 1970/1987, p. 6).

The translator's decision to include this topic can be attributed to its significant importance, irrespective of any doubts or disagreements surrounding it.

Utilizing terminology related to heritage or referencing heritage is not a mere rejection; instead, it represents a pursuit of

justice by demonstrating an understanding of the theoretical and methodological foundations for interpretation. This sentiment is emphasized by Rahhali in his introduction to the translation of Chomsky's book, where he states:

The purpose of this approach is twofold. Firstly, it emphasizes that the reference to heritage in the context of linguistic analysis should not be driven by ethnic, sectarian, or dogmatic considerations. Instead, it should be approached from an epistemological perspective, recognizing it as part of humanity's intellectual heritage. Chomsky, as a cosmopolitan figure, contributed to addressing the contemporary needs and challenges of his time. Hence, Arabo-Islamic scholars did not hesitate to draw upon the heritage of civilizations such as the Greek, Persian, and Indian civilizations.

Secondly, the return to heritage should not be a shallow or misguided endeavor. It should involve a purposeful engagement with the past, not merely for the sake of retrieving something, but to derive valuable insights and wisdom. This approach warrants admiration and appreciation (Chomsky, 1966/2020, p. 12).

This cautious observation is justified because while achieving psychological reassessment is important, it alone lacks cognitive value. Engaging in this kind of relationship with heritage can foster a false belief that past accomplishments can be easily reproduced without considering the historical context, accumulated knowledge, and developmental processes involved. It is essential to approach the exploration of heritage with a critical mindset that takes into account the complexities and dynamics of linguistic development. Therefore, it becomes crucial to review and reinterpret heritage based on modern theoretical and epistemological principles accepted by the scientific community. This should be done in alignment with the problems and needs of our present societies.

Revisiting heritage allows us to explore how past generations addressed the issues that concern us today. By studying the theories and methodologies they employed to solve these problems, we gain valuable insights into their horizons and limitations. This examination helps us deepen our understanding of contemporary concerns and offers potential avenues for further exploration.

Hence, the utilization of heritage is most beneficial when undertaken by individuals who possess the cognitive capacity to delve beyond its surface level. It requires a deep understanding of the historical, cultural, and linguistic context in order to critically analyze and interpret the significance and relevance of heritage in contemporary contexts. These individuals can derive true benefits from heritage within an intellectual framework that values reason, free will, and creativity as fundamental attributes that set the human race apart (Chomsky, 1966/2020, p. 12).

Rahhali (2020) provides insightful commentary on this matter, raising a thought-provoking question. If Chomsky had encountered scholars such as Sibawayhi, Al-Farabi, Ibn Al-Haytham, or other Arab/Islamic intellectuals, would he have been contenting with the knowledge he already possessed? Would he have remained neutral when faced with the challenges, knowledge, and sciences of his time? Or would he have engaged in analysis, understanding, and creative development by building upon the foundation of advanced science through translation, explanation, commentary, and innovation, as these scholars had done before him? (Chomsky, 1966/2020, p. 12, footnote 15).

In the context of this type of relationship with heritage, we may fall into the illusion that we can easily replicate past achievements without considering the significance of history, accumulated knowledge, and developmental processes. Rahhali's remark highlights the importance of recognizing the intellectual contributions of previous scholars and understanding the depth of their engagement with their respective eras.

In a collection of his writings and translations, Al-Mozainy extensively explores the topic of the Arabic linguistic heritage and its connection to linguistics, focusing particularly on the discussions surrounding the impact of Arab Grammatical tradition on Chomsky<sup>12</sup>. The aim is to establish two key points:

The first point to establish is that the similarities between generative grammar and the grammatical traditions of Arabic are not exclusive to the Arabic language alone. While Arabic grammar has often been highlighted in discussions of generative grammar due to its rich and well-documented tradition, it is important to recognize that there are similarities between generative grammar and other grammatical traditions as well.

Generative grammar shares certain theoretical and analytical principles with various linguistic traditions worldwide, reflecting the commonalities and universals found in human language. Therefore, the exploration of these similarities should extend beyond Arabic to encompass a broader cross-linguistic perspective, fostering a more comprehensive understanding of generative grammar's connections and influences across different languages and cultures.

It is incorrect to assume that these similarities do not exist in other ancient and modern civilizations. In fact, numerous aspects of various civilizations, both ancient and modern, encompass ideas that bear resemblance to generative grammar.

