

THE AGENCY OF THE TRANSLATOR:  
KHALIL BAYDAS' LITERARY TRANSLATIONS

by

Spencer Dan Scoville

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements of the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Near Eastern Studies)  
in the University of Michigan  
2012

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Anton Shammas, Chair  
Professor Alexander Knysh  
Associate Professor Carol Bardenstein  
Associate Professor Olga Maiorova

Dedicated to Karina and William.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Portions of my research for this dissertation were funded through the generous support of the Palestinian American Research Council. I am also grateful to the Sweetland Writing Center at the University of Michigan, at which I participated in a summer dissertation writing seminar. I would like to thank the members of my committee for their support, insight, and patience throughout this process.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Abstract	v
Part One: Contexts	1
Chapter One. Influence and Translation in Comparative Literature and the Arabic <i>Nahḍah</i>	2
Chapter Two. Russian/Arab Cultural Connections through the 19 <sup>th</sup> century	45
Part Two: Texts	86
Chapter Three. Translating Nationalism: Khalil Baydas' translation of Pushkin's <i>Kapitanskaia     Dochka</i>	87
Chapter Four. <i>Shaqā' al-Mulūk</i> : educating a new nation	126
Chapter Five. <i>Kniaz' Serebriannyi</i> : on translating history, fictional and otherwise	160
Conclusion	195
Bibliography	201

## ABSTRACT

The Agency of the Translator: Khalil Baydas' literary translations

by

Spencer Dan Scoville

Chair: Anton Shammās

This dissertation examines the translation practice of Khalil Baydas (1875-1949), Palestinian writer, translator, and journalist. Baydas translated dozens of novels and short stories from Russian into Arabic. Literary translation made up a large part of Arabic literature published during the *nahḍah*, the Arab literary renaissance of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, these translations are dismissed because they often drift far from their source texts. This practice, known as *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf*, acknowledges the alterations that the translator makes while translating. Using the translation theory of Lawrence Venuti, this dissertation works to read the space between the translation and the translated text in a new way. Rather than comparing the two texts to measure the fidelity of the translation, this dissertation focuses on the choices that Baydas makes as a translator. In each text considered, we see distinct patterns in the changes that Baydas makes to the source text. To contextualize these decisions, I pair each translation discussed with a selection of

articles from Baydas' journal *al-nafa'is al-'asriyyah* that treat those topics that shape his decisions as a translator.

I pair close readings of three of Baydas' novel-length translations with selections from the nonfiction articles from his literary journal *al-nafa'is al-'asriyyah* that contextualize the decisions that Baydas makes in each of his translations. I pair my reading of Baydas' translation of Alexander Pushkin's *Captain's Daughter* with the articles he published on national identity, a complicated question for Arabs living in the Ottoman Empire. Next, I read the alterations that Baydas makes in Marie Corelli's novel *Temporal Power* together with the articles he published on education in *al-nafa'is*. Finally, I discuss Baydas' translation of Aleksei Tolstoy's *Prince Serebrianiy*. Using Georg Lukacs' theories of the relationship between historical fiction and national identity, I examine the ways in which Baydas manipulates history in his fiction and nonfiction. In each case, the connections between Baydas' alterations to his source texts and the nonfiction articles that he publishes show how deliberate and disciplined his translation practice was, opening the door for a new consideration of the place of translation in the development of modern Arabic literature.

## **PART ONE: CONTEXTS**

## CHAPTER ONE

### **Influence and Translation in Comparative Literature and the Arabic *Nahḍah***

The aim of this dissertation is twofold—to reexamine the role of translated literature in the development of modern Arabic literature, and to begin an exploration of Russian/Arab literary relations in the years leading up to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. It is the first critical exploration of the Russian-Arab cultural exchange that took place in the Levant in the years leading up to World War One. This dissertation builds on the available historical accounts of Russian activity in the region to begin a critical exploration of the literary texts and trends that came out of connections between Arab intellectuals and Russian culture. These texts include translations of Russian literature, translations of British and French literature (translated from Russian translations), and also a significant body of original poetry, fiction, and non-fiction—primarily essays, summaries of international news, and profiles of important individuals from Russian history—that also comes out of these cultural contacts.

As a preliminary step into reintegrating this piece of Arabic literary history into the larger historiography, this dissertation focuses on the work of Khalil Baydas (1874-1949), one of the earliest Arab translators to work extensively with Russian sources. A native of Nazareth, Baydas studied and taught in the schools operated by the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society (IOPS), then went on to have a broad impact on Arabic literature as a translator, journal editor (he owned and edited an early Palestinian literary



journal, *al-nafā'is al-‘aşriyyah*), and public intellectual. He first published his journal out of Haifa, but transferred its offices to Jerusalem when he accepted a position on a local council in that city. In this dissertation, I have chosen to foreground his work as a translator in order to highlight the connections between his translation practice and the issues and concerns of the *nahḍah*, or Arab literary renaissance.

Focusing on Baydas’ translations also provides the opportunity to undertake the second major task of this dissertation—the reappraisal of literary translation during the *nahḍah*. Literary histories of the period have an ambivalent attitude towards translation—while it is recognized as an important catalyst for the rapid developments that took place in Arabic literature during the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, both Arab and Western critics dismiss it as being less literary than the original works that were produced later.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, very little scholarly work done on the translated texts produced during the *nahḍah* takes full advantage of the tools and insights of translation theory to explore the complex translation practices of *nahḍawi* translators.<sup>2</sup> The close readings of Baydas’ translations and translation practices at the heart of this dissertation are a first step in uncovering the wealth of information available to us in these neglected translations. In each case, the translated text provides extra insight into the issues that were filling the pages of *al-nafā'is al-‘aşriyyah* and the many other similar journals that defined the Arabic literary scene in the years leading up to World War One.

\* \* \* \* \*

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, the treatment of translated literature in the work of ‘abd al-Muhsin Taha Badr, Matti Moosa, and Pierre Cachia, to name a few.

<sup>2</sup> Recent literary scholarship by professors Samah Selim and Shaden Tageldin represent notable exceptions to this trend, and have begun to lay the foundation for future work in this field. Their work will be discussed at length in the chapters to follow.

“If a person Arabicized (*‘arraba*) a European novel, carrying across (*naqala*) its meanings into an eloquent and impeccable (*faṣīḥah*) Arabic idiom, which does not create the impression that it has been Arabicized (*ta’rīb*), and took liberties (*taṣarrafa*) with the novel as he saw fit, but left the historical events and the proper nouns unchanged (for Arabic names if used in such novels are like a patch made of *alāgah* [traditional Egyptian striped cloth] in a garment made of taffeta), in short, if he read a European (*ifranjiyyah*) novel and adapted it, and wrote it down to the best of his linguistic abilities, using Arabic proverbs, spicing it up with verse, and using the idioms of the Arabs and their modes of expression, then what should his work be called—An Arabicization (*ta’rīb*)? A composition (*taṣnīf*)? Or what?” (*al-hilāl* 1895 61)

In 1895, the Egyptian journal *al-hilāl* (1892-present) printed the above letter, from a young Palestinian student, Khalil Baydas (1874?-1949). The letter deals with one of the central questions of the day, the translation of European literature, and is particularly rich in the way that it invokes the many nuances of translation in the colonial Arabic context. It is also the earliest evidence of Baydas’ involvement in theorizing literary translation, the work to which he would define his entire career. Over the course of his life, Baydas translated dozens of pieces of Russian literature into Arabic. Evaluations of his literary legacy are uneven—while Baydas is respected for the literary works he made available through his translations, he is also discounted as one whose literary skills never quite matched his literary ideals. This double-speak reflects the common discourse of literary historians on Arabic translation through the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, a period of rapid change known as the literary renaissance, or *nahḍah*. Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad scarcely finishes praising Baydas’ insights into the translation process when he begins criticizing Baydas’ actual translations, asking, “But to what degree was Baydas able to embody these characteristics that he described in his translations and original literary work?”<sup>3</sup> (57-58). The concern at the apparent disparity between Baydas’ theoretical sensitivities and his actual translation practice reflects the

<sup>3</sup> لكن إلى أي مدى استطاع أن يطبق ببس هذه الصفات – التي ذكرها في نتاجه القصصي المترجم والمؤلف؟

concerns of textual fidelity and accuracy so common to evaluations of translations before the rise of translation studies as a discipline in the past 40 years. Baydas respect for the process of translation is reflected in this early letter; we can sense his curiosity and concern with the process of translation. Over the course of this dissertation, it is my aim to examine his translation practice more closely to reconsider the standard dismissal of early Arabic translations of prose fiction. Close readings of Baydas' translations shows how this sensitivity informed his translation practice, and reflects the complexity of Arabic translation during the *nahḍah* that is so often dismissed in the literature on the period.

The question that Baydas poses in his letter shows how important issues of fidelity in translation were in his historical and literary context. In his question, he uses two different terms for translation: *naqala (naql)* and *'arraba (ta'rīb)*. He distinguishes between them, using *naqala* for simply conveying the meaning of a text from one language to another. Baydas explicitly links the process of *naql* to the meaning of the text, separate from the style in which it is expressed. He applies the term *'arraba* to the process of bringing an entire literary work into the Arabic context. The additional semantic value of *'arraba*, to arabize, colors the process of translation with adaptation and originality on the part of the translator. Rather than simply conveying the meaning of the words to the new audience, *ta'rīb* allows the translator to look past the surface level of the words to the stylistics and effects produced by the original text. Thus, *ta'rīb* allows the translator the freedom to fulfill Benjamin's task of the translator, capturing the intended effect of the text and reproducing it in the new linguistic/social environment.

Beyond the purely technical questions of critical terminology, Baydas expresses the reservations that would shape the development of the modern Arabic literary canon in the ensuing years. Despite the fact that he holds translation to be an important literary undertaking, Baydas joins with the prevailing critical discourse in placing translation in an inferior position. Translated works never escaped the secondary status that was put upon them from the beginning. As a noted translator, Baydas' comments also illustrate the questions that translators faced. He deals specifically with the same questions of domestication and foreignization that come to Lawrence Venuti from Friedrich Schleiermacher by way of Goethe.<sup>4</sup> In his case, however, Baydas faces not only the antagonistic literary establishment (the emerging elitist Arab authors) that Venuti decries, but the opposite side of the power equation created by colonial politics. Where Venuti seeks to disturb the powerful position of the language into which he translates (1995 20), Baydas is seeking for ways to empower his target language against the colonial idiom. Baydas valorizes the readable translation, the translation that does not "create the impression that it has been Arabicized" (61). Although Venuti decries such transparent translations as complicit in the domination of marginalized languages, in Baydas' case, the opposite is true. When Baydas describes a translated work as not giving "the sense of being a translation," it shows that the modernized stylistics were gaining wider acceptance. By the time Baydas wrote this letter, no translators were working to reproduce the rhetorical devices of classical Arabic literature in their translations, but rather wrote in something close to the straightforward prose predominant in European realist fiction of the time.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation*, chapter 1.

In answering Baydas' question, the editors of *al-hilāl* cite classical Arabic rhetoric that divides any text into two elements—the meaning (*al-ma'nā*) and the phrasing (*al-lafẓ*). They write that “Every book, indeed, every article or phrase needs two fundamental things in its publication: the meaning (*al-ma'nā*) and the expression (*al-lafẓ*). The meaning is original (*aṣlī*) and the phrasing is secondary (*'āriḍ*)” (62). Such a structure again agrees with Benjamin's preoccupation with the universal meaning that is communicated through language. The meaning can be communicated with equal effectiveness through different linguistic systems and remain the same. The phrasing, on the other hand, is subject to change, being an expression of the dictates of a given literary tradition. By citing this framework in *al-hilāl* the editors encourage the domesticating adaptation (*ta'rīb*) that would be criticized by later generations of scholars and writers.

As Ottoman rule began to give way to Western powers in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, life in the Levant (present-day Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Palestine, and Israel), life began to change rapidly. Foreign missionaries covered the region, founding schools and bringing new methods of education, new ideas into the local society. As would be expected, some of these ideas were quickly accepted, others prompted strong resistance from the local population. A new cohort of Western-educated men came to dominate the intellectual, political, and literary spheres of life in the area. While many were still tied to the traditionally powerful families that administered the affairs of the different principalities under Ottoman rule (like the Husaynis, the Nashashibis, the Bustanis, and others), they looked to Western culture and society with different eyes than their forefathers had done. The impact of this transformation colored every aspect of life in the Arab Levant. In the

literary sphere, it came to be known as the *nahḍah*, or literary renaissance—a time of renewal and rebirth, a reinvigoration of a literary tradition that had, in the eyes of the leading minds of the day, grown stagnant. This literary renaissance took place in a space that had not previously been available to Arab writers—the press. With the rise of print journalism and the explosion of literary periodicals in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, Arab authors and intellectuals suddenly had a powerful pulpit from which to proclaim their message of a new Arab national identity.<sup>5</sup>

The subject of this dissertation, Khalil Baydas, figured prominently on the literary scene in Palestine during the volatile period from 1900-1925. Baydas' life and career illustrate the confluence of journalism, literature, nationalism, and linguistic reform in the Arab *nahḍah* as it emerged in the Levant during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Most of the detailed information about his biography comes from Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad's brief biographical sketch entitled *muḥāḍarāt 'an khalīl baydas (Lectures on Khalil Baydas)*. The only first-hand account that we have of Baydas' life growing up comes from a brief interview Baydas gave to George Merenz, a Russian journalist that was published in a 1946 issue of *Literaturnaia Gazeta*.

Khalil Baydas was born in Nazareth in 1874 or 1875. His father was a wealthy merchant, a member of the Orthodox Christian community in the city. He insisted that his son study in the Russian seminary because “in those days, the Russian schools were the very best,”<sup>6</sup> as Baydas reported in his interview with Merenz. Baydas began his studies at

---

<sup>5</sup> This understanding of *nahḍawi* thought lines up very well with Benedict Anderson's emphasis on print capitalism in *Imagined Communities*, though the changes that I will focus on in this study are much more narrow, looking specifically at the ways in which journalism came together with translation to create new opportunities for authors and translators to experiment with new literary forms, particularly the short story and the novel.

<sup>6</sup> «В те далекие дни русские школы в Палестине безусловно были самыми лучшими.» (Merenz 27 April 1946)

the Russian Seminary in his hometown in 1888, and quickly became enamored with Russian culture. Baydas was clearly an exceptional student at the seminary, mastering Russian to a degree that was unusual for the students at the school at that time.<sup>7</sup> Of this experience, he said:

Scarcely had I learned to write, scarcely had I begun to understand every third word, then every other word, when I began to devour the Russian books that were collected in great numbers in our school library. With every book I read, the cloud that hid Russia from my understanding gradually lifted; what had been at first just a word became a country, then an idea, and finally a world—the only world in which I could live and breathe.<sup>8</sup>

Indeed, Baydas would inhabit the space between Russia and Palestine throughout the rest of his life. His close connection to Russian culture informed all of his various activities throughout his life.

In literature, Baydas is known primarily as the founder and editor of *al-nafā'is al-ʿaṣriyyah*, the most productive and well-circulated literary periodical published in Palestine at the time. Baydas modeled *al-nafā'is* on the other literary journals printed in the Arab world at the time (such as *al-muqtaṭaf*, *al-hilāl*, and others), but also drew on his familiarity with the “thick journals” of Russian literature. Baydas’ impact on Arabic literature came primarily through his translations of literature from Russian. Soviet orientalist Ignatii Krachkovskii gives Baydas full credit for being the first to make Russian literature available to Arab readers. He writes, “In Syria, as in Egypt, direct acquaintance with Russian writers came from the efforts of a graduate of the Nazareth

---

<sup>7</sup> In his interview, Merenz makes special note of Baydas’ “pure Russian language” («чистый русский язык»).

<sup>8</sup> «Едва я выучилвя писать, едва начал понимать каждое третье и затем каждое второе слово, как я стал глотать русские книги, которые были собраны в большом количестве в школьной библиотеке. И с каждой прочитанной книгой туман, скрывавший от моего понимания Россию постепенно рассеивался, и нечто, бывшее для меня сначала только словом, стало страной, затем идеей и, наконец, миром, единственный мир в котором я мог жить и дышать.»

seminary, the young writer Khalil Baydas”<sup>9</sup> (v. 3 30). Sabry Hafez goes even farther in estimating the influence of Baydas’ literary translations on Arabic literature as a whole. “Among all the pioneers of narrative writing of this early period,” Hafez writes, “the Palestinian writer Khalil Baydas played the most significant role in the genesis of the new narrative discourse” (152). Baydas translated dozens of short stories, many articles, and several novels from Russian. Because he translated prolifically (and exclusively) from Russian, Baydas became known in Russia as “The man who introduced the Arabs to Russia,” the title of the piece published by Merenz.

The readership of *al-nafā’is* grew steadily over the years, and included individuals through the Arab world, including the émigré communities in North and South America. In his interview with Merenz, Baydas remarks on the response that his Russian translations found among readers in the Arab world, saying, “The Arabs of Palestine were not the only ones who wanted to read Russian literature in their own language. Soon many orders began to come in from abroad. [Readers in] Syria and Lebanon, Egypt and Iraq all requested my early translations.”<sup>10</sup> We do not have precise numbers of subscribers for *al-nafā’is*, but it is clear that Baydas’ audience was significant and included all of the major Arab intellectual and literary centers of the time.

In addition to his work managing and editing *al-nafā’is*, Khalil Baydas was a committed educator. He worked as both a teacher and an administrator at the Russian schools, where he had continual contact with the leadership of the Imperial Orthodox

---

<sup>9</sup> «В Сирии, как в Египте, непосредственное знакомство с русскими писателями обязано энергии воспитанника Назаретской семинарии молодого писателя Халила Бейдаса.»

<sup>10</sup> «Не только арабы Палестины хотели читать русскую литературу на своем родном языке. Вскоре стали поступать в большом количестве заказы из-за границы. Сирия и Ливан, Египет и Ирак запрашивали мои первые переводы.»



Palestine Society throughout his life. Baydas translated and wrote a number of textbooks. After he retired from publishing, he continued to teach at a school in Jerusalem.

In addition, Baydas' translations attracted the attention of leading Russian orientalists, with whom he maintained correspondence over the course of his life.<sup>11</sup> The Russian schools in Palestine often hosted visitors from the Russian government, the Orthodox Church, and Russian scholars travelling in the area.

In 1910, Baydas moved the headquarters of his journal from Haifa to Jerusalem so that he could accept a post on the Mixed Council (*al-majlis al-mukhtalaṭ*) as a representative of the Orthodox Christian community of Nazareth. During the years that Baydas spent in Jerusalem, he became more involved in political issues of the time, particularly Palestinian nationalism. Though it is difficult to gather precise records of Baydas' involvement with different organizations in Jerusalem, it seems clear that he was a well-known figure, involved not only with the Mixed Council, but with the various literary clubs active in Jerusalem in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, particularly *al-muntadā al-'arabī*. It was at this club that Baydas was arrested by the British in 1920 for delivering an allegedly inflammatory speech during the *nabī mūsā* festival that year. Baydas detailed the events leading up to his arrest, the trial, and his time in prison in 1921, in a series of articles entitled "*ḥadīth al-sujūn*" that he published in *al-naḫā'is*.