The second aspect to address is the assertion that, given the existence of similarities between non-Arabic aspects and generative grammar, it is necessary to establish that Chomsky was aware of these other influences (Chomsky,



In order to respond to the questions raised, efforts were made to demonstrate that many ideas shared between Arabic grammatical tradition and generative grammar can also be found in other domains. It was emphasized that these areas were within the scientific and cultural sphere in which Chomsky was immersed during his formative years. Chomsky himself acknowledged that he had encountered some of these influences and openly acknowledged their impact (ibidem).

In summary, our investigation of the terminological aspect of the books under consideration leads us to conclude that the terminological choices made in some of these translations (specifically, Khalil, Rahhali, and Al-Mozainy) have been successful. These translations exhibit a high level of alignment with the linguistic frameworks and proposals utilized by numerous researchers, including Arab linguists. The translators have demonstrated a keen understanding of the relevant terminology and have effectively conveyed the intended meaning within the target language. However, it is important to note that this level of success has not consistently been achieved in the other translations. In those cases, there may be discrepancies and inconsistencies in the use of terminology, which can hinder accurate understanding and interpretation of the original concepts.

One of our observations regarding the texts in these translations is that some of them lack a clear reference to the criteria upon which the choices are based when adopting a term or preferring one term over another. And even if such references exist, the focus is often on one or two terms only, especially those mentioned in the title of the translated book, without considering other aspects.

## 5. More miscellaneous deficiencies

Among the other observations that led us to track the translation strategies in the translated texts is the variation in mechanisms for transferring and rephrasing linguistic knowledge. One of the most significant points we note in this context is that some of these translations have adopted rigorous scientific approaches that demonstrate an awareness of the importance of translation and its role in establishing linguistic knowledge. On the other hand, some of them have appeared to be casual about the matter, resulting in a lack of coherence in many aspects.

The cumulative findings did not yield the desired wealth of linguistic knowledge. Instead, they resulted in a dryness in the formats of presenting and reformulating linguistic concepts. One evident manifestation of this discrepancy can be observed in the translation of book titles, which takes various forms (Soudani, 2018, p. 21), often resulting in a change in the original title, such as *naẓariāṭ tšūmskī al-lisāniāṭ*, *tšūmskī*, *ġūmskī*. This means that two titles were chosen for the first book, though no such discrepancy is found in the title of the translation of the second book: *al-lisāniāt al-dīkārtīa*.

One notable distinction among the translated texts is the presence or absence of certain content, both in terms of the actual text and the titles. An instance of content omission can be observed in Kibbeh's translation, where certain sections were left untranslated. These sections consisted of a comprehensive and precise discussion of generative grammatical rules using English sentences. Instead, Kibbeh opted to present examples from the Arabic language. However, it should be noted that he had initially promised to include English examples, analyze them, and provide them in the form of endnotes. Additionally, on page 66, around 14 lines were omitted without any explanation for their exclusion. (p. 80 in the English text, pp. 6-19 in the translated works) (Al-Mozainy, 2000, pp. 169-190).

The discrepancy is also evident in the author's name. The name "Chomsky" appears in various different forms, reflecting clear differences and the same applies to the book by Lyons, as it is written in two distinct forms.

Another aspect worthy of discussion is the specialization of translators. Transferring specialized knowledge from one language to another requires the involvement of a researcher who specializes in that particular field, utilizing modern techniques developed in the field of translation. Translation is not merely a process of transferring symbols and lexical terms from one language to another; it is the transmission of vibrant, intellectual thought after comprehending and internalizing it from one culture to another. This process considers all the elements that constitute these two cultures, making them comprehensible to others (Al-Waar, 1969, p. 261).

Upon revisiting the translated texts, it is evident that Khalil, Rahhali, and Al-Mozainy are affiliated with departments of Arabic, indicating their expertise in the Arabic language. On the other hand, Kibbeh is associated with a department of English, and Al-Obeidi and Al-Azzawi are part of a department of translation. It is worth considering that these affiliations may contribute to certain deficiencies observed in the various translations. The translators' disciplinary backgrounds and areas of expertise can influence their understanding of the source text and their ability to convey its nuances accurately in the target language. Therefore, differences in translation quality and approach may be attributed, at least in part, to the specific backgrounds and disciplinary orientations of the translators.



## 6. Conclusion

The reader may indeed draw the conclusion that the identified flaws in these translated works highlight the importance of having a translator who is well-versed in linguistics. It suggests that translating works in the field of linguistics requires a deep understanding of linguistic concepts and theories. However, it is important to note that translation competence goes beyond expertise in a specific discipline. While knowledge of linguistics is undoubtedly valuable, it is not the sole determinant of translation quality. Translation competence also encompasses proficiency in translation theories, techniques, and strategies, as well as linguistic proficiency in both the source and target languages. The ideal translator for a specialized field like linguistics would ideally possess a combination of linguistic expertise and translation skills to effectively convey the complex ideas and nuances of the source text to the target language audience<sup>13</sup>. Some linguists while working on translation linked theory to practice. Hence, they experienced this close relationship<sup>14</sup>...

As mentioned earlier, our goal is firstly to document the linguistic research history in the Arab context, focusing on one important aspect, which is translation. Second, we seek to shed light on some aspects of the deficiencies we observed, as a prerequisite for achieving the desired goal of translation in certain texts of the books under consideration. This aspect can greatly contribute to enhancing future translation works, while waiting for the availability of a theoretical model that may not be accepted by everyone but can still be essential. However, such a scenario remains unlikely due to the adoption of theoretical frameworks in translation that are based on conflicting ideologies (Bannour, 2013, p. 109).

We do not deny the importance of the accumulated works in translation; but at the same time, we call for more efforts. The establishment of organizations and centers concerned with translation in the Arab world does not mean at all that we have found a solution to the problems of translation. Because these institutions need decision-making compulsory, institutional authority is the result of clear language policy and language planning. The most important problems raised in this analysis remain in the multiplicity of translations of a single text, and this raises more than one question when we evoke the absence of translation of standard sources in linguistics such as Bloomfield's book entitled *Language* or the works of Edward Sapir, Harris, Nida, Hockett, Trager, Wells and other poles of the structural school of linguistics.

Saussure's '*Course in General Linguistics*' remained untranslated into Arabic until the mid-1980s. When it was finally translated, it appeared in various textual formats, some of which were widely accepted, while others faced rejection (Alaoui, 2018). Similarly, translations of works by Trubetsky, Jakobson, Hjelmslev, Benveniste, and other structural linguists are yet to be undertaken.

The linguistic contributions of these individuals remain largely unknown, as only introductory fragments are available that do not provide a comprehensive understanding of their ideas without access to their original texts. To address this gap, it is crucial to develop an Arab plan or comprehensive work program dedicated to translating the foundational works in linguistics into the Arabic language. This would enable Arabic-speaking scholars and researchers to engage directly with the ideas and theories put forth by these pioneers and founders.

### Acknowledgment:

*We would like to thank professors Alghazi Mohamed, Murtadha Jawad Bakir Hamza Al-Mozainy for their help in reading this article and reviewing it.*

### Conflicts of Interest Statement

*The authors certify that they have NO affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs) in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.*

### References

<sup>1</sup> Here, we focus on works that are related to the pioneer of the theory, Noam Chomsky, whether through his own writings as an author or through works written about him as a subject of research.

<sup>2</sup> We have focused on methodological and technical aspects since investigating the content of translations would require a more extensive critical analysis of the translations themselves and their origins. This broader discussion goes beyond the scope of our current conversation.

<sup>3</sup> We will refer to some aspects related to language and style based on the critical readings that focused on reviewing some texts of the studied blog.

<sup>4</sup> Translation by Helmy Khalil was published by Dar Al-Ma'arifah Al-Jame'iyyah, Alexandria, in 1985. It is possible that the translation of Chomsky's book, "Aspects of the Theory of Syntax", preceded this translation. The book itself does not have a publication date, but the translator's introduction is dated 1983. This was confirmed to us by the translator of the book, Murtadha Jawad Bakir. The translation was published in 1985, and there is a reference to the deposit number in the National Library found on the last page of the book. However, the date mentioned in the introduction (1983) refers to the date when the written draft was sent to the publisher, who then sent the book to two reviewers before sending it to the printing press. The book was part of a program initiated by the University of Basra, inviting its professors to translate what they deemed important within their respective fields (personal communication, May 4, 2022).

<sup>5</sup> He says, "As for the book in our hands, it is a translation of the second edition, which was published in 1977. It is an expanded and revised edition of the first edition, which was published in 1970". This is evident in the significant difference in the number of pages between each version of the book.

<sup>6</sup> We have not found any indication of Helmy Khalil's translation, and I think that the author has done with his own translation before knowing about Khalil's one. Especially that the second translation was achieved in 1405 AH-1985 AD.