Baydas' health took a serious turn for the worse in 1923. In the opening editorial to the ninth volume of *al-naḫā'is* (August 1923), Baydas wrote,

*“al-naḫā'is* has been suspended for several months, which seemed to us like several years. This halt came because of an infection that afflicted the owner's [Baydas'] eyes, and kept him from working for a time, then the doctors urged him

---

<sup>11</sup> It is curious that Krachkovskii does not mention Baydas by name in his account *Nad Arabskimi Rukopisami*, although the two eventually became well-acquainted and exchanged letters, and Krachkovskii published a handful of short articles in later issues of *al-naḫā'is*.

to abandon writing for several months, and he reluctantly agreed to their request”<sup>12</sup> (1923 210).

This condition was serious enough that Baydas was forced to make more permanent changes to the administration of the journal. In this same piece, Baydas assures his readers that he desires nothing more for *al-nafā'is* than that it “be published on time and filled with the most wonderful and interesting of beneficial articles to which our readers have become accustomed to finding in it, particularly in the years before the war”<sup>13</sup> (1923 210). Baydas goes on to inform his readers that “The first step that we will take to achieve this goal is appointing our son to be responsible for the affairs of the journal; this will free us up for editing duties, and nothing will interrupt the publication of the journal or rob us of our small amount of free time”<sup>14</sup> (1923 210). Baydas’ son continued to run the affairs of the journal through 1923, but then it ceased publication. While we do not have clear evidence that Baydas’ health problems led to the closing of the journal, they clearly interfered with his ability to run it singlehandedly as he had done up to that point.

In the ensuing years, Baydas’ literary output diminished significantly. In 1924 he published two volumes of short stories, but they were all stories and translations that had been previously published in *al-nafā'is*. While he seems to have dropped out of public life after this point, Baydas continued to teach at an Anglican school in Jerusalem until late in his life. When fighting broke out in 1948, Baydas tried to stay in his Jerusalem

---

<sup>12</sup> انقطعت النفائس عن قرائها بضعة أشهر خلناها بضع سنين. وكان انقطاعها لمرض أصاب صاحبها في عينيه أقعده عن العمل مدة، ثم اضطره الأطباء إلى ترك الكتابة بضعة أشهر، فانقاد لإرادتهم مرعماً

<sup>13</sup> لتصدر في مواعيدها تماماً وتكون حافلة بكل شائق ورائق من المباحث والفوائد التي اعتاد القراء أن يطالعوها فيها، وخصوصاً قبل الحرب.

<sup>14</sup> وأول خطوة نخطوها في سبيل تحقيق هذه الأمنية هو أننا عينا لإدارة شؤون المجلة ولدنا، فهو يعني منذ الآن بالإدارة، ونتفرغ نحن للتحرير، فلا يبقى ما يعوق سير المجلة وينهب أوقات فراغنا القليلة.

home, but was eventually forced to flee; he lived in Amman for a time before moving to Beirut, where he died in 1949.

The temptation in studying the career of an individual so deeply invested and involved in two cultures, as Khalil Baydas was, is to seek explanations for his activities in one setting by examining the other. This search for causes and scramble for origins has characterized much of the study of modern Arab literary history. It is impossible, it seems, to talk about modern Arabic literature without reference to external influences. This influence is always seen to flow from West to East—from outside the Arab world to inside. The ‘allusions, references, quotations and borrowings’ that always surface in studies of modern Arabic literature always seem to be located in Western literature. This has had profound effects on the shaping of the modern Arabic literary canon and the attention given to (or withheld from) authors like Baydas. In order to redirect this attention back to the authors, translators, and publishers who shaped early Arabic literature, I will first step back to consider the study of influence in the field of comparative literature.

Questions of influence and literary relations have been at the core of comparative literature since it began to take shape out of philology departments in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. “Tracing influences and filiations, finding allusions, references, quotations and borrowings had always been the pursuit of literary scholars” (Haberer 59). Sometimes this process is treated as if it were the unraveling of a secret code underneath any piece of literature; if a critic could just see clearly enough, s/he could see through the text to the influences from which it sprang. Part of the problem with the concept of literary influence comes from the passive nature of the construction in which it is usually

found—too often we discuss how a given author *was influenced by* y, ignoring the agency of the author in question. Somehow influence becomes a boundless force exerting itself on the author, determining the literature that emerges from a literary tradition, only briefly passing through the author onto the page. Thus, the race to identify “influences and filiations, finding allusions, references, quotations and borrowings” robs the author of her/his standing as an active subject, giving the attention and credit instead to the influences that shape an author’s production. Despite these concerns, the concept of influence remained a vital part of the lexicon employed by practitioners of comparative literature for the better part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Commenting on the place of influence in literary studies, Claudio Guillen writes, “*Toda critica de influencias tiende a ser un estudio de genesis*,” (“All criticism of influences tends to become a study of origins,”) a statement that explains the preoccupation with the question of literary influence in Arabic literature. In studying modern Arabic literature, consideration of influences (especially foreign influences) comes together with the search for firsts and origins. Consequently, the emergence of Arabic prose fiction in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries is first treated as a European import before it can be considered an authentic Arab enterprise. The urge to look at connections to European influence directly feeds the drive to find the first Arabic novel, the first Arab novelists, and the first examples of each in the various national literatures of the Arab world.

In the 1980’s, literary scholars began to seek ways to theorize the shifts in literary studies that had taken place in the preceding decades. The concept of literary influence became increasingly problematic as literary theory embraced deconstructionist, post-

modern, and post-colonial frameworks. Julia Kristeva's 1966 interpretation of Bakhtin first brought a theoretically complex notion of intertextuality to displace the traditional concept of literary influence. As the field of post-colonial studies came to take a more prominent place within comparative literary studies, theorists worked to develop alternative approaches to the question of influence that would capture more of the complexity of the colonial context. In a 2007 essay, Harish Trivedi gave voice to this concern, citing arguments that hold that "though Western literature may have exercised a vast amount of influence on Indian literature, that should not be construed as a continued dominance of the latter by the former" (128). Seeking to undo the power of chronological precedence and a Eurocentric conception of cultural influence, Trivedi shows how scholars use the concept of intertextuality to avoid talking about influence, because of the way that it moves out of a linear, teleologically-oriented concept of literary influence into a multi-directional concept. 'Intertextuality' describes an active appropriation of cultural material, while 'influence' is passively received by the influenced, an especially important distinction in studying postcolonial literature.

These assertions are a far cry from the papers from a roundtable on the question of influence in comparative literature that were printed in the inaugural issue of *Comparative Literature Studies* (1963). In this collection, I.A. Owen Aldridge points out the relationship between "the vogue of seeking influence in literary criticism" and "the nineteenth-century emphasis on scientific method" (143). Thus, he connects the interest in influence studies in literature to the influence of enlightenment values and positivism of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

In a post-colonial context, the conflation of studying literary influence with positivistic, teleological understandings of how culture develops takes on a more sinister hue. Because literary influence is most often conceived of in a temporal sense, it projects the teleological tendencies of a modernity infused with enlightenment era thinking. Such conceptions merge uncomfortably easily into a model in which culture and modernity flow exclusively from the colonial center to the colonized periphery, thus rendering the culture of the colonies perpetually derivative, perpetually backwards, and inherently less worthy than the original. In this context, the line between noting that a work is ‘influenced by’ another and stating that a work is ‘derived from’ another becomes an important site of political contestation in addition to whatever literary significance the distinction might have. While the borrowing taking place in translation may be explicit, its place within (post)colonial societies is always subject to this same line of questioning. What Aldridge treated as a question of semantics in his 1963 essay had already become a matter of national importance within Arab literary criticism. In the discussion that follows, I will highlight several examples of the sensitive line between preserving authentic identity and appropriating the institutions of modernity they perceived in Western European culture. Because the European novel precedes the Arabic novel temporally, does the latter necessarily depend on the former? Is the former, then, automatically superior to the latter because of its ‘originality’?

This anxiety of influence, so different than that described by Harold Bloom in his seminal 1973 work on Romantic poetry, is further complicated when we are discussing literary translation. It is in translation that works move beyond their original audience. Is the influence of these translations ascribable to the authors, the translators, or neither? In

his seminal essay “The Task of the Translator,” Walter Benjamin seems to divide the responsibility between the translator and the source text; he maintains that it is the translator who calls out into the source text, eliciting an echo which then conveys the meaning to the new linguistic context. It is the translator’s act, the translator’s initiative that actually creates the meaning that then moves out into the new linguistic space. The afterlife of the text owes its entire existence to the decision of the translator to turn towards it and: “from outside it, facing it, and without entering it, the translation calls to the original within, at that one point where the echo in its own language can produce a reverberation of the foreign language’s work” (159). The true translation, then, in this sense, is totally a result of the translator’s recognition of the translatability (in the peculiar meaning that Benjamin gives to the term) of the source text, his decision to call into the ‘forest’ of the source text’s language, and to record the echo that comes back.

What this particular metaphor from Benjamin does not elucidate is the precise relationship between the source text and the translation. Obviously, they are intimately related, but he reverses the usual image and makes the translation the prime mover, as it were, in the process of creating a translation. While the translator works with an echo, it is not the echo of the source text, but the echo that the source text produces when the translation calls out into the forest of its language. The space in which this echo reverberates, the gap between the texts involved in the translation, this is the space that translators inhabit. While both translation studies and intertextuality deal with the relationship between texts, the two are rarely brought into direct conversation with each other.

Does the term ‘intertextual’ mean anything in a translation context? Among the many lessons that Borges’ Pierre Menard taught us, is the fact that translation blurs and expands the borders of the translated text.<sup>15</sup> So often we talk as if the ideal translation somehow *is* the original, but ultimately every translation is inherently and absolutely other than the original. When considering translations, then, instead of focusing on the intertextual relationship between the two texts (source and translation), the more interesting points of consideration are the moments in which intertextuality breaks down—the moments in which the translator makes clear to the reader that the translated text is not the source text, nor is it meant to be. These moments give us a special glimpse into the translation process, as we begin to see how the translator chooses to diverge from, adapt, and alter the text s/he is translating. These are the moments in which the translated text breaks away from the source text—not because of any linguistic deficiencies of the translator, but because the translator willfully alters the source text.

Translation continues to inspire anxiety in the field of comparative literature today. In a paper included in the American Comparative Literature Association’s report on the state of the discipline for 2004, Steven Ungar writes, “The work of translation is often dismissed within literary production as a second-order representation, with the translator accordingly invisible as an extension—faithful or unfaithful—of the original work attributed to the author” (Saussy 129). The reified value of the source text eclipses the creativity and agency expressed in the act of translation, leading to a situation in which the translator who is least visible is judged most successful, a tendency that inspired Lawrence Venuti’s return to the concepts of foreignizing and domesticating

---

<sup>15</sup> Benjamin, Walter. “The Task of the Translator.” trans. Harry Zohn, in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968. pp. 69-82.



translations. Much effort has been put forward in the field of translation studies to theorize the practice of translation in ways that recognize its meaning and value in a literary context, as well as the other ways that translation interacts with social, political, and cultural contexts.

In fact, we find translators who take liberties with source texts in many different literary contexts. Translators and their critics are always acutely aware of the relationship between source text and translation, and often eager to express their opinions on the subject. That does not mean, however, that these opinions coalesce into any kind of coherent argument about what translation is, or what it should be. For example, in his famous introduction to his translation of Ovid's *Epistles*, Dryden writes, "The second way is that of Paraphrase, or translation with Latitude, where the Author is kept in View by the Translator, so as never to be lost, but his Words are not so strictly followed as his Sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered." (Dryden, *Ovid*, xix). This well-known quotation comes from Dryden's taxonomy of literary translations, and is often cited in discussions of theories about translation in the western tradition. At the close of his introduction, however, Dryden includes a confession that is particularly interesting to read with his initial statement for our consideration of translation in a colonial context. He writes,

"For my own Part, I am ready to acknowledge, that I have transgressed the Rules which I have given; and taken more Liberty than a just translation will allow. But so many Gentlemen, whose Wit and Learning are well known, being joined in it, I doubt not but their Excellencies will make you ample Satisfaction for my Errors."  
(*Ovid* xxvi)

Dryden's admission that a translator achieves his goals more easily by focusing on 'keeping the author in sight' rather than literally reproducing the original text word for

word seems to endorse the translator's role as an active agent molding and shaping the source text into its new linguistic context. At the same time, he does two things in his confession at the end of the introduction. Dryden posits the existence of a "just translation," tying translation to concepts of ethics, justice, and fidelity in ways that have run throughout western translation theory. Dryden justifies his own unjust translation by pointing out that it is a common practice, and has actually produced enjoyable translations. His justifications are driven by the social context in which he produces his translation, and also the reception of the translation produced. It is clear that these two factors profoundly shape the translation practices of the Arabic *nahḍah*, and especially the practice of *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf* in which Khalil Baydas (and so many of his fellow Arab translators) openly engaged.

Despite these trends within the larger field of literary studies, historical studies of modern Arabic literature still depend almost entirely on narratives of influence to explain the rapid changes that took place on the Arab literary scene throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Napoleon's Egyptian expedition traditionally marks the point of departure for such narratives, bringing Arab society into contact with European modernity in an upsetting moment that started the wheels turning. As with all historical narratives, the narrative of the *nahḍah* has been constructed to emphasize certain trends and connections while downplaying others. As the colonial/postcolonial dynamic has come to define the limits of the conversation about modern Arabic literature, connections with the great colonial powers are at the forefront of such narratives—particularly Britain, France, and America.<sup>16</sup> Oftentimes these histories will briefly recognize other cultural connections that lie outside of this strictly colonial web of relations. It is my purpose in this

---

<sup>16</sup> Edward Said follows this pattern, as do so many others who study Arabic literature.

dissertation to turn greater critical attention to Russia's impact on the literary scene in the Levant to begin to fill in this gap in the history of modern Arabic literature.

Russia's role in the development of modern Arabic literature is woefully understudied in literary histories for a number of reasons: firstly, because of the scarcity of critics capable of working in all of the necessary languages. This can be understood by comparing the number of works in Russian and Arabic on the subject (dozens) with the number of works that treat the subject seriously in English (none). At the same time, the existing scholarly works in Russian and Arabic present particular biases and tendencies that place them outside of the current scholarly conversation concerning modern Arabic literature. On the one hand, Russian-language scholarship is often less interested in the consequences of Russian involvement for the Arab populations of the Middle East than they are with the policies themselves and the 'achievements' of the various Russian institutions that functioned in the region during this period. Russian-language scholarship on the issue generally falls into two camps. In Soviet orientalism, Iurii Krachkovskii and his students provided the most thorough catalogues and bibliographies of the Arab literati who engaged heavily with Russian culture. These works all treat the issue from the outside, paying little attention to the trends at work within Arabic literature that Russia's influence informs. Conversely, post-Soviet scholarship on Russian activities in the Middle East have been funded primarily by the resurgent Russian Orthodox Church. In these writings, the activities of the Orthodox Church receive the lion's share of the attention. All of these works are strictly historical in focus. Similarly, Arabic-language scholarship on the issue lacks theoretical rigor and discipline, being limited almost

entirely to laundry lists of works written and translated by individuals with connections to Russian culture.<sup>17</sup>

### **Colonial Concerns**

The second reason that Russian influence in modern Arabic literature is understudied has to do with the alignment of colonial powers in the period. Russia does not fit easily into traditional post-colonial critiques of modern Arabic literature. Russia encouraged Arab Orthodox Christians to work actively against the foreign powers that had established themselves in various aspects of life—politically, against the British and French colonizers; religiously, against the foreign missionaries (American, British, French) and Greek clergy. Socially Russia encouraged the Arabs to become familiar with and honor their own rich heritage instead of abandoning it for more fashionable western tastes.

### **Translation in the Colonial Context**

While many discussions of translation focus on the texts involved in translation, what happens when we turn our spotlight instead on the translators between the texts, denying them their invisibility? Translation produces a peculiar set of texts that are characterized by both their inherent intertextuality and the insurmountable difference between them as well. In studying translation, it is precisely those moments in which the reader feels most keenly the absence of intertextuality that interest the scholar. In such moments, the actions, decisions, opinions, and abilities of the translator come to the fore.

---

<sup>17</sup> These works are included in the bibliography of this dissertation, but for examples of this phenomenon closest to the present study, see the work of ‘Umar Mahamid (*filisīn rūsiyā*), Hanna Abu Hanna (*ṭalā’i’ al-nahḍah fi filisīn*), and Jihad Saleh. In their works, the bulk of the attention is given to delineating what was published, when, and where. None of the works include instances of close critical attention to the texts themselves. Sabry Hafez has made a greater effort to engage the texts produced in this context, though he focuses on a later time period of 20<sup>th</sup> century literature. Samah Selim and Shaden Tageldin have brought literary criticism and translation theory to bear on Egyptian literature during the *nahḍah*, but have not done the same for literary production outside of Egypt during this period.

We can highlight this space—the gaps that surface between a source text and a translation—to inquire into the choices made and agency exercised by the translators. This space is clearly delineated in the practice of Arabic translators working in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, which is typically labeled *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf*, a term that merits further exploration. Consider the following quotations from Baydas’ 1909 translation of Aleksey Tolstoy’s famous historical novel *Kniaz’ Serebrianiĭ*:

“And what’s more, I’m completely free **to act** as I wish in this grand house, this great palace; and no one can hold me to account for it.”<sup>18</sup>

“And I have **acted freely** in adding to, cutting from, changing, substituting, and organizing the translation.”<sup>19</sup>

The first quotation comes from the text of the novel, and the second from Baydas’ introduction to his translation. The word in boldface in each sentence is the same – *taṣarrafa*. The first quotation comes from one of the story’s villains, Prince Viazemskii, immediately before he kidnaps Morozov’s (one of the main noblemen in the story) wife and ransacks his home. One of Viazemskii’s companions implores him not to set fire to the home (a grave concern in Russia at that time),<sup>20</sup> which inspires the above sentence in response. In claiming that he is “completely free to act” Viazemskii is aware that he is violating norms of Russian society, but considers himself above these laws because of he is carrying out the will of the tsar. The verb *taṣarrafa* does not indicate any particular action, but a general sense of ‘acting;’ under the umbrella of a single word “*ataṣarrafu*,” Viazemskii expresses his complete freedom to act. He is not bound by any legal or social constraints; there is no authority that can restrain him in this affair.

<sup>18</sup> وبعد ذلك فأنا حر مطلق أتصرف في هذا البيت الفخيم، بل القصر العظيم كما أشاء وليس لأحد أن يناقشني الحساب.  
<sup>19</sup> ولقد تصرفت في تعريبها بزيادة وإسقاط وتغيير وإبدال وتبويب وغير ذلك لتوافق ذوق القراء. (emphasis added)

<sup>20</sup> In 1571, Moscow was devastated by a fire that destroyed the entire city.

This same verb “to act” (*taṣarrafa*) is used to describe the notoriously liberal translation practices of translators working in the Arabic literary renaissance, a practice commonly known as ‘*al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf*.’ Typically translated as ‘abridged,’ ‘liberal translation,’ or ‘translation with alterations,’<sup>21</sup> this term is commonly applied to translations from this period (both by later critics and, as evidenced above) by the translators themselves. This word is actually the same verb that Viazemskii uses in the first quotation above—*taṣarrafa*, and it carries with it the same range of meanings—action, authority, agency. It is in this sense that Baydas uses this word in the second quotation, taken from his introduction to this translation.

Baydas’ clear statement of his role in altering the source text that echoes Viazemskii’s claim to unrestricted, unsupervised action in his respective field of activity. Both Viazemskii and Baydas are about to embark on activities that serve their interests while violently disrupting established cultural rules. It is important to note that while there is no violence inherent to the verb *taṣarrafa* or the root from which it derives, it is implicit in both contexts. The violence in the first case is clear from the context in which Viazemskii makes the statement—his intentions are to kidnap the nobleman’s wife, plunder his home, and then burn it to the ground. Conversely, the violence in the second sentence is imposed not by Baydas’ own context, but by later critics. Baydas simply acknowledges his intervention as translator, even explaining the various types of

---

<sup>21</sup> I will discuss this term in greater depth below, but it is interesting here to note that this concept is not limited to Arabic literature, but found in many other literary traditions at moments of rupture in which literary translation plays an important role in the establishment of new modes of literary expression. During the Meiji period of Japanese literature, for example, paraphrastic translations labeled *hu’nan* produced the bulk of popular literary material adapted from Western literature. In the case of Russian literature, translations of English and French literature (especially drama) played an important role in the development of narrative fiction in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Similarly, translations figured prominently in the emergence of new literary styles in early 19<sup>th</sup> century German literature. Translation is closely connected with the literary *avant garde* in many different contexts of change.

alterations that he has made in translating Tolstoy's novel. Baydas' various manipulations of the source text can be (and have been) read as a violent crime against the original texts—something akin to Viazemskii's attack on Morozov's home. At the same time, Baydas' candid statement of his intentions indicates that the perceived violence in his translation practice is a projection of later concerns with originality, fidelity, and textual integrity. It is tempting to look back at this statement as a confession, an acknowledgement of guilt on the translator's part, but Baydas is not at all uncomfortable with admitting his role in altering and manipulating the text he is translating. These concerns with textual fidelity are all projections of much later concerns—first by Arab nationalists of the twentieth century, then by western literary critics. In fact, the liberties that Baydas takes in his translations were the standard practice, and translations concerned with absolutely faithful reproduction of source texts were limited to other contexts.<sup>22</sup> His statement quoted above is less a confession than a proclamation; by making his *taṣarruf* explicit in introducing his translation, Baydas informs the reader that the text to follow is his own, and that he has constructed it to serve a particular function. This practice was common among the great majority of Arabic translators working during the *nahḍah*, and would not have concerned his readers in the least. The close readings of Baydas' translations in the following three chapters will explore the space created by Baydas' agency as a translator, taking it as a window to investigate the influence of Russian literature, thought, and culture on the development of modern Arabic literature during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>22</sup> In religious, academic, and a certain literary translations we can observe the desire to produce a 'faithful' translation. Even in these cases, however, foreign texts were often forced into existing Arabic literary conventions (rhymed prose, strict meters and rhyme schemes, etc.).

In addition to the textual translations that make up the core of *nahḍawi* translation, there is also a broader translation dynamic as Arab intellectuals worked to create a new discourse. Khalil Baydas and his contemporaries were engaged in introducing Arab society to elements of a different world—Western European modernity—through their publications and political/educational activities. In effect, they took Western European modernity as a template, and sought to bring it into Arab society in a way that would reform the latter without simply giving in completely to the former. This process involved not only the translation of literary texts from Russian into Arabic, but also the larger project of translating an entire understanding of society from a Russian context into an Arab context.

Since translation projects like Baydas' defined such a large part of the literary landscape of emergent modern Arabic literature, literary influence remains a vital question to understanding the literature produced in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. At the same time, scholarly work on Arabic has not moved far beyond the British and French influences to the other international streams of influence flowing through the Arab world during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The entire historical narrative is constructed as a reaction to the shock of experiencing such a superior military and scientific forces of Western European nations. In Arabic-language scholarship, this tendency has been reinforced by the prevalence of Egypt-centric narratives of *nahḍah* and emergent cultural modernity.

### **The Arabic Literary Renaissance, or *Nahḍah* (1798-1917)**

It is difficult to find a description of the Arabic literary renaissance, or *nahḍah*, that does not rely on the common metaphors of reemergence, resurrection, rising up,



revitalization that are all contained within the Arabic word. Traditionally, literary historians point to Napoleon's 1798 Egyptian expedition as the launching point for the reforms that would come to define the period. In actuality, the borders (both chronological and spatial) of the *nahḍah* have been stretched in recent scholarship. Recent considerations of the period have sought to challenge that assumption, making connections between movements in the 'post-classical' period (the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries) and the rapid changes that took place in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The *nahḍah* can also be defined as a particular intellectual moment—the intersection of competing interests and intellectual movements within the Arab world. In existing histories of the period, and in much of the discussion going on during this period, the *nahḍah* is described in terms of binary opposites, or sets of dichotomies: east/west, modernity/tradition, etc. For the purposes of this discussion, the exact chronology of the *nahḍah* is not as important as the social, intellectual, and political trends that define this moment in Arab history.

Tropes of 'awakening,' 'rebirth,' 'renaissance,' 'resurrection,' and 'resurgence' all aim to capture the defining characteristic of the period – a sense of activity and change. The various titles this period bears also testify to the wide variety of opinions and narratives that grew up around what was happening and why. For some, it was the awakening of the Arab world after long centuries of slumber under (and due to) Ottoman rule. For others, it was a process parallel to the European renaissance (a point of view fraught with the very problems that plague narratives of Arab modernity as a whole—derivativeness, belatedness, Euro-centeredness). These themes became apparent early in the period, and are repeated several times throughout the literary journals and newspapers of the time that will be considered below. In these mentions, however, it is important to

note that the general sense of a unified historical movement that has been assigned to the period was not present at the time. These are not calls for independence, or for autonomy, but merely for a revitalization of activities and institutions associated with the communities.

For example, Khalil Baydas' journal *al-nafā'is* had a strong connection to the Orthodox community, and we find several articles within the paper that call for a “*nahḍah*” in the Orthodox Church throughout the Levant. For example, Baydas uses the term in a 1911 article of the history of the Orthodox Church in the region, proclaiming, that the formation of the mixed council (*al-majlis al-mukhtalat*) in 1908 was the beginning of “the Orthodox Palestinian renaissance” (“*al-nahḍah al-filisṭīniyyah al-urthūduksiyyah*”) (1911 92). He then connects this local renaissance to the general activities of the Palestinians to (re)form their local educational, religious, and governmental institutions to strengthen the people (*al-sha'b*) going forward.

What is striking within these narratives of renaissance is the unified story that gets told repeatedly. The story of the *nahḍah* became so important to later nationalist movements that it was cleaned and shaped into a coherent narrative of interaction with Europe, response, and resurgence that inevitably led to independent Arab republics that were proud of their rich cultural heritage, both ancient and modern. The Ottomans were cast as the villains in the story, with European actors shifting between the role of Prometheus and that of enemy infiltrators. Reexamining primary sources from the period (especially those that have not been included in the canon of *nahḍawi* materials) reminds us of the wide variety of voices and viewpoints that were participating in the great

debates and discussions of the time. In recent years, several scholars have been working to highlight the diversity present in *nahḍawi* intellectual history.

Roger Allen engages with these questions about the universality (within the Arab world) of the historical narrative of the *nahḍah*. The basic template for describing this period comes out of the debate between secularists (primarily depicted as Lebanese Christians) and religious reformers (primarily Muhammad Abduh and his followers in Egypt). This dichotomy does not capture all of the voices and conversations that were happening in this period. It simplifies things by reducing them into a single narrative of Arab intellectuals chasing after British and French culture in different ways—some eager to make it their own, others looking to bring their own cultural heritage into the sphere that Western culture inhabited. Allen writes:

The preference for the mostly European-based model of development on the one hand and the unwillingness to investigate continuities alongside ruptures on the other have served to make the Egyptian model, starting with Napoleon’s invasion in 1798, the preferred one—one model of *al-nahḍah* fits all, as it were.” (Allen, “Rewriting the Arabic Novel”. (p. 253)

Allen goes on to suggest increased attention to continuities within the *nahḍah* alongside the traditional emphasis on rupture that defines discussion of the period. Considering the Russian presence in Palestine during this period casts light on some of the other possibilities contained within the *nahḍah*. Much of the reduction of *nahḍawi* discourses has come as a result of the reimagination of *nahḍawi* projects in terms of the nationalist movements that successfully emerged from the period.

### **Literature in the *Nahḍah***

The material discussed in this dissertation is of particular importance to the question of the emergence of new literary genres in Arabic literature during the *nahḍah*.

One of the most striking trends within Arabic literature during this period is the sudden popularity of prose fiction among Arab readers, in particular the short story and the serialized novel (sometimes collected into single volumes). Much has been written about the striking way in which prose fiction burst onto the Arab literary scene. These narratives tend to follow one of two lines in describing what took place. For some, it was a direct import from European literature that came through translations of European works. For others, modern prose fiction in Arabic reaches back to pre-modern literary genres such as the *maqāmah*. Whichever of these two possibilities may be closer to the truth, this dissertation will focus exclusively on the practice of translation as it is related to Arabic fiction in this period. I am anxious to develop a vocabulary (drawing heavily upon the well-established field of translation studies) for discussing the phenomena of translation and influence in Arabic literature that sidesteps the debunked hierarchies of European originality/centrality and non-European derivativeness/peripherality. By so doing, we can open a more useful space for considering the agency of the individuals who were engaged in cross-cultural exchange, whether through translation or through another avenue.

### **Provincializing Europe/Reintroducing Russia**

These are not simple questions of origin and influence. In examining these relationships, we are not merely perpetuating the historicist narratives that valorize everything European, nor projecting such a narrative into a space that it did not already define. In fact, both Arab and Russian intellectual societies during the 19<sup>th</sup> century were concerned with questions of modernization. Both had already inculcated a sense of lateness in their own transition towards a modernity that echoed and emulated European

modernity. Both saw in the other a tool that could help them achieve their goals more quickly and completely. For the Russians, the Arab world (or the Ottoman Empire, as they would have seen it) was the premier site for proving the might of a modern nation-state. It was in the unraveling of the Eastern question that modern political and military powers proved their mettle against one another. For Russia to prove that it belonged among the Great Powers of the period, it needed to make itself a player on this stage. For the Arabs, on the other hand, Russia proved an invaluable alternative to British and French colonial penetration into the Levant. Orthodox communities in the Levant were presented with an alternative that at once affirmed their own cultural heritage as Arabs and Orthodox Christians, while encouraging them to assert that identity in opposition to the increasingly onerous burden of British colonialism. This dynamic gained importance even more rapidly as Zionist movements became more closely connected with British policies in the region.

In this context, it can be useful to conceive of Russian influence in the Levant in the terms that Deleuze and Guattari describe a minor literature. Their conception of a minor literature revolves around three points: “the first characteristic of minor literature in any case is that in it language is affected with a high coefficient of deterritorialization. . . . The second characteristic of minor literatures is that everything in them is political. . . . The third characteristic of minor literature is that in it everything takes on a collective value” (16-17). Translation during the *nahḍah* has been so thoroughly written out of the acceptable body of modern Arabic literature that it is, in this sense, deterritorialized. It is not Arab enough to be claimed as Arabic literature, nor is it European literature any more because of the liberal changes that translators made to each text. This is not the

geographical deterritorialization usually associated with minor literature, but in this context in which Arab national identities are just beginning to find their voice, and geographical boundaries are drawn and revised with such ease, I would argue that the dispossession of translated literature is a powerful form of deterritorialization in line with the dynamic that Deleuze and Guattari indicate. In terms of politicization, Russia's influence in the Levant is a minor influence in this way because it mobilizes a thoroughly politicized conception of Arab identity-building institutions within the British/French sphere. Russian influence in the Levant came mainly through religious institutions, but was always primarily concerned with the expansion of British and French interests in the weakening Ottoman Empire. Even in matters not inherently political, every decision became politicized.

We will see in the discussion of Baydas' literature that follows how this politicization crept into every aspect of his literary career. While the communal aspect of the Russian/Arab connection is more elusive when speaking in general terms, it also emerges forcefully from close consideration of Baydas' literary texts. In every major work that Baydas translated, he always had an eye toward collective action on a large scale.

The discourse that flowed out of the Russian-Arab connection (to both the east and the west) is in fact doubly minored. In addition to the international minoring described above, within the local Arabic-language context the graduates of the IOPS schools produced a minor literature. While they wrote in Arabic and dealt with all of the major concerns of the Arabic *nahḍah*, their sense of functioning as a millet in the Ottoman Empire remained strong. This sectarian community identity drove their political,

cultural and social development throughout the period leading up to the First World War. Russian influence fueled the development of the Arab Orthodox communities in the Levant in a minor way instead of a major way. In other words, if traditional considerations of foreign influence on modern Arabic literature result in linear genealogies of origin and imitation (always moving from the colonial center to the colonized periphery), then Russian influence is something very different. It is itself a peripheral influence that works encourages Arabic culture not to refashion itself in a Russian image, but to grasp onto a nascent sense of Arab (national?) identity that stood in direct opposition to the British colonial presence at the same time that it moves to master the modern discourses that symbolize Britain's superiority in the modern age.

### **Traditional Histories of the “Age of Translation”**

The so-called “Age of Translation” that was ushered in with Muhammad Ali's policies in Egypt beginning in the early 1800s has received much attention from historians of Arabic literature and culture. The standard historical narrative relates how these early efforts focused on military, technical, and technology-related texts that were seen to have immediate impact on the modernization projects that suddenly became so urgent during the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>23</sup> From the earliest stages, however, we also find instances of literary translation among those works being brought into Arabic. The most prominent individual sent by 'Ali's government to study and translate in France, Rifā'ah Rāfi' al-Ṭahṭāwī, himself translated a number of literary works into Arabic in addition to the technical works that he was commissioned to translate.

---

<sup>23</sup> For more information on this early moment in the history of translation into Arabic, see corresponding the sections in M.M. Badawi's history of Arabic literature, as well as the work of Roger Allen describing this period in modern Arabic literature.

Historical accounts of literary translation during this period tend to focus on the great works of classical European literature that were translated into Arabic at an early date. Sulaymān al-Bustānī translated Homer's *Iliad* into classical Arabic prose, a tremendous achievement. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī published his translation of Fenelon's 18<sup>th</sup> century novel *Les aventures de Télémaque* into Arabic in 1867. Other notable early translations include an anonymous 1835 translation of Robinson Crusoe. Such notable translations always garner attention in standard histories of modern Arabic literature.<sup>24</sup> With the proliferation of weekly and daily newspapers/journals in the later part of the nineteenth century, more and more prose fiction found its way into their pages. Often dismissed as 'low brow' or derivative, this body of literature was never given proper scholarly attention until only very recently, as I will discuss below.

Current scholarship has taken renewed interest in the neglected Arabic literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. As scholars across the field of literary studies have pushed the boundaries of established literary canons, so too have students of Arabic literature begun to question the established narratives of literary development and the canons that reinforce them. Carol Bardenstein's work incorporates the concepts of transculturation into the world of Egyptian drama during the *nahḍah*. She examines the ways in which Egyptian translators adapted French drama to fit their audience and cultural context. In prose fiction, Shaden Tageldin has recently begun new research into early modern literary translations into Arabic, particularly those of al-Ṭaḥṭāwī that apply translation theory in a more critical way to his early work. Samah Selim makes the case for giving increased critical attention to the popular literature of the *nahḍah* in a number of recent

---

<sup>24</sup> See, for example, the above referenced section in Badawi's volume, Matti Moosa's history, and Roger Allen's work.



publications. Noting the strong connection between nationalist movements and the canon of modern Arabic novels, she writes:

“On the margins of this process, there is another, discarded body of texts that offers a different set of possibilities, of windows into the novel as the textual site of the modern—one that joins the powerful, mythopoeic imagination of established modes of popular narrative to the polysemous codes of a new and hence, potentially democratic genre” (2006 57).

Selim’s turn to the margins of early modern Arabic literature marks a stark change from traditional approaches to studying Arabic literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. She pushes against a long tradition of literary scholarship that discounted the literary merit of early translations and original novels because they were seen to be low brow and popular. I wish to engage this same discourse on the matter of literary translation, as it forms a large portion of this marginalized popular literature about which Selim writes.

For example, in his seminal work *tatawwur al-riwāyah al-‘arabiyyah al-ḥadiithah*, ‘Abd al-Muḥsin Ṭaha Badr takes a negative view on literary translation carried out during the *nahḍah* in terms that echo throughout the established historical narrative of the period. In the section labeled “Translation and its Influence” (122-136), Badr summarizes and reconfirms the usual complaints against translation during this period. He writes,

“The vast majority of the translators did not expose a mature literary culture, nor did they understand the value of the works they presented, nor did they understand the meaning of translation, but rather they were closer akin to merchants responding to the demands of the market, sometimes presenting it with an immature (unripe) product, other times with a plagiarized product, but almost always with a distorted product”<sup>25</sup> (126)

This criticism raises several interesting questions about translation that will run throughout the readings that make up this dissertation. First, Badr states that these

<sup>25</sup> وكانت الكثرة العظمى من المترجمين لا يكشفون عن ثقافة أدبية ناضجة، ولا يقدرّون قيمة الإنتاج الذي يقدمونه، ولا يفهمون معنى الترجمة، وإنما كانوا أشبه بتجار يلبون حاجة السوق، ويقدمون إليه بضاعة فجة أحياناً، ومسروقة أحياناً ومشوهة في أغلب الأحيان.

translators “do not understand the meaning of translation.” This sweeping statement rests on a number of assumptions that prove to be anachronistic when applied to the bulk of *nahḍawi* literary translation. Indeed, it exemplifies the attitude taken by post-independence critics towards the early work of Arab authors and translators. It would be more accurate, perhaps, to remark that they did not understand translation the way that Badr does. We can extrapolate from Badr’s writing that he faults the translations for not transparently moving works of great literature from other languages into Arabic.

Badr’s further characterization of these translations as unripe (*fajjah*), stolen (*masrūqah*), or deformed (*mushawwahah*) gives insight into his own understanding of the purpose of translation. These three adjectives each bring new and serious allegations against *nahḍawi* translators. In the first case, an ‘unripe’ translation may simply be a result of lack of ability on the translator’s part. Hardly a malicious act, in this case we can imagine Badr reading the translation as a shallow shadow of the original work. This first adjective intimates nothing inherently damaging about translation, simply discounts the work of early translators because they cannot be expected to understand the western work that they are translating. In this case, the translator’s only fault is being non-western—a damning assessment of their prospects, even if it does not actually insinuate any malicious intent on the part of the translator.