<sup>7</sup> It is most likely that the translators relied on the first edition of the book, which explains the absence of the eighth and ninth chapters. Another indication of their reliance on the first edition is their decision to confine themselves to the introductory section of that edition, titling it "Prelude." Additionally, the translated version consists of eight chapters instead of nine. All of this confirms the reliance on the edition published in 1970 by Viking Press, which did not include the chapter titled "Contemporary Developments of the Chomskyan Schools" added by the author to the second edition of the book, which was translated by Hilmy Khalil.

<sup>8</sup> He refers here to what Kibbeh mentioned in his presentation of the translation.

<sup>9</sup> Al-Mozainy and Al-Waar made other observations on the translation of Kibbeh (1987), which in many places needs a new formulation, and they summarized these defects in poor style, errors in translation, and grammatical errors. Al-Mozainy, 2000, pp. 176-177-186), and the two reviewers pointed out some positive aspects of the translation itself.

<sup>10</sup> He is referring here to a saying attributed to Chomsky, which was cited by Al-Waar in an interview with Chomsky. According to the citation, Chomsky claimed that.

<sup>11</sup> Mazen Al-Waar attempted to verify the influence of Arabic linguistic heritage on Chomsky's work by referring to an interview he conducted with Ahmed Moutaouakil in Rabat. According to Al-Waar, Moutaouakil claimed to have communicated with Chomsky and sent him his thesis, which Chomsky acknowledged. However, these claims have generated significant confusion and numerous allegations. To shed light on these matters and ascertain the truth behind these allegations, one can turn to Hamza Al-Mozainy's presentation of the book, "The Origins of Generative Grammar as Chomsky Sees It". Al-Mozainy's work provides insights into the alleged lies and fabrications surrounding Chomsky and his contributions.

<sup>12</sup> See his introduction to the book "New" and his introduction to the book about *Chomsky*. He dedicated a lengthy introduction to this subject and responded to many claims and allegations through his direct communication with Chomsky, who refuted them all.

<sup>13</sup> See the relationship of theory to application in translation: (Eugene, 1964) (Eugene, 1969).

<sup>14</sup> On this issue see (Jakobson, 1959) (Snyder, 1994).

#### المراجع العربية

- [1] أبو بكر، رشيد. (1982). استخدام التحويلات النحوية في دراسة اللغة العربية، المجلة العربية للدراسات اللغوية، س1، ع1.
- [2] بنور، عبد الرزاق. (2013). *رواسب في الترجمة*، (ط1). دار الغرب للنشر والتوزيع، الجزائر.
- [3] تشومسكي، د. نعم. (2002). *معرفة اللغة*، (ط1). ترجمة: محي الدين حميدي. دار الزهراء للنشر والتوزيع، الرياض.
- [4] تشومسكي، نعم. (1987). *البنيات التركيبية*، ترجمة: مصطفى كمال. مجلة بيت الحكمة المغربية، الدار البيضاء، ع6، س2.
- [5] تشومسكي، نعم. (1987). *مظاهر البنيات التركيبية*، ترجمة: مصطفى كمال. مجلة بيت الحكمة المغربية، الدار البيضاء، المغرب، ع6، س2.
- [6] تشومسكي، نعم. (1993). *اللغة والعقل: مساهمات لسانية في دراسة العقل*، (ط1). ترجمة: إبراهيم مشروح ومصطفى خلال. مراکش.

- [7] تشومسكي، نعوم. (2005). *آفاق جديدة في دراسة اللغة والذهن*، ترجمة: حمزة بن قبالان المزيني، القاهرة، المشروع القومي للترجمة.
- [8] تشومسكي، نعوم. (2009). *آفاق جديدة في دراسة اللغة والعقل*، (ط1). ترجمة: عدنان حسن، اللاذقية.
- [9] تشومسكي، نعوم. (2012). *اللسانيات الديكارتية: فصل من تاريخ الفكر العقلاني*، ترجمة: حمزة بن قبالان المزيني، عمان، دار كنوز المعرفة.
- [10] تشومسكي، نعوم. (2020). *أصول النحو التوليدي كما يراها تشومسكي- مقدمة كتاب النبية المنطقية للنظرية اللسانية*، (ط1)، ترجمة وتقديم حمزة بن قبالان المزيني. كنوز المعرفة، عمان.
- [11] تشومسكي، نعوم. (2020). *اللسانيات الديكارتية*، (ط1). ترجمة: محمد الرحالي. الطبعة الأولى، دار الكتاب الجديد المتحدة، بيروت.
- [12] تشومسكي، نعوم. (2022). *اللسانيات الديكارتية: فصل من تاريخ الفكر العقلاني*، نعوم تشومسكي، ترجمة حمزة بن قبالان المزيني، عمان، دار كنوز المعرفة.
- [13] تشومسكي، نوم. (1993). *المعرفة اللغوية، طبيعتها، وأصولها، واستخدامها*، (ط1). ترجمة: وتعليق وتقديم محمد فتوح. القاهرة.
- [14] الجابري، محمد عابد. (1994). *الخطاب العربي المعاصر، دراسة تحليلية نقدية*، (ط5). مركز دراسات الوحدة العربية، بيروت.
- [15] جومسكي، نعوم. (1996). *اللغة والعقل*، (ط1). ترجمة: بدياء علي العلكاوي، مراجعة سلمان داود الواسطي. دار الشؤون الثقافية العامة، وزارة الثقافة والإعلام، بغداد.
- [16] جومسكي، نعوم. (د.ت). *جوانب من نظرية النحو*، (د.ط). ترجمة: مرتضى جواد باقر. وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي، جامعة البصرة، بغداد.
- [17] الحباشة، صابر. (2012). موازنة بين ترجمتين عربيتين لكتاب تشومسكي آفاق جديدة لدراسة اللغة والفكر، العربية والترجمة، بيروت، مج4، ع10.
- [18] زكريا، ميشال. (1983). *الألسنية التوليدية والتحويلية وقواعد اللغة العربية*، (ط1). المؤسسة الجامعية للدراسات والنشر والتوزيع، بيروت.
- [19] السوداني، حسين. (2018). ترجمة المصطلح وتوطين اللسانيات، مثال الترجمات العربية الخمس لدروس فردينان دي سوسير، مجلة اللسانيات العربية، ع 7. 02.6-57. [https://kaica.org.sa/links/emags/lesaneyat\\_02.6-57](https://kaica.org.sa/links/emags/lesaneyat_02.6-57)
- [20] شومسكي، نعوم. (1987). *البنى النحوية*، (ط1). ترجمة: يؤيل يوسف عزيز. مراجعة مجيد الماشطة، وزارة الثقافة والإعلام العراق، بغداد.
- [21] صالح، فخري. (2007). *آفاق النظرية الأدبية المعاصرة: بنوية أم بنيويات*، (ط1). المؤسسة العربية للدراسات والنشر، بيروت.
- [22] علوي، إسماعيلي حافظ. (2009). *اللسانيات في الثقافة العربية المعاصرة*، (ط1). دار الكتاب الجديد المتحدة، بيروت.
- [23] غلفان، مصطفى. (د.ت). *اللسانيات في الثقافة العربية الحديثة*، سلسلة رسائل وأطروحات رقم 4، جامعة الحسن الثاني، الدار البيضاء.
- [24] لاينز، جون. (2001). *جومسكي*، (ط1). ترجمة: بدياء العبيدي ونغم العزاوي، دار الشؤون الثقافية العامة، وزارة الثقافة والإعلام بغداد.
- [25] ليونز، جون. (1985). *نظرية تشومسكي اللغوية*، (ط1). ترجمة: حلمي خليل. دار المعرفة الجامعية، الإسكندرية.
- [26] ليونز، جون. (1987). *تشومسكي*، (ط1). ترجمة: محمد زياد كبة، النادي الأدبي، الرياض.
- [27] المزيني، حمزة بن قبالان. (2000). *مراجعات لسانية*، ج1، (ط2). سلسلة كتاب الرياض، العدد 79، الرياض.
- [28] المسدي، عبد السلام. (1989). *مراجع اللسانيات*، (ط1). دار العربية للكتاب، تونس.
- [29] الميساوي، خليفة. (2015). *المصطلح اللساني وتأسيس المفهوم*، (ط2). منشورات ضفاف، بيروت.
- [30] الوعر، مازن. (1989). *دراسات لسانية تطبيقية*، (ط1). دار طلاس للدراسات والترجمة والنشر، دمشق.

## References

- [31] Chomsky, N. (1955). *The Logical Structure of Linguistic*. Springer.
- [32] Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- [33] Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- [34] Chomsky, N. (1966). *Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought*. New York: Harper and Row.
- [35] Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- [36] Chomsky, N. (1986). *Language and Mind*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- [37] Chomsky, N. (2000). *New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [38] Lyons, J. (1970). *Noam Chomsky*. Viking Press.

- 
- [39] Lyons, J. (1987). Chomsky (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Translation: Muhammad Ziyad Qabah. Al-Nadi al-Adabi, Riyadh.
- [40] Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- [41] Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E. J. Brill.