The second allegation is more serious, moving from the unintentional effects of the translator’s (in)ability to a deliberate act of deception on the part of the translator. Badr contends that translators represent someone else’s work as their own. This adjective also refers to the common practice of publishing translated works without reference to the original work or author. This accusation seems to be somewhat misplaced, however, as

there were other factors at work in the literary context in which this practice was most common. Since translations were in high demand during the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, many works were published with the subheading “a translation” despite the fact that they were actually original compositions.<sup>26</sup> The works of Khalil Baydas to be considered in the chapters that follow hold to this same pattern. Some of his works are clearly labeled as translations, and in the case of his longer works he always gives a complete explanation of the origin of his translations. At the same time, many of his shorter stories are labeled as translations, but without reference to the original works. Still others are clearly stories and ideas that he gleaned from other sources and reworked in Arabic without any clues as to the source text. While this does present particular challenges for the would-be scholar investigating these works, Badr’s dismissal hints at a stronger prejudice that underlies the approach to writing the history of modern Arabic literature. This same Romantic championing of the individual genius of the author and the tightly bound relationship between the author and the work lines up closely with the nationalist spirit that dominated the history of the Arab world in the period leading up to and post-independence.

The third allegation is the most interesting, as it can either be read as a deliberate distortion of the original work on the part of the translator, or as another consequence of the translator’s own deficiencies—either way the result is a distorted text that no longer represents the original text faithfully. In this sentiment, Badr betrays the influence of the European Romanticisms that became so important for Arab nationalist movements post-independence.

---

<sup>26</sup> This type of pseudotranslation is present in other literary traditions as well, and gives interesting insight into the place of translations in the literary marketplace, as well as the marketplace of ideas.

Throughout *taṭawwur al-riwāyah*, Badr outlines what has come to be the dominant paradigm for understanding the emergence of novelistic literature in modern Arabic literature. In addition to the violence against the source texts that these translators perpetrated, Badr is quite concerned with the popular nature of the works that were translated. As mentioned above, Samah Selim has recently turned critical theory onto the subject of popular fiction, upsetting this paradigm in an extremely effective section of her book *Rural Imaginary in Egyptian Literature*. Selim relies on the work of Lennard Davis (1987) to undercut the authority of the established canon of the modern Arabic novel by reminding us that the conception of realism in fiction so prized by nationalist critics like Badr is “as much an artifice as the ‘deception’ practiced by romancers and hack novelists” (2004 70). Having exposed the artificial nature of the structure of the modern Arabic literary canon (especially as it pertains to the emergence of the novel in this tradition), Selim calls for a reexamination of the early Arabic fiction that falls outside of this paradigm. Turning close critical attention to the literary translations published in this same period (late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century) serves this same purpose; it is an attempt to understand a suppressed dynamic within the early development of modern Arabic literature.

One aspect of this study aims to expand this trend in the study of modern Arabic literature. While graduates of the IOPS schools did indeed translate some of the great works of Russian literature into Arabic, the vast majority of their writings and translations would not be included in such lists. Including stories (however dubious their literary merits) and serialized novels was such a powerful force in attracting subscribers during this period that even those publications strongly opposed to them on moral

grounds eventually capitulated and began to include fiction in their pages.<sup>27</sup> In addition, we find publications touting the inclusion of such works in their pages at the center of the marketing and advertising for these journals. Perhaps, as Hafez argues, this is an indication of a new need from the reading public, one that could not be met by existing literary genres, but this assertion begs the question of the difference between a fashion and a need. In particular, Hafez's assumption that "literary genres emerge as an answer to a literary need more than as a result of a deliberate attempt to innovate or introduce new cultural products" (35) is a difficult one to substantiate. At the same time, the sociological approach to literary studies that he pursues provides very useful linkages between social circumstances and literary production. The gap between the translated text and the translation provides a more specific opportunity to examine the specific ways in which one *nahḍawi* translator worked to "answer the literary needs" of his audience. Comparing Baydas' claims in his introduction to each translation with his translation practice, as I do in the following chapters, is a new way to explore the concept of an audience's "needs." In addition, giving new attention to early translators is a vital step towards reexamining the established narratives of the development of Arabic literature during the *nahḍah*.

The tendency to project unity back onto the changes occurring during the *nahḍah* extends to the history of Arab nationalism. Timothy Mitchell writes of the problematic nature of the concept of '*nahḍah*' and nationalism:

"there seems to follow from [a unified conception of *nahḍah*] the implication that nationalism always exists, as a singular truth about 'the nation' waiting to be realized. It is something discovered, not invented. Nationalism was not a singular truth, but a different thing among these different social groups" (119).

---

<sup>27</sup> This comment refers most famously to *al-Muqtataf* – see Elisabeth Kendall's description of this dynamic in *Literature, Journalism, and the Avant-Garde*, pp. 8-52.

Giving attention to those works and individuals who, like Khalil Baydas, were actively engaged in the shaping of early Palestinian nationalism allows us to perceive a political landscape characterized by a plurality of potential Palestinian (proto)-nationalisms in the period leading up to World War One. Arab political dynamics of the twentieth century have made it so easy to reduce discussion of the *nahḍah* to a conflict between secular modernizers (largely characterized as (Lebanese) Christians) who would abandon tradition to embrace European modernity and reformers who would adapt the established institutions to fit the new modernity (largely identified with the Muslim reformers in Egypt). The ensuing examination of Baydas' literary career and his relationship to Russian culture upset this dichotomy, as will be illustrated in the chapters that follow.

In sum, the colonial context seems to have created an extra measure of “anxiety of influence” for colonial subjects. By giving critical attention to Arabic translations produced during the *nahḍah* (irrespective of their origins or provenance), we open the door to a more complete understanding of the dynamics that shaped the arguments in and around Arabic literature that were taking place at the time. In this context, translation provides a strong alternative to broader discussions of literary influence, because of the concrete connection between the source text and the translation. At the same time, recognizing and exploring the gap between the texts tied together through translation opens a discursive space for expanding on the role that these translations played in shaping the literary, social, and political discussions that defined the *nahḍah*. This is precisely the space in which Arab translators working in this period acted. The texts that they produced, whether we consider them translations or paraphrases, literature or drivel, made up an overwhelming part of the texts that were published, circulated, and read. We

cannot understand the dynamics that shaped *nahḍah*-era literature (and, by extension, prose fiction throughout modern Arabic literature) without giving more attention to this body of translated literature.

The remainder of the dissertation will proceed as follows:

Chapter Two considers the special relationship between Russia and Palestine. By focusing on first-hand accounts of those involved in the process of institutionalizing this relationship (primarily Porfiriĭ Uspenskiĭ and Vasilĭĭ Nikolaevich Khitrovo), I explore the disconnect between Russian foreign policies regarding the Arab world, the attitudes of those individuals who enacted these policies on the ground, and the eventual results of these policies for Palestinian culture and society. The history of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society outlined in this chapter provides the necessary historical context for the examination of Khalib Baydas' literary works that comes in the following chapters.

Chapters Three through Five each examine closely one of Baydas' major literary translations. These translations have never been subject to close critical readings, though they contain a fascinating record of cultural adaptation, manipulation, and the early formation of a national Palestinian literature. Upon close examination, Baydas proves a very talented translator, sensitive to the potential of each piece he translates. In each case, I argue for a more nuanced reading of *nahḍah* translation, using other articles that Baydas published in *al-nafā'is* to substantiate my reading of Baydas' agency as a translator. In each case, the evidence from the articles that Baydas edited for publication (both his own compositions and those of other individuals) makes clear the deliberate nature of the alterations that he makes to each literary text as he translates.

Chapter Three discusses Baydas' first literary translation, an 1898 translation of Alexander Pushkin's novel *Kapitanskaia Dochka* (*The Captain's Daughter*, published originally in 1836). Baydas makes a variety of alterations to the content, style, and tone of Pushkin's novel in his translation. My reading of these changes focuses on the ways in which they express a nascent national identity, against the developing understanding of Palestinian national identity as expressed in articles published in his journal *al-nafā'is* on the topic. Baydas manipulates Pushkin's text in very specific ways to create a narrative that champions the authority of the modern state and its apparatuses (particularly the army) in the face of chaotic intrusion of rebellion and usurpers. He also goes to great lengths to emphasize the concept of patriotism among the people, and its importance in establishing a strong government. This concept constantly evolved in his political writings, as he progressed from an outspoken Ottomanist in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to a vocal leader in nascent Arab and Palestinian national movements during the 1920s and 1930s.

Chapter Four pairs Baydas' translation of Marie Corelli's novel *Temporal Power* (originally published in 1902) with his articles on education in Palestine. Through his translation, *Shaqā' al-Mulūk* (1908), from a Russian translation of Corelli's novel (*Pod Bremenem Vlasti*, translated into Russian by Z.N. Zhuravskaia and published in 1906), Baydas transforms Corelli's novel into a text that very closely resembles a manual on government and governance for the leaders and citizens of a modern state. While this text is far removed from the explicit Russian connections of his other translations, it shows his continued commitment to issues of state and government in the modern age. His reshaping of Corelli's novel is another important representation of Baydas' concern with



establishing a sense of patriotism among the Arabs living in the Levant. At the same time, this particular translation is interesting for the material that Baydas chooses to leave out; he eliminates many of the references to religion and its connection to the rulers of a modern state. This chapter reads these omissions in conjunction with Baydas' own writings on education and its relationship to the development of a viable national identity.

Because of the overtly didactic nature of the translation that Baydas produces, I pair this text with the articles on the topic of education that Baydas published in *al-nafā'is al-‘aşriyyah*. As a life-long educator, Baydas had many strong opinions on the subject, and felt that it was inextricably tied to the welfare of the emerging Arab nation(s). This chapter will explore Baydas' opinions on the role of foreign and national education, the relationship between moral education and scientific pursuits, and ultimately the relationship between education and modern society.

Chapter Five reads selections of Baydas' translation of Aleksey Tolstoy's historical novel *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* (originally published in 1862) to highlight the way in which Baydas adapts this piece of historical fiction to tell a story pertinent to his own setting in post-Ottoman Palestine. Using Lukács' work on historical fiction, I consider the impact of translation on historical fiction. In Baydas' work, we can see clearly that it is not merely a matter of linguistic approximation, but of wholesale manipulation of historical narratives in order to tell a story that fits the new context. Where the previous translations involve reading two texts against each other, reading this piece of historical fiction adds a third layer—the relationship of each author to the historical record. By reading Baydas' translation together with a selection of the historical articles that became so prominent in *al-nafā'is* during the British Mandate period, we can see Baydas'

relationship to history change. The role of the historical novel in constructing nationalist ideologies in many different contexts has been well documented. In this chapter, I consider how Baydas appropriates a novel imbued with the peculiarities of Russian nationalism and alters it to fit his emerging Arab/Palestinian paradigm under British Mandate rule. Comparing his decisions in translating *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* with the articles he published on the history of the Ottoman Empire, famous individuals from world history, and other historical topics gives us a better understanding of the ways that Baydas worked to bring history and entertainment together to educate his readership.

Baydas' career as a translator exemplifies the rich body of material present in *nahḍawi* translations. I argue that by pairing his translations with contemporary articles published in his periodical, we gain extra insight into both the translations as literary texts and the issues with which Baydas was concerned as he engaged in translating and publishing fiction for an Arabic-reading audience. This important aspect of *nahḍawi* literature has been completely overlooked within the dominant approaches to studying modern Arabic literature.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Reading Russian in Palestine: Contextualizing Khalil Baydas' Literary Career

In this chapter I intend to outline the historical context of Russian/Arab interactions in the Levant, focusing on the activities of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society, from its founding in 1882 to its swift disbanding in 1917. This historical outline is meant to provide the framework for examining the literary career of Khalil Baydas, one of the leading literary figures of Palestinian intellectual life in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The IOPS was the primary instrument of Russian influence in the region, and operated a large network of schools, hospitals, and cultural centers throughout the Levant.<sup>28</sup> Baydas and the other graduates of the IOPS schools were the primary translators of Russian culture into Arabic society.<sup>29</sup> They translated many works of fiction, articles from contemporary Russian newspapers, and wrote original articles on elements of Russian society that were published in the Arabic literary journals of the period. This chapter tells the story of the unintended consequences of Russian policy in the Levant. Late in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Russian officials worked to gain advantages against their Western European rivals, leading to the material support of the IOPS. This support came to an abrupt end in 1917 with the Bolshevik Revolution, which also had important effects on intellectual life in

---

<sup>28</sup> By the turn of the century, there were more than 50 schools operating, with more than 4000 students enrolled (Makhamid 2002). These numbers continued to grow up until the First World War. An article published in *al-nafaa'is* in 1911 notes that there were more than 100 schools operating at that time (1911 239).

<sup>29</sup> These graduates include such well-known Palestinian authors and intellectuals as Mikha'il Nu'aymi, Anton Ballan, Kulthum Awdeh (Vasilieva), Salim Qub'ayn, Iskandar Khuri al-Baytjali, and others.

Palestine. The historical and cultural dynamics outlined in this chapter shaped Baydas' career, informing his translations, his publications, and his work as an educator, as will be explored in detail in the chapters that follow.

### **Russia in the Levant**

Russia's foreign policy in the Middle East exemplifies a situation in which the results of foreign intervention are quite different from the initial goals. Russian policy in the Levant during the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was shaped by its antagonistic relationship with the Ottoman Empire and its longstanding rivalries with the Western powers active in the region. Unable to establish lasting economic or colonial influence in the region, Russian leaders came to rely on the connection between Russian Orthodoxy and the Arab Orthodox communities in the Levant as an avenue for influence. Russia worked to leverage these relationships to strengthen themselves in relation to its western rivals. For this reason, Russian institutions interacted with the Arab population quite differently than their British, French, or German counterparts. At the same time, the Arab communities in question were not passive receptors of Russian cultural influence. They functioned within their own religious, political, social, and intellectual climate responding to Russian policies from within a particular context. Consequently, the agency and activities of the Arab Orthodox individuals cannot be directly attributed to Russian policies in the region, but rely greatly upon the space opened up by Russian policies for activities that would ultimately undermine the other foreign powers working in the region. The Russian example is particularly notable because of its inherent differences from British and French interventions in the same region

This history is important in the present discussion of Khalil Baydas because it forms the historical context he lived and worked. His entire literary career is a product of his close connection with Russian culture, a connection that began during his years as a student, teacher, and ultimately administrator at the Russian schools run by the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society (IOPS). Thus, the bulk of this chapter aims to analyze the history of the IOPS, focusing specifically on the spaces that the policies of the IOPS opened up for agency and activity on the part of the Arab Orthodox communities that they intended to serve.<sup>30</sup> In this chapter, I want to outline these policies in the following manner:

First, I will briefly recount the history of Russian involvement in the region through the texts written by those individuals who were involved in the establishment of the various organizations. Second, I will juxtapose this traditional Russian historical narrative with the accounts left by Arab Christians who participated in and benefitted from the Russian policies described above. This type of contrapuntal reading brings into focus the gaps between Russian conceptions of the Arab world and Western Orientalism. In addition, it reveals the gap between Russian foreign policy in the Levant and the effects of these policies on society in the region. Most importantly, in the context of this dissertation, understanding this historical context allows us to understand better Baydas' role as a translator and editor.

Ironically, the most liberal, enlightened encounter between a European power and an Arab population during the 19<sup>th</sup> century came as a result of a rise in conservative

---

<sup>30</sup> It is important not to overstate the benevolence of the Russian policies that will be discussed below. They were never interested in moving the Arabs toward independence, but always interested in weakening their rivals so that they might increase their own influence and power in the region. For this region, this is not so much a case of the center collaborating with the periphery as it is a case in which the lines dividing center from periphery are complicated enough that the results are quite different from the intended aims.

ideology in Russia following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II (the Liberator) in 1881. In the aftermath of his death, Russia underwent a dramatic political shift from the emancipating liberalism of Tsar Alexander II to the reactionary politics of Tsar Alexander III. Conservative ideologies that had been developing for a number of decades came to dominate every aspect of government and intellectual life. Slavophile and Panslavist ideas came back into vogue, shaping the debates over national identity, foreign and domestic policy. Russian foreign policy during this period reflects the radical change that came with the ascension of Alexander III to the throne. The Orthodox Palestine Society, established in 1882, was one of the institutions that facilitated this interaction in foreign policy. The policies and goals of the IOPS differ from Western European missionary societies in the region during this period because of the intellectual and political climate from which they emerged.

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Levant was the site of a tremendous amount of foreign missionary activity. The great majority of this work belonged to groups originating in Western Europe and the United States, and falls outside the scope of this dissertation. In way of contextualization, a cursory summary of this literature finds two general trends in the literature. One group of scholars, represented by the work of Abdul Latif Tibawi and Edward Said, examines the various foreign missionary groups operating in Palestine almost explicitly as extensions of the colonial powers of the time.<sup>31</sup> More recent scholars, such as Laura Robson, and Ussama Makdisi take a more nuanced approach, ascribing the missionaries a greater degree of agency and self-determination as

---

<sup>31</sup> Tibawi's primary publication on the topic is *American Interests in Syria, 1800-1901*. Said discusses the matter extensively in his book *Orientalism*.

they examine their actions.<sup>32</sup> Such missionary groups make up an important part of the context in which the IOPS operated. As this is not the primary focus of this project, I will limit myself to a brief outline of these activities in order to provide context for the discussion of Russia's activity in the region.

The Protestant missionaries from America were very active in the Levant, winning many supporters and establishing schools, particularly the Syrian Protestant College, now known as the American University in Beirut. The first missionaries sent under the authority of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) arrived in 1823 (Zachs 151). The American missionaries were also very active in publishing religious and educational materials, and established one of the early presses in Beirut. They worked closely with several Arab converts who became leaders of the Arabic literary *nahḍah*, such as the Bustānī family, Naṣīf al-Yāzījī, and others. The translation of the Bible directed by American missionary Eli Smith (with major contributions from both Butrus al-Bustānī and Naṣīf al-Yāzījī) in 1856 remains the standard translation used in many congregations today. The activities of the American missionaries led to measurable success. According to Fruma Zachs, “On the eve of the First World War, the American missionaries ran 675 schools with a total of 34,317 pupils” (156). This is indicative of the large number of Arabs (primarily Arab Christians) who participated in the projects and institutions established by American missionaries.

The French missionaries in the region were much more closely connected to French colonial activities in the Levant. Catholic missionaries from France worked to establish hospitals, schools, and churches. While they did engage in proselytizing, they

---

<sup>32</sup> From Makdisi, see especially *The Artillery of Heaven*, from Robson, in addition to the text in the bibliography, see her book *Colonialism and Christianity in Mandate Palestine*.

also dedicated a great deal of energy to supporting Catholic pilgrims and other established Catholic institutions in the region.

Likewise, British missionaries in the region eventually came to be closely connected with British authorities. The initial missionary efforts of the British were late, sporadic, and poorly organized. Laura Robson gives an excellent summary of early British missionary efforts in Palestine, noting their tendency to define themselves in opposition to the Catholics.<sup>33</sup> Their efforts focused primarily in and around what would become the British Mandate after world War One. The British missionaries established schools as well, though their institutions did not rival the French and American institutions to the north.

### **History of Russia in the Levant through Personal Accounts**

By looking at texts produced by different individuals involved in Russian organizations in the Levant during this period we can trace the development of Russian policies in the region. While the general thrust of these policies remained consistent—an effort to establish a meaningful Russian presence in the fading Ottoman Empire, the strategies and policies put in place to achieve this goal shifted over time. These policy shifts came not only in reaction to the changing situation on the ground, but also in response to shifts in Russia’s domestic political and intellectual scene. From the first individual commissioned by the tsarist government to travel in the Levant, Porfirii Uspenskii, to the founder of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society, Vasilii Nikolaevich Khitrovo, each of the men involved in Russian attempts to establish an organizational presence in the Levant reflect the tensions present in Russian foreign policy in their

---

<sup>33</sup> Robson, Laura. “Archeology and Mission: The British Presence in Nineteenth-Century Jerusalem,” *Jerusalem Quarterly*. 40 (2010): 5-17



writings. In this chapter, I will put these narratives in dialog with writings from some of the Arabs who were heavily involved in Russian organizations (primarily the IOPS) in the region in order to give a complete picture of Russian influence in the Levant during this formative era.

### **Russian Missions in Palestine**

The Russian presence in the Middle East precedes the IOPS by many centuries. Russian Orthodox pilgrims formed the backbone of this presence, leading to the establishment of churches, hospitals and guest-houses that formed this early institutional presence.<sup>34</sup> Despite the long history, Russian Orthodox organizations in the Holy Land were not centrally organized, and often worked against each other more than they cooperated. In addition, rivalries with the Greek Orthodox, whose livelihood was threatened by the Russian presence in the region, further exacerbated the inefficiency of the Russian spiritual missions in the region. Seeking to establish a more visible official presence, Andrei Nikolaevich Muravev suggested the creation of a Russian spiritual mission in Jerusalem after visiting the city in 1838 (Hopwood 13-14). These early efforts were sporadic and unorganized. They had little interaction with the local Christian communities, and focused exclusively on providing services for Russian pilgrims coming through the area.

In 1843, Porfiriĭ Uspenskiĭ traveled to Jerusalem. Ostensibly a traditional pilgrim, he nevertheless carried a secret charge to function as a government official during his time in the Holy Land (Uspenskiĭ 14). Uspenskiĭ stayed in Jerusalem in this capacity for

---

<sup>34</sup> Though many traditional accounts refer to a large number of Russian Orthodox pilgrims moving between Russia and the Holy Land, Eileen Blake's recent research suggests that by the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century very few pilgrims were actually traveling in the region. I have chosen to adhere to the more traditional view because it reflects the picture painted in Khitrovo's writing, as well as his predecessors in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Porfiriĭ Uspenskiĭ and Konstantin Bazili.

many years. In 1847 his presence was formalized as the Russian Spiritual Mission, and he was given control over all of the affairs connected with Russian pilgrims. Porfirii Uspenskiĭ's time in the Middle East embodies the mix of religion and politics that characterizes much of Russian orientalist discourse. Though he was an ordained bishop in the Church, the Russian government asked him to present himself to the people he met on the journey as if he were simply traveling alone. Uspenskiĭ comments several times in his journals on how uncomfortable he felt with that situation, but complied in the end. He writes,

“But what will happen if it [news of the official nature of his visit] precedes me to the east? There I will cast myself as a humble worshiper; while the Greeks, Armenians, Catholics, Protestants, and Turks will look at me as a ‘yes-man.’ In such a case will I succeed in achieving my goals? . . . Is it not possible to change my role and send me to the east in the name of our Church?” (121).<sup>35</sup>

The director, however, absolutely refused this request. He reiterated the main goal of Uspenskiĭ's travel, “They can open to you the true state of the Orthodox Church in the East . . . Try in every possible way to obtain the trust of those people who will be shown to you, or with whom you become acquainted yourself”<sup>36</sup> (121). Later in his instructions, he repeated this same sentiment, “Do not surround yourself with any sense of secrecy, but at the same time, do not give anyone to know that you are sent by the government”<sup>37</sup> (125).

While Uspenskiĭ's remarks reflect a variation of the East/West divisiveness that lies at the heart of Said's concept of Orientalism, the dividing lines in Said's framework

---

<sup>35</sup> Там я стану выдавать себя за смиренного поклонника; а греки, армяне, католики, протестанты, турки будут смотреть на меня как на согладатая. Въ такомъ случаѣ, успѣю ли я достигнуть своей цѣли? . . . Нельзя-ли перемѣнить мою роль отъ лица нашей церкви?

<sup>36</sup> Но тѣ могутъ раскрыть вамъ настоящее состояніе церкви на востокѣ . . . Старайтесь всѣми силами пріобрѣсть довѣренность тѣхъ лицъ, которые будутъ указаны вамъ, или съ которыми вы встрѣтитесь сами.

<sup>37</sup> Не окружайте себя никакою таинственностію, но и ничѣмъ не давайте знать, что вы посланы правительствомъ.

are very different than those of Uspenskiĭ's worldview. For example, as a member of the Russian Orthodox hierarchy, Uspenskiĭ produces an account much more aware of and concerned with theological dividing lines rather than nation, race, color, or politics. Rather than a firm East/West divide like that found in Said's conception of orientalism, his divides reflect the Russian situation, which was tied primarily to the tensions between the Greek Orthodox clergy and the other Orthodox groups that worshipped in the region. Consequently, Uspenskiĭ makes very little mention of Arabs in his account as an ethnic affiliation. Instead, his comments draw lines between Russian Orthodox and the other religious groups in the region (Christian, Muslim and Jewish).

Similarly, Uspenskiĭ records this comment about the Protestant missionaries in the region:

The Protestant bishop (pastor) has little success. According to the consul's opinion, Protestantism will never take root on Palestinian soil. Asiatics [*Aziattsam*] need extravagant ceremonies, they need mysticism; religion must speak more to their feelings than to their intellect. (163)<sup>38</sup>

Uspenskiĭ lumps the groups living in Jerusalem into the category 'Asiatics,' a move very similar to those of Said's orientalists. In addition, he repeats all of the characteristics that Western European orientalism had ascribed to this group. Curiously, he seems to place Russian Orthodoxy on the Asian side of his dividing line, characterizing the Russian liturgy as the kind of 'extravagant ceremony' that Asiatics need. Such manipulation of the imaginary line between East and West often takes place in Uspenskiĭ's account.

Other selections from Uspenskiĭ's writings give further insight into the particular geography of his imagination onto which he inscribes each different group of people with

---

<sup>38</sup> Протестантскій епископъ мало имѣеть успѣха. По мнѣнію консула, протестантизмъ никогда не примется на палестинской почвѣ. Азіацамъ нужны пышные обряды, нуженъ мистицизмъ; религія должна болѣе говорить ихъ чувствамъ, нежели расудку.

which he interacts. During the beginning of his time in Istanbul, Uspenskiĭ describes a small monument raised to Russian soldiers who fought alongside the Turks against the Egyptian rebellions. This passage is of note for the way that it expresses the relationships between Russia, Turkey, Europe and the East/West divide.

In 1833, on the hills surrounding Bosphorus on the Asian side, our victorious soldiers stood in a row. A small simple stone, fixed upon a seaside hill, now marks the peaceful presence of our soldiers in these local parts. They saved the throne of Mahmud, who was shaken by the Egyptian sorcerer.<sup>39</sup> The Sultan, in gratitude, wanted to raise a large and wonderful memorial in honor of the Russian soldiers. But the French and the English, out of jealousy, did not want to see reminders of the glory and might of Russia; and so a simple stone stands instead of some kind of spectacular obelisk. Condemned, they forgot the words of God, “He that shall humble himself shall be exalted.” Looking at this humble memorial from the highest of the Embassy garden, my thoughts turned to the prophetic premonition that nations have of their own passing away. The Romans, the Byzantine Greeks, and the Mexicans guessed—they had premonitions about their own sorrowful future; and the Turks now tremble and feel that sooner or later they will be forced to leave Europe, where, according to their words, they speak loudly about the fall of Tsar-grad, behind which stands the imaginations of the entire world. I expressed this thought to the fathers, my fellow travelers, sitting in the wooden gazebo with my back to the setting sun and enjoying the shrubs, cypresses, and grape vines. (155-156)<sup>40</sup>

The passage is striking in the way that it expresses Russian/Turkish relationships. In the first part of the passage, Uspenskiĭ places the Turks and the Russians in one camp and

<sup>39</sup> The editor gives a footnote explaining that this is in reference to Muhammad ‘Ali, Egyptian Pasha.

<sup>40</sup> На холмахъ, окаймляющихъ Босфоръ съ аз атской стороны стояли даге ремъ наши победоносный войска въ 1833 году Небольшой простой камень водруженный на береговомъ холмѣ напоминаетъ мирное пребываніе нашихъ воиновъ въ здѣшнихъ мѣстахъ. Они спасли тронъ Махмуда, расшатанный египетскимъ кудесникомъ. Султанъ въ благодарность хотѣлъ воздвигнуть большой и прекрасный памятникъ въ честь русскаго воинства. Но французы и англичане изъ зависти не хотѣли видеть напоминанія о славѣ и могуществѣ Россіи; и вотъ простой камень заменять какой-либо великолѣпный обелискъ. Окаянные забыли они слова Божіи: «Смиряться вознесется.» Смотри на этотъ скромный памятникъ съ высоты посольскаго сада я невольно думалъ о пророчественномъ предчувствіи народовъ ихъ собственной гибели. Римляне, греки, византійскіе, мексиканцы угадывали, предчувствовали свою печальную будущность; и турки нынѣ тревожатся и чувствуютъ, что рано или поздно имъ придется оставить Европу, гдѣ, по ихъ же словамъ, они стоятъ лагеремъ: а русскіе во дворцахъ и хижинахъ громко поговариваютъ о взятіи Царь-Града за коимъ послѣдуетъ преставленіе свѣта. Эту думу я высказалъ отцамъ спутникамъ сидя въ деревянной беседке спиною къ палящему солнцу и любуясь лаврами кипарисами и виноградниками

Western Europe (France and Britain) in another. The physical proximity of Russia to the Turks allowed them to provide military support in a way that the Western European powers could not, and Russia gained stature in the eyes of the Turkish rulers. As proved to be the case throughout history, however, Britain and France continually held the upper hand from afar. According to this account, their jealousy and interference prevented Russia from receiving the recognition that it deserved. In such an alignment, Russia is undoubtedly a 'Great Power,' and considers itself equal with those of Western Europe, but in the end proves unable to establish a meaningful historical trace of this power and potential.

On the other hand, the latter part of the passage highlights the immanent and unavoidable end of Turkish power in the region. In his unique description of this 'fact,' Uspenskiĭ subtly emphasizes the Russian preeminence in the history of the region. Together with an obscure reference to the Mexicans, Uspenskiĭ recounts the major empires of the Mediterranean world—Rome, and the Byzantine Greeks. Though Uspenskiĭ does not explicitly mention Russia in this sentence, it lurks just behind the list that he recites. Russians have long called Moscow the "Third Rome," the successor to Rome and Constantinople as the capital of Christian civilization. In addition, Uspenskiĭ's choice of cities highlights the importance he gives to Russian Orthodox Christianity in the culture of the area. Rome (Catholicism) and Constantinople (Greek Orthodox) had their day in the region, but those times had passed into history. Moscow and Russian Orthodoxy seemed poised to step into the cultural and political void left by the decline of the Byzantine influence in the region.

In this passage the divisions between East and West become less important than the place of Russia itself on the stage of world history. For Uspenskiĭ, Russia is able to travel back and forth between the Eastern Turks and the Western powers as if it were not entirely part of either group, but rather played an important role in all of the events to come. Such ambiguous positioning reflects the complicated nature of Russian discourse on the ‘East.’

As a result of increased Russian activity in the Holy Land, Russian Orthodox authorities succeeded in getting Cyril, who had strong connections to the Russian Orthodox hierarchy, elected Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1845, “marking the entry of Russia into the religious politics of Jerusalem” (Mazza 52). From that point forward, Russia would work to maintain official avenues of influence open to the intense religious politicking that has characterized Christianity in the Levant for so long.

If the organization of the Russian Spiritual Mission marked the formalization of the religious aspects of Uspenskiĭ’s career in the region, the establishment of the Palestinian Committee in 1859 did the same for the political aspects of his initial mission. The Palestinian Committee handled consular duties and managed other secular affairs in the region from 1859-1864. At that point, it was replaced with the Palestinian Commission, which was charged with the maintenance of both secular and religious issues in the region. In general, cooperation between these organizations—particularly across the secular/spiritual divide—was lacking. This issue would not be effectively addressed until the establishment of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society (IOPS) in 1882. Between 1882 and 1917, the IOPS would outstrip all other Russian religious institutions in the Arab world to take the lead in ecclesiastical, educational, pilgrim-

related, and even political matters in the region. The IOPS enjoyed a great deal of official support, and its success came directly as a result of the enthusiasm and tireless work of its founder, Vasiliĭ Nikolaevich Khitrovo. The unique legacy of this society reflects the context in which Khitrovo conceived of its mission and methods.

### **V.N. Khitrovo and the Establishment of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society**

The life and writings of Vasiliĭ Nikolaevich Khitrovo (1834-1903), the primary architect of the group that would become the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society, connect the internal dynamics of conservative Russian intelligentsia and Russia's foreign policies in the Ottoman Empire. A member of St. Petersburg's affluent class, Khitrovo belonged to the class of people that developed and supported Pan Slavist ideologies. The Palestinian Commission was still the clearinghouse for Russian political interests in the Holy Land when movements to establish a new organization to support Russian Orthodoxy in the region began to stir. In fact, potential competition between the Palestinian Commission and the new organization that Khitrovo envisioned was one of the main obstacles that he had to overcome in securing support for his venture. In his effort to garner support for the creation of the new Society, Khitrovo's plays off of Russia's growing rivalries with France, Britain, and America; in addition, Khitrovo's text illustrates the ways that the debates around Russian national identity and Pan Slavist thinking had come to influence Russian foreign policy in this period.

Even the earliest texts published by Khitrovo portray the situation in the Levant through the filter of the great debates of 19<sup>th</sup> century Russian culture. For example, an 1876 text published by Khitrovo entitled *Sinaĭ i Palestina* mirrors many of the typical descriptions of biblical lands that populate Christian communities. Khitrovo's

introduction to the description, however, gives us a sense of the special urgency that Russians felt as the 19<sup>th</sup> century drew to a close. He lists all of the prominent orientalists from Germany, France, and the United States then remarks,

“Because of a lack of Russian sources, we are forced to turn to western literature, which takes its information from two sources: Catholic, which cannot deal impartially with Orthodox sources, if only they were aware of them, and Protestant—treating both the one and the other unfaithfully in most cases”<sup>41</sup> (1876 ii-iii).

For Khitrovo, his duty was not only a religious one, making information available to pilgrim and pious Christians in Russia, but also a matter of national pride. Russia’s lack of orientalist scholarship (in his eyes) was a serious matter in and of itself, showing the gap that still remained between Russia and the great powers of Western Europe.

Whatever shapes the rhetoric around Russia’s involvement in the Levant took over the ensuing years, these anxieties drove most of the policies and organizations that Russia supported in the region. This drive is simply one minor manifestation of larger trends within Russian politics of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The conservative elements of society that came to power in the wake of the assassination of Alexander II in 1881 sought to revive the majesty of the Russian empire. In the context of 19<sup>th</sup> century international politics, the obvious way to carry out such an agenda was through imperial expansion. In 1889, the tsarist government took interest in Khitrovo’s organization, bestowing upon it the title “Imperial.” It is clear that from this time on, the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society was

---

<sup>41</sup> «За недостаткомъ русскихъ источниковъ мы по неволѣ принуждены обращаться къ западной литературѣ, которая почерпаетъ свои свѣдѣнія изъ двухъ источниковъ: --католическихъ, не могущихъ относиться безпристрастно къ источникамъ православнымъ, если бы даже они были имъ извѣстны и протестантскихъ—относящихся въ большинствѣ случаевъ недовѣрчиво и къ тѣмъ и къ другимъ.»



a part of the Russian government efforts to establish itself on the same level as Western European nations in international politics.

As the Ottoman Empire continued to decline and the “Eastern Question” became more pressing in European politics, Russia needed desperately to compete with the more well-established colonial endeavors of Britain and France. Unable to muster the military and economic might needed to establish a traditional colonial presence in Ottoman lands, Russia turned to other avenues of influence on the region—primarily their claim to be the ‘defenders of the Orthodox faith’ in all the world. Russia had gained this legal right in the Ottoman Empire as part of the 1774 treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji, when Russia was officially accorded the right and responsibility of protecting Orthodox communities in the Ottoman Empire (Hitti 697). This period of Russian international politics is compelling for the constant tension within Russian society between Russian heritage on the one hand, and European culture (intimately connected to European colonialism) on the other.

It is interesting to note that following each military conflict between Russia and the Ottoman Empire we witness a new wave of Russian religious interest in the Holy Land. Russia never succeeded in dealing the Ottoman army a decisive blow, and though it secured some favorable treaties they never established a political presence in the region. The support of religious missions in the region allowed Russia to address these military disappointments in alternative ways. The establishment of religious institutions in the Ottoman Empire provided an avenue for influence and activity in the absence of a more traditional (in European history) colonial presence.

In 1871, Khitrovo made his first visit to Jerusalem. He was terribly saddened by the state of the native Orthodox congregations and the Russian pilgrims in the Holy Land,

and upon his return to Russia decided to do something about it. His experiences there sparked an obsession with the region that would dominate the rest of his life. His dismay at the poor state of Orthodox affairs in the Holy Land led him to spearhead the creation of the Orthodox Palestine Society.

Initially, Khitrovo ran into powerful resistance from Moscow around the creation of a new Russian organization in the Middle East. Khitrovo worked tirelessly for several years before he made any progress in changing the situation of Orthodoxy in Jerusalem. Beyond simple endurance, Khitrovo owed his success to his ability to win the support of important individuals within the tsar's court. First among the powerful allies that Khitrovo won was K. P. Pobedonostsev, the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod—the highest religious authority appointed by the tsar. Closely connected to the conservative politics that dominated this era, Pobedonostsev championed many elements of the reactionary politics that marked Alexander III's reign. His position as a religious official added to his interest in the question of Orthodoxy abroad. Pobedonostsev was instrumental in securing the support of the tsar and his family for the establishment of the IOPS. Hopwood notes Pobedonostsev's vital role in the establishment of the Society, calling him Khitrovo's "most important acquaintance" (101-102).

Speaking to the "right people" was only part of Khitrovo's success. In addition, he succeeded in framing his arguments for an increased Russian presence in the Levant in terms that resonated with the political and intellectual climate of the time. Hopwood summarized this fact in the following words,

"He had drawn on the knowledge of those who had worked in Jerusalem, and under Panslavist influence had modeled his society on the Moscow and Kiev Slavonic Benevolent Committees which, although concerned with the Slav provinces of the Ottoman Empire, had very similar aims. The Society, unlike the

Committees, could not emphasize the ties of race and so stressed the bonds of religion. The Arabs, largely unknown in Russia, were presented as little Orthodox brothers.” (Hopwood 104)

As will be shown below, Khitrovo repeatedly emphasizes religious relationships and responsibilities in the place of ethnic relationships. He repeats again and again the tenets and constructions of Panslavism, highlighting Russia’s responsibility towards Slavs (and, by extension, non-Slavic Orthodox populations) beyond the borders of the Russian Empire.

Khitrovo’s effectiveness in pleading his case to a Russian audience earned him broad support in Russian society. Concerning the early days of the IOPS, Naumkin writes,

“Funds for the Society came not from government subsidies, comparatively inconsequential, as much as from members' dues and different donations. Interest in it from the first steps was so great that the flow of funding allowed the Society by the 1890's to transform itself into a powerful organization with large land holdings in old Turkey, largely in Palestine and Syria, and partially in several other countries” (143)

The Society secured such large contributions through two very different sources of income—individuals interested in the scientific/ethnographic aims of the Society, and people attracted to the religious connections of the Society. Khitrovo’s unique variation on the themes established by Panslavist intellectuals allowed him to appeal to a wide variety of people in Russia’s elite circles.

The IOPS differed from previous Russian religious organizations in the Levant in important ways. It featured a high level of organization, eliminating the infighting that had hampered previous Orthodox activities in Palestine. In addition, the IOPS benefited from an unprecedented level of government support. The IOPS also had a specific mandate to support Orthodoxy in the region through the construction of schools,

hospitals, guest-houses, and other religious buildings. For these reasons, the IOPS would leave Russia's deepest mark on the cultures and peoples of the Middle East.

### **Mission of the Society**

The original charter of the IOPS distills Khitrovo's vision into a clear mission statement. It reads as follows:

“1. Collect, analyze and disseminate in Russia information about the holy sites; 2. render help to Orthodox pilgrims; 3. found schools, hospitals, and guest houses and also render material support to local residents, churches and clergy; 4. in general, through its scholarly and charitable activities work towards the growth of orthodoxy in Palestine and strengthen its connection with its related Russian (*velikorusskim*) Orthodoxy” (quoted in Vorob'eva 95).

From these four directives, we can see how the struggles concerning Russian national identity influenced its relation to the Middle East. This mission statement reflects earlier Panslavists' notions of Russia's place in the world.

The fourth point in the IOPS mission statement is particularly clear in illustrating the close connection between Khitrovo's vision for the Arab Orthodox community and Panslavist thought. The Panslavists were among those Russian intellectuals who built their view of Russia's place in the world on its status as the 'big brother' of other Slavic nations. For Khitrovo, this line of thinking was easily extended to the non-Slavic Orthodox Christians in the Middle East.

Khitrovo's own comments in his early writings make the connection between Panslavist conceptions of Russia's place in the international community and the Middle East clearer. In his first published work, *A Week in Palestine*, which was published in 1876, Khitrovo explicitly compares the situation of Orthodox Arabs to that of the Orthodox Slavs living in the Balkan Peninsula. He writes,

“In order to understand the primary nature of our religious issue in Palestine, one must explain that the relations of the Greek clergy in Palestine to the local Orthodox Arab population are exactly the same as they are in the North part of the Turkish Empire to the Slavic Orthodox populations.”<sup>42</sup>

Panslavists championed the cause of the Slavs in the Balkan Peninsula in their struggles for independence from the Ottoman Empire. Khitrovo’s statement draws upon that political fervor to encourage the support of the Arab Orthodox population of Palestine. This attitude exhibits the peculiar flexibility of Panslavist discourse that allows Khitrovo to valorize confessional affiliation over ethnic and racial differences. Khitrovo equates the Greek Orthodox clergy with the Muslim Ottoman rulers in their treatment of the Orthodox populations of their respective jurisdictions. At the same time, he equates the Arab Orthodox community with the Slavic Orthodox communities of the Balkans. In this new constellation of relationships, it is impossible to say who or what is East and who or what is West.

### *A Week in Jerusalem*

Khitrovo published an account of his first journey to Jerusalem under the title *A Week in Jerusalem*.<sup>43</sup> Roughly 90 pages long, this work falls squarely within the genre of European travelogues to the Holy Land, with which he would have been familiar. Khitrovo’s writings reflect his place in the intellectual landscape of late 19<sup>th</sup> century Russia. Russian intellectuals came to rely heavily upon the Orthodox Church as an element of national identity. This dynamic forms a unique aspect of Russian national history in the period. In addition, his works on Palestine highlight the ways in which

---

<sup>42</sup> Чтобы понять главную суть нашего церковного вопроса в Палестине, нужно объяснить, что отношения греческого духовенства в Палестине к местному православному арабскому населению те же, какие они на севере Турецкой Империи к православному славянскому населению.

<sup>43</sup> Unfortunately, the only copy of this work available to me does not have any kind of pagination. My references, therefore, are given without page numbers. All translations from the Russian are my own.

confessional differences could trump ethnic and racial differences within Panslavist (and consequently, Russian orientalists') thinking of the time. At the same time, he maintains a delicate balance in relation to European culture and civilization. Khitrovo's writings exemplify the "uneasy triptych" of European / Russian / Oriental relations.

Throughout his account, Khitrovo invokes European culture by repeating familiar stereotypes of traditional European Orientalism. Chief among these, he associates all progress and civilization with Europe, while dismissing everything associated with disorder and stagnancy as Oriental / Eastern.<sup>44</sup> This is particularly clear in the opening sections of his narrative. Throughout the account Khitrovo is consistent in labeling the off-putting sights, sounds and smells he encounters as "Eastern." Khitrovo's East is instantly recognizable, if at times difficult to put into words. He remarks on the "Eastern structures" that cover the hills of Jaffa and then comments, "I say 'Eastern' and all who have in their lives seen even one of the eastern coastal towns understands my expression."<sup>45</sup> He goes on to delineate the distinct differences between an 'Eastern' port town and a European port.

The second Orientalist stereotype in the account comes as Khitrovo struggles to comprehend the details of the unfamiliar aspects of life in Palestine. Again, regarding Jaffa, he writes, "it all blends into a single mass in which, even through a telescope you are unable to discern where one home ends and another begins."<sup>46</sup> Khitrovo's tone echoes that of other travelogues produced throughout Europe in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>44</sup> I have chosen to translate the term "*vostok*" and its derivatives as "East," although they could also be rendered as "Orient."

<sup>45</sup> Я говорю восточных, и каждый, видевший в своей жизни, хотя бы один из приморских восточных городов, поймет мое выражение.

<sup>46</sup> все это сливается в одну массу, в которой, даже в подзорную трубу, вы не в состоянии отличить, где кончается один дом, где начинается другой.

Khitrovo also reflects West European Orientalism in the way that he interacts with Islam. He briefly describes a visit to the Dome of the Rock and the al-Aqsa Mosque. In describing his visit to the mosque, he encounters it solely as a desecrated church. He is more concerned with the traces of Christianity and the elements of a Christian place of worship that are obviously missing (the icons and the altar) than with what is before him. Khitrovo experiences the absence of a Church more readily than the mosque in which he stands.

Khitrovo's experience with the Palestinian countryside reflects the European Orientalist fixation on an eternally unchanging Orient. He does not experience the Palestinian as much as he experiences the Biblical. Concerning pilgrimage, Kalinowska notes, "pilgrimages have always been conceived as journeys towards a source of an essential truth, and, as such, they have tended to reaffirm that single truth" (48). Indeed, throughout the opening sections of his account, details of modern life in Palestine are only presented as obstacles to experiencing the Biblical countryside. He exclaims, "At each step in this country, an entire ocean of memories embraces you."<sup>47</sup> Obviously Khitrovo is referring to religious memories, memories connected to contemporary Palestine only insofar as they invoke Biblical scenes.

Based on these passages, it would not be difficult to label his writing as Orientalist in its treatment of Palestinian society. Khitrovo reinforces the Europe / not Europe dichotomy, marking Palestine as a land devoid of progress in which nothing ever changes. He sets European civility and order off against Palestinian chaos and disorder. All of these attitudes fall squarely within the boundaries defined by Said's Orientalism. In each of these instances it is clear that Khitrovo places himself squarely on the European

---

<sup>47</sup> Что шаг в этой стране, то целое море воспоминаний охватывает вас.

side of the equation. As one continues through the rest of his work, however, it becomes apparent that while Khitrovo is working within an Orientalist European textual tradition, his own attitudes and actions often diverge from the traditional Orientalist paradigm as explicated by Said. These divergences are all closely related to Khitrovo's Russian Orthodox identity.

Khitrovo refers to Europe throughout the opening section of his account, and it is always clear that for him Europe is familiar and the Middle East is foreign. He never, however, identifies himself as exclusively European, but rather hedges his position in phrases such as, "Those who are familiar with Europe" and "Those who are accustomed to the European way." Undoubtedly, Khitrovo is familiar with Europe. At the same time, he is Russian, or more specifically, Russian Orthodox. Kalinowska comments on the importance of pilgrimage to the Holy Land in Russian identity thus, "The oriental journey served the purpose of asserting the Russianness—not the Europeanness—of imperial Russian culture" (139). For Vasiliĭ Khitrovo, this was undoubtedly the case.

One of the principal 'biblical memories' that Khitrovo relates is that of Peter's vision at Jaffa. Related in Acts 10:9-48, this vision marked a major turning point in the early history of the Christian church. Following his vision, Peter, then the leader of those who followed Jesus' teachings, understood for the first time that the Gospel was to be preached to all peoples. This was a major departure from their practice at the time, when Jesus' disciples only taught his doctrine among the Jews. Khitrovo's interest in relating this event opens space for him to express an inclusivist view not possible in a traditional West European Orientalist framework. He writes, "In all of the scriptures there is perhaps nothing so joyous for us as the Jaffa vision, in which it was said that not only the sons of



Abraham, but all of humanity would be saved.”<sup>48</sup> Khitrovo’s attitude toward the other people that he meets reflects the inclusive attitude expressed in his commentary on this vision. Many of his traveling companions are Jesuits, and Khitrovo never comments disparagingly about their presence in his group. Although the divisions between sects and religions are important for Khitrovo, in the end he aligns himself closely with Peter’s vision—the community of which he is part is an open one, and crosses ethnic and racial bounds. This is a sharp departure from the fixed borders of more traditional European relations with ‘the Orient.’ In place of concern with ethnic divisions and racial superiority Khitrovo expresses instead of the possibility of unity through religion across such divisions.

Khitrovo expresses these sentiments more explicitly through comments on the languages that the people use. For Khitrovo, language is an important factor in discerning and assigning identities to the individuals with whom he interacts. For example, each time they enter a Russian pilgrim house, Khitrovo notes the linguistic details of that encounter. When they entered the first such house he writes, “The Arab overseer of the home spoke up in broken Russian.”<sup>49</sup> Later he refers to this same individual as “an Orthodox Arab.” This added epithet sets this individual apart, bringing him closer to Khitrovo. In contrast, Khitrovo refers to the other Arabs he encounters as “Bedouin” reducing their language to a single word—“the unavoidable word in the East—*baksheesh* [a request for a tip]” and an unintelligible cacophony of shouting.<sup>50</sup> Khitrovo’s second encounter at a Russian guest-house further complicates the divisions that he considers

---

<sup>48</sup> Да, среди многих видений Священной Истории нет, может быть, другого более для нас отрадного, как видение Яффское, которым высказано было, что не одни сыны Авраамовы, но и все сыны человеческие будут спасены.

<sup>49</sup> проговорил ломанным русским языком араб - смотритель дома

<sup>50</sup> неизбежное на востоке «бакшиш»

important. He writes, “But this time we were not greeted by broken, but pure Russian speech. The overseer of the guesthouse is a native of Moscow; where she married a Greek or an Arab, a native of Ramallah, thrown by fate into our esteemed capital city.”<sup>51</sup>

The difficulty of linguistic communication also serves to underscore the universality of religious connections. Khitrovo relates,

“Several elderly Arab women came down the staircase; one of them greeted us by making the sign of the cross. Whether this custom is widespread among the Christian population of the East I do not know . . . but it sunk deep into my soul. This greeting, this sign—it is as if it said, ‘What trouble is it if we don’t understand each other, if we cannot speak with each other? Greetings, visitor. We are brothers—we are children of the same church’.”<sup>52</sup>

Although linguistic differences earlier formed an insurmountable barrier, for Khitrovo religious identity is an even more important criterion in grouping individuals. Through the above examples involving language, Khitrovo reveals a much more complicated taxonomy of identities than the European/non-European dichotomy available in traditional Orientalist discourse. In the place of a firm East/West divide, Khitrovo experiences various shades of mixed identities in which religion plays a larger part than ethnicity.

The Orthodox faith played a fundamental role in defining Russian national identity during this period. Khitrovo appeals to this aspect of Russian identity in part to fulfill the goal of this publication. By the time *A Week in Jerusalem* was published and distributed in 1876, Khitrovo was already busily engaged in the organization of what

---

<sup>51</sup> Но на этот раз нас приветствовали уже не ломанной, а чисто русской речью. Смотрительница подворья - московская уроженка, вышла замуж в Москве за грека или араба - уроженца Рамлэ, какой-то судьбой заброшенного в нашу первопрестольную

<sup>52</sup> Несколько старух арабок спускались вниз, одна из них приветствовала нас крестным знаменем. Существует ли этот обычай повсеместно между христианским населением Востока, я не знаю, позже ни разу мне не случалось его подметить, но он мне сильно пришелся по душе. Этот привет, этот знак как бы говорил - что за нужда, что мы друг друга не понимаем, друг с другом говорить не можем; привет тебе пришел, мы братья, мы дети одной церкви.

would become the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society. The publication and dissemination of this tract helped to make such an undertaking possible by introducing Russians to the Arab Orthodox community and giving voice to their needs. Khitrovo's nuanced understanding of the political and religious challenges that the Russian Orthodox Church faced in Palestine allowed him to appeal to a broad section of Russian conservatives. He needed their support to convince the government that renewed efforts and a new institutional framework were necessary in the region. Khitrovo periodically interrupts his narrative to make impassioned pleas to his Russian audience concerning the state of Orthodoxy in the Holy Land. At the conclusion of each spiritual episode, he transitions carefully into a different tone of voice, describing the plight of Orthodoxy in the region, imploring his readers to take some action of their own. These sections describing the challenges facing the Orthodox community in Palestine further emphasize the degree to which religious faith informs Russian Orientalism.

After relating the details of his entry into Jerusalem, for example, he reflects on the role that pious Russian pilgrims had played in establishing and maintaining Orthodoxy in the region:

“Much has befallen our worshipers in the Holy Land, while it is only thanks to these hundreds and thousands of gray headed men and simple women, year by year moving from Jaffa to Jerusalem and back, exactly as if through a Russian province; we are indebted to that influence for what it means to be a Russian in Palestine (today); their influence is so great that you can pass along this road speaking Russian and only those Bedouin who come from far away will not understand you.”<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Много нападали на наших поклонников по Святым местам, а между тем только благодаря этим сотням и тысячам серых мужичков и простых баб, из года в год движущихся из Яффы в Иерусалим и обратно, точно по русской губернии, обязаны мы тому влиянию, которое имя русского имеет в Палестине; влиянию настолько сильному, что в вы с русским языком пройдете по этой дороге и вас не поймет разве только какой-то пришлый издалека бедуин.

He concludes this section with the statement, “Take away this gray-headed man and Orthodoxy will be extinguished by the systematic Catholic and the Protestant propaganda that has grown even stronger in recent times.”<sup>54</sup> In this passage, the Russian Orthodox pilgrim is an intrinsic part of the Palestinian landscape, as opposed to the intrusive Catholic and Protestant missionaries. Russian Orthodoxy belongs in the East, and is threatened by Western missionary propaganda.

Another similar example comes after he relates a moving account of the spiritual significance of his visit to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and the Via Dolorosa. Immediately following these transcendent experiences, he writes, “He who does not know the situation of affairs in Palestine in general, and of religious affairs in particular, can never comprehend how difficult the work of the director of the Russian spiritual mission in Jerusalem is.”<sup>55</sup> Khitrovo then goes on to outline the difficulties facing the current Russian institutions in the region. He ends this description with another plea for material and institutional support for the Russian infrastructure in Palestine.

We can see this textual strategy most clearly in the final section of Khitrovo’s account. Toward the end of his visit, he reflects on the unique nature of Jerusalem. He writes, “This city is either spiritual or historical, in it you live either by religion or by science, it is impossible to live any other way.”<sup>56</sup> This enigmatic statement comes in the midst of an aside concerning Russian government officials serving abroad. Khitrovo expounds on the various ways in which service in Jerusalem differs from service in other

---

<sup>54</sup> Отнимите вы этого серого мужичка и исчезнет «Москов», единственно еще поддерживающий в Палестине русское влияние. Отнимите его, и православие заглохнет среди систематической католической и еще более сильной в последнее время протестантской пропаганде.

<sup>55</sup> Тот, кто нехорошо знает положение в Палестине дел вообще и церковных в особенности, никогда не может отдать себе отчета, как трудна должность Начальника русской духовной миссии в Иерусалиме.

<sup>56</sup> Этот город или духовный или исторический, в нем живешь или религией или наукой, жить иначе в нем невозможно

parts of the world. He concludes this section by reflecting on Russia's strategic positioning in relation to the Middle East. He writes,

“We have no commercial interests in it, it is as if we do not pursue any political interests in it—this means that all of our activity in the holy city (Jerusalem) is defined by the spiritual interests of those thousands of worshipers who come year by year from Russia to worship at the holy sites.”<sup>57</sup>

In Khitrovo's understanding, the Russian Orthodox Church is the single most important factor in defining Russian interests in the region. While he may have overstated Russia's political and economic disinterest in the rapidly weakening Ottoman Empire, these comments underscore the power of the religious attachment of Russia to Palestine.

Writing in 1876, Khitrovo attributes the difficulties that the Russian Spiritual Mission had faced in Palestine during the previous 25 years to be the result of Russian consuls and diplomats acting like they would in Europe. Concerning the difficulties they face (and cause), he writes,

“At the same time, it is impossible to transform Jerusalem into Marseilles, Naples or Danzig. Jerusalem exists exclusively for spiritual and scholarly life. . . . In Jerusalem, separating secular matters from spiritual matters is not possible. If you were to transfer to a spiritual representative, as is right, spiritual matters, than the secular representative would either have nothing at all to do, or he would be required to submit himself to the leadership of the spiritual representative, which our consuls did not wish to do.”<sup>58</sup>

Khitrovo makes Jerusalem the sole realm of the spiritual. In his opinion, all of the difficulties facing the Orthodox Church in the region are the result of giving attention to the political over the spiritual.

---

<sup>57</sup> Торговых интересов мы в нем не имеем; политических, как-будто не преследуем; значит вся деятельность наших представителей в Святом граде ограничивается духовными интересами тех тысяч поклонников, которые из года в год приходят из России поклониться Святым местам.

<sup>58</sup> Между тем приравнивать Иерусалим к Марсели, Наполи или Данцигу нельзя. Иерусалим только существует для духовной или ученой жизни. . . . Разграничение в Иерусалиме светских дел от духовных невозможно, если же передать духовному представителю, как и следует, духовные дела, то светскому представителю придется или ничего не делать, или отдать себя под начальство духовного лица, чего наши консула допустить не хотели.

Whereas up until this point it has been fairly straightforward to distinguish between those aspects of Khitrovo's writing that resemble West European Orientalism and those that diverge from it, this statement is open to multiple interpretations. On the one hand, his relegation of Jerusalem to the realm of the spiritual and the scholarly could be read as an Orientalist reduction of an entire region to an unchanging mystical entity. On the other hand, his statement falls in line with Pan Slavist conceptions of Russian national identity and the peculiar place that religious identity plays within that context.

By reading the preceding passage together with other sections of his account that treat issues of religious identity, it becomes clear that the latter is closer to the paradigm in which Khitrovo writes. At several points, Khitrovo reveals another side of his experience in the Orient. Because of the central place of Orthodoxy in Russian national identity, confessional differences often formed more substantial barriers than did ethnic or racial divisions. Toward the end of *A Week in Palestine*, Khitrovo addresses the topic of interfaith relations in Jerusalem. Giving attention first to the Catholics, then the Protestants, and finally the Greek Orthodox, Khitrovo sets the Russians off from each of these groups. In each case, Russian identity lines up neatly with the Arab Orthodox Christians against the other groups, a situation that would never occur in West European Orientalist discourse.

For Khitrovo, it is the confessional divisions that are ultimate and eternal. He conceives of the different religious traditions as two rivers that flow through the region. "When you consider these traditions rationally, you are struck by the traditions that flow through the land like two rivers—the Catholic and the Greek—never coming into contact

with each other.”<sup>59</sup> Here in the religious realm, Khitrovo finally identifies the impenetrable East/West divide. Clearly, however, it is not the same divide that exists in Said’s conception of Orientalism, for Khitrovo places himself on the Eastern side of the equation. For Khitrovo, Russia’s interests line up with those of the Arab Orthodox community in Palestine. Even more than the Western missionary organizations who came seeking converts and proselytes, the IOPS came to Jerusalem with the explicit goal of strengthening and supporting an existing Arab community. In essence, they worked to help the Arab Orthodox Christians be more Arab and more Orthodox. As Khitrovo seeks support from among the Russian nobility for a new charitable organization, he presents the Arabs not as strangers, but as members of the same family who are in need.

Later Khitrovo makes a more striking comment on the same subject, saying, “This is why we, as far as was possible, had to defend the struggles of the Bulgarians in this respect; this is why our politics in Palestine must be to support the local Arab population.”<sup>60</sup> This is a decidedly non-Orientalist turn, invoking a circumstance peculiar to the Russian context. The Bulgarian question was a defining moment in both internal and external Russian politics. Russia acted out in support of the Bulgarian struggle against the Ottoman Empire primarily because Bulgaria framed the call for autonomy in religious terms. They were an Orthodox people being oppressed by a non-Orthodox government. They needed protection, and Russia considered itself the sole protector of Orthodoxy. This resembles the situation in Palestine that Khitrovo describes, although it troubles the East/West dichotomy even further. Khitrovo advocates supporting the local

---

<sup>59</sup> Когда беспристрастно относишься к этим преданиям, вас поражает в Палестине протекающие через ряд столетий, точно две реки, предания: католические и греческие, никогда почти не сливающиеся вместе.

<sup>60</sup> Вот отчего мы, насколько было возможно, должны были защищать стремление в этом болгар, вот отчего и наша политика в Палестине должна была поддерживать местное арабское население.

Arab population in the same way that they supported the Bulgarians. In this case, however, in addition to supporting them against Ottoman rule, Khitrovo puts the Russians in direct opposition to the Catholics, the Protestants, and by extension, the British and French.<sup>61</sup> Such an appeal would have been especially important for Khitrovo's cause. Despite a vague interest in the Holy Land, Russian society was not particularly concerned with or aware of the people who lived there. Hopwood writes,

“The Arab world, unlike the Slav, was a matter of little concern to most Russians. What interest there was in the Arabs was to some extent a by-product of the branch of Panslav philosophy which sought to free all Orthodox Slavs from foreign domination—whether by the Ottoman Turks or the Greek Church.” (100).

The direct connection between Panslavist philosophy and the underlying principles of the IOPS accounts for differences not only in the rhetoric surrounding the societies, but also in the outcomes of these various groups.

Although Western Orientalism colors the tone and structure of Khitrovo's narrative, he builds his worldview on a very different foundation. When we examine the divisions, relationships and communities within the world he describes, it is clear that his writing relies almost exclusively on the Panslavist notions of Russia's role in the world. Khitrovo's writing assumes the superficial forms of orientalist discourse, but maintains a specifically Russian outlook on what actions to take in the region. In this way, Khitrovo's writings characterize the close relationship between religious identity and national identity in late 19<sup>th</sup> century Russia. He received support from the Russian government

---

<sup>61</sup> The repercussions of these policy decisions in Russian/British and Russian/French relations would manifest them several years later, after the IOPS had established itself in the region and instituted a very successful chain of schools. In these schools, they perpetuated the support of the local Arab population in the way that Khitrovo proposes here, teaching several subjects in Arabic—a practice unique among missionary schools at that time.



and Russian society because his cause fit so neatly within an accepted construction of Russia's national identity.

### **Effects of the IOPS in Palestine**

Prior to the work of the IOPS, no organization had been successful in overcoming the divisions and conflicts in the Orthodox communities of the Levant. The rivalry between the Greek and the Russian Orthodox Churches took much of the energy of the leaders in the region. In addition, tension between the Greek clergy and the Arab laity led to a general decline in the efficacy and activity of the Orthodox Church within this population. All the while, the Catholic and Protestant groups were spreading in the region and growing in strength at the expense of the traditional Arab Orthodox communities. One historian of the Orthodox missions wrote of this period, "Indeed, the Russian presence was not coordinated, and there was no single organization responsible for overseeing this presence"<sup>62</sup> (Kildani 83-84). Alexander III's decision to co-opt the structure of Khitrovo's Orthodox Palestine Society in 1882 marks the first time that a unified administrative structure answerable to the tsarist government oversaw the activities of the Orthodox communities within the Levant.

This special relationship between the IOPS and the Arab Orthodox population of Palestine set the IOPS apart from British and American Protestant missionaries in the region. Whereas Protestant missionaries came into the region and asked Arab Christians to give up their traditional beliefs and convert to a new form of Christianity, the IOPS took it as their mission to strengthen the indigenous Orthodox Christian community. For this reason, they appealed to segments of the native population that were not willing to align themselves with the Protestant missionaries. The aims, activities, and results of the

---

<sup>62</sup> أن الوجود الروسي لم يكن منسقا، ولم تكن هناك جهة واحدة مسؤولة عن رعاية هذا الوجود"

activities from both groups are so different that it is difficult to place them both under the umbrella of the term Missionary Societies. Russian Orthodox missionary societies in the Levant produced no controversy that matches the fallout surrounding the Shidyāq affair.<sup>63</sup> On the contrary, members of the Orthodox Christian community came to praise Russia with almost complete unanimity. When Russian support for the IOPS institutions abruptly ended with the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, many members of this community spoke out strongly against the revolution, and in strong support of the Tsar and his family. Reading a few examples from this literature illustrates the profound impact that Russian activity had on the identity and makeup of the Orthodox communities in the Levant during this period.

Kulthum ‘Awdah Vasil’eva, one of the most prominent graduates of the IOPS schools, wrote in a 1965 article looking back on her experiences in the IOPS schools,

“In the IOPS schools they had done everything in their power to acquaint us, Arab Christians, with our people’s glorious past . . . They opened our eyes to the history of Arabic literature. . . the cultural activities of the society were not limited to religious proselytizing and propaganda for the Russian tsar. Intellectuals with a humanistic bent came from Russia not with the goal simply to convert Arabs to Christianity, unlike the missionary activities from Western Europe.”<sup>64</sup>

Vasil’eva went on to have a very important career in Russian academia, helping to develop modern faculties of *vostokovedenia* (oriental studies) in Russian universities.

Without a doubt, the most lasting effect left by the IOPS came through its schools.

In the autobiography of noted Arab author and literary critic Mikha’l Nu’aymah we have

---

<sup>63</sup> As’ad al-Shidyāq, brother of the famous author Ahmed Fāris al-Shidyāq, was an early convert to Protestantism. After his conversion, he was detained by the Maronite authorities, and eventually died while being held by them. His ‘martyrdom’ became a powerful symbol in the rhetoric of Protestant missionaries working in the region. For a more detailed description and analysis of this situation, see Usama Makdisi’s work *The Artillery of Heaven*, esp. p. 180-213.

<sup>64</sup> فقد كان من المسلم به عند سكان لبنان في عهد المتصرفية أن روسيا هي الحامية التقليدية للروم، وفرنسا للمارونيين، وبريطانيا للبروتستانت والدروز، وتركيا للمسلمين.

one of the most complete firsthand accounts of what it was to be a student in the schools run by the IOPS. Nu'aymah graduated from the Russian school in his hometown of Biskenta, and his account sheds light on the ways in which the confessional differences that shaped Russian policy in the regions were reflected and received by the local Arab population.

Lebanon is (in)famous for the powerful sectarian divisions that have defined large parts of its history. Nu'aymah's divisions line up very closely with those that Khitrovo highlights in his writings. Nu'aymah writes, "It was well know among the inhabitants of Lebanon during the protectorate that Russia was the protector of the Orthodox (al-Rum), France of the Maronites, and Britain of the Protestants and the Druze, and Turkey of the Muslims" (74).<sup>65</sup> Nu'aymah also remarks on the much more advanced status of Catholic and Protestant projects in his area. For this reason, the coming of a Russian school for the Orthodox community was a very big event. The Arab Orthodox had always been a minority in the region, and under the pressure of increasing missionary activity in the area, many were leaving the community to seek better opportunities with the British and the French. Nu'aymah captures the elation of the small community when he writes, "We were swept away with a sense of pride in our new school. Indeed, we felt that there stood behind us a great nation respected (feared) by other nations"<sup>66</sup> (76). In the Arab context, to have Western support for your community meant to have prestige and opportunities.

Nu'aymah 's account also gives important information about the curriculum and teaching approach used in the Society's schools. He remarks on the fact that "The Arabic

---

<sup>65</sup> In the context of this discussion it is interesting to note that in Arabic the common term for Arab Orthodox is "al-Rum."

<sup>66</sup> فقد كان من المسلم به عند سكان لبنان في عهد المتصرفية أن روسيا هي الحامية التقليدية للروم، فرنسا للمارونيين، وبريطانيا للبروتستانت والدروز..

language received special attention” in the Russian schools (75). The special focus on teaching Arabic language—especially reading and writing—drew many students to the Russian schools.<sup>67</sup> The willingness to make Arabic a central part of their curriculum highlights the principle difference between Russian missionary activities in the Arab world. Students at the IOPS schools could at once assert their own Arab identity (no small matter in the late Ottoman period as Arab nationalism was beginning to find its voice), and at the same time progress through a well-organized curriculum that would grant them access to the international powers moving matters in the region. The Russians came into an existing religious community to strengthen and preserve it; their impulse to ‘civilize’ was tempered by a recognition of the community as inherently important and worth supporting.

This unique attitude toward the Arabs is reflected in the language policies that the Russian seminaries instituted. Part of the attraction of the foreign schools was the opportunity to learn a foreign language and thus gain access to the West. At the same time, the Russian schools attracted many pupils because they taught Arabic on a high level in addition to the Russian (and later English) classes that they offered. Indeed, though we have evidence that some graduates of the IOPS schools attained a very high proficiency level in Russian, when Nu’aymah wished to emphasize the difference between the IOPS education and that available through other missionary schools in the region, he wrote the following of the language policy at the IOPS schools:

“Rarely did one graduate from the [Russian] school understanding more than a very little bit of Russian. This is in contrast to the rest of the foreign schools in

---

<sup>67</sup> In some cases, non-Orthodox families chose to send their children to the Russian schools because of the excellent Arabic instruction.

Lebanon that used to – and still do – focus their education on foreign languages much more than on Arabic” (75)<sup>68</sup>

The respect given to Arabic attracted more conservative elements of Arab Ottoman society. The IOPS schools made modern education available to segments of society that were not welcome or interested in the French and British schools. They opened a back door to European culture that gave a more prominent place to Arab literary and cultural history; studying at the IOPS schools did not have any of the colonialist connotations of the West European activities in the region.

The Russian focus on teaching Arabic falls directly in line with their mandate to ‘support the local Orthodox population’ discussed above. Following this policy empowered the Arab Orthodox Christian communities in several ways. First of all, it spread literacy among a population that had never before had such high levels of literacy. It instilled the Orthodox community with a sense of pride, as reflected in Nu’aymah’s earlier comments. These schools provided opportunities for work, travel, and study in a broader world of 20<sup>th</sup> century culture than was accessible to their graduates before their arrival. What’s more, Russia represented an alternative to the oppressive (and rapidly expanding) British influence in the region. Because of Russia’s rivalry with the British, many saw Russia as an anti-imperial force in the region. They could look to Russia to help them in resisting the British. This dynamic was especially attractive to the liberal intellectuals of the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century.

Education in the Russian schools also appealed to conservative elements of Arab society because of the strong emphasis on Orthodoxy within the Russian schools.

Involvement with the Protestant missionaries meant abandoning a fundamental part of

---

<sup>68</sup> "فقل من تخرج من المدرسة وكان يتقن القراءة الروسية أو يفهم إلا القليل القليل من مفرداتها. وذلك على عكس باقي المدارس الأجنبية في لبنان التي كانت – ولا تزال – تهتم بتعليم لغاتها أكثر بكثير من اهتمامها بتعليم العربية."

one's identity to convert to a new form of Christianity. The close connection of these Protestant efforts with British colonialism also stirred suspicions among many Arab Christians.<sup>69</sup>

The impact of Russian education efforts in the region was not as widely reported in Russia. Outside of a limited circle of academics and Church officials, few cared about what happened to the IOPS schools or their graduates. What's more, all of the activities of the IOPS came to a quick halt with the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. The IOPS would reemerge as the Palestinian Society many years later, but it cannot be considered the same institution. Writing several decades later, leading Soviet orientalist Ignatiĭ Krachkovskiĭ lamented the lack of information about the Society and its effects on Palestinian culture, noting that: "there is yet another side of life in Palestine over the past century that the Palestinian Society, unfortunately, has paid too little attention: the growth here of Arab literature and society." (quoted in Naumkin 140). The IOPS was directly responsible for several important individuals in the development of modern Arabic literature.<sup>70</sup>

## Conclusion

Khitrovo's adaptation of Panslavist thought affected the IOPS in two important ways. Within Russia, it gave him a vocabulary with which he could explain the need for Russian involvement in the Middle East in a way that would raise sympathy among the Russians. It allowed him to depict the Arab Orthodox population as a part of Greater Russia's (*velikorussii*) sphere of familial influence and responsibility. Khitrovo could

---

<sup>69</sup> The project of translating the Bible into Arabic, for example, undertaken by Protestant missionaries with Arab assistants, led to many difficulties for the Arabs involved and their families.

<sup>70</sup> In addition to Mikhail Nu'aymah, several members of the *al-Rābiṭah al-Qalamiyyah* group graduated from the Russian schools, as did noted journalists and translators Khalil Baydas, and Salim Qub'ayn.

not have won the support necessary for his project without appealing to this element of Russian national identity. Khitrovo carried out his work in an unflinchingly conservative climate. The Panslavist paradigm allowed him to appeal to the most conservative parts of the regime (such as Pobedonostsev). Hopwood notes this irony thus, “It was paradoxical that the foundation of a society devoted to the enlightenment of a subject people should have to depend on the support of an ultra-reactionary Procurator at the opening of a reign of reaction” (102). As we will see in the ensuing study of Khalil Baydas’ career, not only did the IOPS engage in the enlightenment of the Arab Orthodox community, but their graduates laid the intellectual infrastructure for the tide of Arab nationalism that would sweep through the area in the years following the dissolution of the IOPS.

On the other hand, Khitrovo’s legacy would not have left such a profound impact on Arab society were it not for the way that he framed the mission of the society. Drawing on Panslavist conceptions of Russia’s place in the world allowed him to find value in the Arab Orthodox community that West European colonial thought could not. Had they taken the British or French as their model, the Russians would not have invested so much in Arab society. Rather than seeking to import civilization to a barbarous land, the IOPS took it as its mission to reinvigorate and support an indigenous community. In this way, the benevolent character of Russian interactions with the Arab Orthodox community in Palestine came as a result one of the most reactionary periods in Russian history. Describing the reasons for establishing the IOPS, Khitrovo wrote,

“We consider it our obligation here to solemnly declare that political goals never entered into the direct or indirect goals of the IOPS. But at the same time, we do not find it necessary to hide the fact that for us, taking that into account, we are bold enough to think that for all true Russians, to turn away from sympathy to all Orthodox, without the western division between nationalities, from helping them

in their days of need and from the desire to see Orthodoxy triumphant at all times and in all places would be the same as if we had refused to be Russian.”

Like the passages cited above, Khitrovo here ties Russian national identity to the Orthodox Church, claiming that this piece of Russian identity transcends “the western division between nationalities,” allowing Russia to cultivate a different kind of relationship with the local populations of the Levant than Western missionary organizations. From the examples shown above, we can see that the different nature of this relationship was easily recognizable to members of the Arab Orthodox Christian communities in the Levant. Reiterating the views expressed above, Shukri Swaydan wrote the following in his history of the IOPS,

“We do not have any way to adequately repay Khitrovo for the benefit, love, and attention that he has shown to the East. If we praised him, that would be too little, instead we must pray to God that He will reward him in the afterlife and the heavenly kingdom. Amen” (224).<sup>71</sup>

Swaydan’s deep gratitude for Khitrovo’s interest and efforts gives a sense of the profound impact that Russian involvement had on these parts of the Arab world.

Another example of this sentiment in the Arab Orthodox Christian community comes from Salim Qub’ayn. As an addendum to his translation of Pierre Gilliard’s description of Tsar Nicholas II’s last hours (*mašra’ al-qayšar wa ahl baytihi*), he included this open letter to Gilliard:

“The Eastern Christian world is connected to the Russian Tsars by unchanging marks engraved on hearts throughout the years and all the days. Those glorious tsars who went to war and shed blood to protect Christianity in the East, and gave themselves entirely to spread their peace and tranquility and spent great sums of money to found schools and establish churches and hospitals and shelters. Those tsars raised the heads of the Christians of the east and made them live well after they had been oppressed, subjected to all manner of trials and tribulations as an onslaught of outrageous derision is poured out on their heads. The late well-

<sup>71</sup> وليس لنا شيء نقدر أن نكافي به خيتروفو على ما أظهره للشرق شرقنا الأرثوذكسي من المنفعة والمحبة والغيرة فإذا مدحناه فذلك قليل بل علينا أن نصلي إلى الله لكي ينيله الأخرة الصالحة والملكوت السماوي. أمين.



respected priest Yusuf al-Dibs said in a sermon he gave in Bkirki in Lebanon: “If not for Russia, a priest in Syria or Palestine could not put the cowl upon his head; if not for Russia, Christians could not have bells in their churches, or carry the cross in their funeral processions.

“All of these things have left in the hearts of Christians a fond memory of those tsars. True humans remember the good that a person does and remember them as long as the veins in their body are pulsing. Therefore, they compose a covenant of gratitude to M. Pierre Gilliard who defended the tsar Nicholas II and his family disproved the false accusations and were attributed to them and showed the piety and purity that they possessed. You have our sincerest thanks for the facts that you have proclaimed and for the magnanimity and courage that you have shown. You are a true Christian and a supporter of the truth. The truth does not lack supporters who will raise its banner and lift its light up high.”<sup>72</sup> (114)

Qub’ayn signs his letter “the Christians of the East.” In this letter Qub’ayn reemphasizes the close relationship between the Orthodox communities in the Arab world and those of the Russian Empire. Qub’ayn’s geography also lines up with the sentiments expressed by other members of the Orthodox Christian communities in the Levant in which Russia is seen as a (would-be) liberator from the oppression that the Arab Christians experienced throughout their history. This liberation was never realized completely because of the revolution that prompted Qub’ayn’s letter, and cut short the government support and funding that had been flowing from Russia into the region.

Both Swaydan and Qub’ayn lived in Arab émigré communities (in Boston and Cairo, respectively). The feelings that they express, however, can be found in contemporary works by members of the Orthodox Christian community within the

<sup>72</sup> إن العالم المسيحي الشرقي مرتبط بقياصرة الروس بتذكارات مرسومة على القلوب لا يحوها توالي الأعوام وكرور الأيام. أولئك القياصرة الأمجاد شنوا الحروب وأهرقوا الدماء في سبيل حماية مسيحيي الشرق وبدلوا النفس والنفس لتوفير أسباب راحتهم وطمانينتهم وأنفقوا القناطير المقتطعة من الأموال على إنشاء المدارس وتأسيس الكنائس والمستشفيات والملاجئ. رفع أولئك القياصرة رأس مسيحيي الشرق وجعلوهم يعيشون عيشة الناس بعد أن كانوا أذلاء معرضين في كل أونة للامتهان وانقضاض صواعق السخط على رؤوسهم. قال المرحوم الطيب الذكر المطران يوسف الدبس من خطبة خطبها في بكركي من أعمال لبنان: "لولا روسيا لما استطاع كاهن في سوريا وفلسطين أن يضع على رأسه قلنسوة ولولاها ما استطاع المسيحيون تعليق جرس في كنائسهم أو حمل صليب أمام جنازات أمواتهم." كل هذه الأسباب أيقنت في قلوب المسيحيين ذكرى حسنة لأولئك القياصرة، والإنسان الحقيقي يحفظ الجميل لصانعه ويذكره به ما دام فيه عرق ينبض. لذلك لأنهم يصوغون عقود الشكر والامتنان للمسيو بطرس الجبار الذي دافع عن القيصر نيقولا الثاني وأفراد أسرته وكذب ما نسب إليهم من التهم الباطلة وأظهر ما كانوا عليه من التقوى والسيرة الطاهرة النزيهة فلك من الشكر الجزيل على ما صرحت به من الحقائق وعلى من انصفت به من صفات الشهامة والمروءة. أنت نصير الصدق ومؤيد الحق والحق لا يعدم أنصارا يرفعون شعاره ويعلون مناره.

Levant as well. Mikha'il Nu'aymah, Kulthum 'Awdah, and others spoke fondly of their time in the Russian schools, and expressed great hope at Russia's ability to lift the Arab Orthodox Christian communities to new levels of culture and prestige. Interestingly, historical accounts of Russia during this same period do not give the same level of attention or importance to the work of people like Khitrovo or institutions like the IOPS.

In the years leading up to the First World War, Russian policy in relation to the Ottoman Empire depended almost entirely on the vitality of the Orthodox Christian community in the Levant. Russia invested heavily in strengthening this community, and eventually directed the bulk of its activities and energies towards this goal. This connection was romanticized by Arab intellectuals because it was cut off at the height of its influence and activity. Russian influence grew greater in the imaginations of individuals like Nu'aymah, Baydas, Qub'ayn, and 'Awdah as they struggled to find their place in life under the British Mandate. Many members of this community emigrated (Nu'aymah to the United States, Qub'ayn to Egypt, 'Awdah to the Soviet Union, and Baydas eventually fled to Lebanon), unable to find a place in Palestinian society under British rule. The abrupt end of these activities after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 preserved the unique nature of the Palestine-Russia connection, and consequently amplified its meaning in the collective memory of the Orthodox communities that they targeted. This phenomenon helps to account for the fervor expressed in Palestinian accounts of the IOPS, even today.<sup>73</sup> As we move to specific texts produced by the intense flurry of Russian activity in the Levant between 1882 and 1917, this background explains

---

<sup>73</sup> In Nazareth and the surrounding villages, individuals like 'Umar Maḥāmīd and Aḥmad Marwat are working hard to document and preserve the history of Russian activities in the region. Their accounts of the period are filled with the same passion and enthusiasm expressed in Qub'ayn's letter and Nu'aymah's memoir. Renewed support for the IOPS in Russia today has led to a renaissance of Arab-Russian connections in the region where it all began.

the unexpected impact of the Russian-Arab literary connections that came about as a result of these Russian policies.

Despite the unanticipated interruption of official support, the seeds planted by the IOPS activities bore substantial fruit in the years that followed. In the fields of literature, history, and education, Arab graduates of the IOPS schools made profound contributions to the emergence of Palestinian society. In order to illustrate one example of such a contribution, the following three chapters will focus on the literary output and editorial legacy of Khalil Baydas, one of the earliest graduates of the Russian seminary at Nazareth. The dual nature of his career gives an opportunity to read its two sides against each other. In each chapter, I will make assertions about Baydas' translation practice taken from close readings of his translations and the source texts from which he worked. As evidence in support of these assertions, I will cite examples from non-fiction pieces on relevant topics that were also printed in *al-nafā'is*. Some of these non-fiction works were written by Baydas, some were written by others and then passed under Baydas' editorial hand before they appeared on the pages of his journal.

**PART TWO: TEXTS**

## CHAPTER THREE

### Translating Nationalism: Khalil Baydas' translation of Pushkin's *Kapitanskaia Dochka*

In this chapter, I wish to explore early manifestations of nationalist thinking in Baydas' literary career through a close reading of his first literary publication. Khalil Baydas' translation of Alexander Pushkin's famous novel *Kapitanskaia Dochka* (*The Captain's Daughter*) appeared in 1898 in *al-manār*, a Beirut newspaper that catered to the Orthodox Christian community in the area. It was his first translation to appear in print, and was published serially under the title "*ibnat al-qubṭān*" (*The Captain's Daughter*), only a few years after he had graduated from the Russian Seminary in Nazareth.<sup>74</sup> This early example of Baydas' efforts in the field of literary translation exhibits his philosophy of literature and its role in Arab society. Throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, translated literature still made up the bulk of all literature published in Arabic, but has not received meaningful critical attention in comparison to the relatively few works from this period that were originally composed in Arabic. Literary translations from the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century actually provide a uniquely fruitful field of inquiry because of the opportunity they provide to

---

<sup>74</sup> This was not his only translation to be published in 1898; Baydas also published translations of a handful of religious texts from Russian in that same year, including a book of the lives of the saints entitled *tārīkh al-aqmār al-thalāthah* (*The History of the Three Great Hierarchs: [Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, and John Chrisostom]*) and some textbooks in various subjects for primary students. Unfortunately, it is not clear exactly when Baydas entered or graduated from the IOPS school in Nazareth.

observe the creative process of the Arab translators during the *nahḍah*. Through a consideration of the alterations that Baydas made in translating Pushkin's *Kapitanskaia Dochka*, we can look beyond critical dismissals of these early translations as somehow 'less literary,' gaining insight into Baydas' conception of literature.

The second half of this chapter will seek to contextualize Baydas' translation by reading it against later articles and stories that Baydas published on the pages of his literary journal *al-nafā'is* (1908-1924). In order to understand more clearly Baydas' translation practice in working with Pushkin's novel *Kapitanskaia Dochka*, I will focus on those articles and stories from *al-nafā'is* that deal with the issues of 'homeland' (*al-waṭan*) and patriotism (*ḥubb al-waṭan* or *khidmat al-waṭan*), which occur many times throughout Baydas' translation. In these articles, we can see Baydas' nationalist thought, often considered to be later phenomenon, is not only present in his very first literary publication, but central to his translation practice.

### **Pushkin's *Kapitanskaia Dochka* (1836)**

Pushkin's novel tells the story of the Pugachëv uprisings through the eyes of a young officer in the Russian army, Pëtr Grinëv. Grinëv's first assignment comes in the frontier outpost of Belogorsk. While serving there, Grinëv falls in love with the captain's daughter, Mar'ia Ivanovna (Masha). Their romance is interrupted when Pugachëv attacks the fort and takes Masha captive. Grinëv eventually frees Masha, but is then imprisoned by the tsarist government for sympathizing with Pugachëv. In the end, a chance encounter between Masha and Tsarina Catherine frees Grinëv and he is happily reunited with Masha.

In Baydas' translation of *Kapitanskaia Dochka* we find several instances of something that resembles the phenomenon that Lawrence Venuti labels "domesticating translation." Venuti takes this concept from the German Romantics who were concerned with translation, particularly from the German philosopher and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), who sums up the concept in the following words, "Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him" (74). The translator that brings the text to the reader is said to domesticate the text, smoothing out any difficulties that might remind the reader that the text is of foreign origin.

Venuti describes this practice in pejorative terms as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target language cultural values, bringing the author back home" (*Invisibility*, 20). In constructing an ethics of translation, he is concerned with the ways in which a tendency to favor domesticating translations efface the otherness of the original text and limit the texts that are considered candidates for translation. The Arabic concept of *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf* has often been assumed to be a similar practice, reducing differences and difficulties in foreign texts in order to make them acceptable for an Arabic-reading audience. Consequently, the practice is roundly criticized and dismissed in histories of Arabic literature. In reality, the practice of *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf* differs fundamentally from the practice Venuti criticizes under the title 'domesticating.'<sup>75</sup> While for Venuti domesticating translation is associated with translation into politically and economically dominant languages, *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf* during this period flows in the

---

<sup>75</sup> Carol Bardenstein outlines some of these differences in her work on Muḥammad 'Uthmān Jalāl, positing instead a transculturation model that draws on the work of Mary Louise Pratt to describe the ways in which subaltern cultures selectively appropriate pieces of the dominant (foreign) culture.

opposite direction—from European languages into Arabic. What’s more, Baydas is translating from a non-colonial western language – a point worth noting – into a ‘colonized’ (by Russia’s rivals, the British) Arab context.

In the case of translation into Arabic during the *nahḍah*, Venuti’s characterization of domesticating translation begins to fall apart. The moral/ethical framework behind Venuti’s condemnation of domesticating translation seems out of place when applied to Baydas’ situation. While Baydas’ *tarjamah bi-tasarruf* may have ostensibly been an ethnocentric act of reduction, his translated works are filled with concepts and values that were not familiar to his target audience. His translation of Russian literature was hardly oppressive, repressive, or dismissive – on the contrary, Baydas sought to highlight certain unfamiliar or foreign cultural concepts within *Kapitanskaia Dochka* in order to introduce these concepts into Arab society as part of a broader platform of proposed social and cultural reforms. Thus the blend of foreignizing and domesticating alterations that he makes in translating Pushkin’s novella do not fit exactly into Venuti’s rubric. The terms foreignizing and domesticating are still useful, however, for describing the kinds of alterations that Arabic translators during this period routinely chose to make as they arabized their source texts to different degrees.

Closely examining the decisions that Baydas makes in ‘domesticating’ Pushkin’s text uncovers the complexity of his translation practice. Even within a single translation, Baydas employs a range of strategies—sometimes foreignizing sections of the text, other times domesticating aspects of the text. From this angle, Baydas proves a very skilled translator making subtle decisions about what changes he makes to Pushkin’s text. In addition, paying close attention to his decisions foregrounds the role of the translator as



an active mediator between Arab society and the source cultures from which the translations were taken.

The names of the characters in Baydas' translation illustrate the rich variety of decisions that he makes in translating *Kapitanskaia Dochka*. Russian is notorious for the wide variety of names that can be applied to any given individual. Baydas is forced to make certain decisions as he brings this complex system into Arabic, and follows a particular pattern in placing his characters' proper names at different points along Venuti's domestication / foreignization spectrum. Through his naming conventions, he brings the protagonists in the story closer to the reader and creates more distance between the reader and the antagonists in the text.

For example, after introducing the main character by his full name, Pëtr Andrevich Grinëv, Pushkin, in typical Russian fashion, refers to him exclusively by his surname, Grinëv. At some points, other characters refer to him by either some form of his first name (Pëtr, Pëtrusha, Pëtrukha, Petya, etc.), or his first name and patronymic (Pëtr Andrevich). In Arabic, it is much less common to refer to an individual by surname, so Baydas must do something different. He simplifies the wide variety of names applied to Grinëv, referring to him exclusively as Buṭrus. Even in this simplification, however, Baydas makes an important decision. He could have just as easily simply transliterated the Russian name, using بيطر (Bītr) or بيوتر (Byūtr), for example. By choosing an Arab name for his protagonist, Baydas brings him closer to the reader. Similarly, Baydas chooses an Arab name for Buṭrus' servant's as well, rendering him Ayyūb instead of Arkhip Savelich. Baydas gives each of the positive characters in the novel recognizably Arab names to make it easier for his readers to identify with them.

At the other end of the spectrum, the antagonists in Baydas' translation are all called exclusively by their surnames. In addition, he does not make any effort to Arabize the names of his negative characters—Pugachëv becomes Būkatshūf, Shvabrin becomes Shfabrīn, and so forth. Choosing to retain the Russian names and naming conventions in this situation puts more distance between the reader and these characters. Each time their names appear in the text, it comes as a jarring reminder that this person is foreign.

Perhaps the most interesting decision around naming, however, comes with the title character of the novel. Baydas keeps Mar'ia's name in the distinctly non-Arab form of 'Mary' (*Mārī*) as opposed to the more distinctively Arabic form of 'Mariam.' This is a strategy employed elsewhere by Arab translators of this period in naming female protagonists. A non-Arab name gives her a measure of freedom in the eyes of the Arab reader of the time to do things and function in situations that would not be appropriate for an Arab woman. Thus we can see that even in foreignizing Mar'ia's name in the translation Baydas is making the text more acceptable to his target audience.

The different ways in which Baydas renders the proper names in Pushkin's text into Arabic is just one indication of the level of critical engagement that he has with the texts that he translates. In place of the haphazard decisions we would expect from a deficient translator, Baydas' writing contains distinct patterns that illuminate his translation practice. His sensitivity in translating Russian naming conventions into Arabic represents the level of thought that he put into making these works accessible to his intended audience.

Baydas also preserves the distinctly Russian practice of not naming the primary city in which the novel takes place. As is customary in Russian literature, Pushkin refers

to the city only as “*gorod N*” (City N).<sup>76</sup> Curiously, Baydas maintains this convention in his Arabic translation without comment or explanation. In fact, he maintains all of the place names in the translation with one exception. The name of the fortress in which Grinëv serves is called “Belogorskii” in Pushkin’s text, a name derived from the words “White Mountain” (*Belaia Gora*). Baydas chooses to translate this place name literally, rendering it “*al-jabal al-abyaḍ*.” This can also be read as a domesticating move, as it produces a name very similar to many village names in the Levant, thus reading very comfortably to the ear of Baydas’ Arabic reading audience.

### **GENERIC STRUCTURE OF PUSHKIN’S NOVEL**

In relating the adventures of young Grinëv, Pushkin creates a complex text in which various genres come together under the heading of *semeistvennyye zapiski* (family memoir). The different characters and perspectives represented in Pushkin’s work create a complex portrait of the struggle between popular and official authority. Pushkin packages his narrative in multiple layers of narrative voices—a narrator reading a family history written by an old man recollecting the adventures of his youth. Leslie O’Bell, writing about the relationship of Pushkin’s work to the genre of family memoir (*semeistvennyye zapiski*) in Russian literature, shows how Pushkin expands and violates the norms of a family history record that his story claims to be. Though the entire work is narrated in the first person, Pushkin inserts a wide variety of voices into the narrative by including various pieces of ‘documentary’ evidence concerning the events in the narrative, including letters, reports, and other ‘written’ materials within the novel.

---

<sup>76</sup> This is a common way to refer to the city of Nizhnii Novgorod, though the convention of abbreviating city names is common enough that it could refer to a different city. As intriguing as the possibility may be, I have not found any evidence that Baydas’ decision to maintain this convention is at all connected to the city of Nazareth.

Baydas simplifies the structure of Pushkin's work in his translation, but still includes a similar variety of text types within his story, citing letters, reports, and orders as if they were read to the reader. Baydas creates a feeling of an official document by maintaining some of the stylistic idiosyncrasies that mark Russian documents: Not spelling out the name of the city, but using the initial instead (Gorod N), and also calling everyone by their last name (Grinëv instead of Pëtr).

The complex narrative structure of *Kapitanskaia Dochka* influences the relationships that Pushkin creates between his characters. The tension present throughout Pushkin's story between Grinëv, as the main character in the novel, and Mar'ia, the "daughter" in the title of the novel, is resolved through these relationships. Pushkin holds Grinëv at the center of his novel, describing each character in terms of her/his relationship to Grinëv. Most often, these relationships are couched in familial terms. The story begins with Grinëv comfortably at home with his own parents. As soon as he is deprived of their protection, he moves between various surrogates—from Savelych to the Mironovs, to Pugachëv, and ultimately to Catherine herself. Grinëv is always the person at the center of the relationships in the history that he recounts, but the title of the work tells us that it is not his story, but Masha's. O'Bell illustrates the powerful way in which Pushkin makes the story hers through its closing scene between Masha and Catherine. "But the entire end of their story, the episode with Catherine, though retold by Grinëv is actually a *pereskaz* of family tradition, as related by Masha" (57). This final twist cements Masha as the core character of the story, even as Russia's path is characterized through Grinëv's experiences and growth.

As Baydas translates Pushkin's novel, he removes the ambiguity and complexity from the story, and focuses attention instead on the dual concepts of patriotism and duty to country. These changes are especially telling when we read them in conjunction with the material that Baydas published around these same questions in his journal *al-nafā'is al-ʿaṣriyyah*. In exploring how Baydas exercised his agency as a translator, I wish to focus on two types of alterations that he makes in his translation: first, domesticating changes. Many of the decisions that Baydas makes in translating the text serve to domesticate the text, making it less foreign to his intended audience. Second, didactic changes, or changes that highlight certain lessons that Baydas would have his readers take away from the novel. In the changes that he makes to Pushkin's text, we can see Baydas consciously reshaping the novel into a more clearly focused didactic work with an unequivocally clear message.

While we cannot definitively state why Baydas made each change to Pushkin's text that we find in his translation, it is possible to gather much information from both the structural and the content changes. Many of the changes are simply the result of the format in which Baydas' translation was published. His translation barely covers 70 pages, while Pushkin's text is more than 280 pages. As a serial publication, Baydas' translation does not preserve the chapter divisions of Pushkin's text. With these major structural changes foisted upon it, it is no surprise that Baydas' translation does not capture all of the irony, nuance, and poetry of Pushkin's story. In this chapter, I hope to show that Baydas' translation should not simply be dismissed because it does not replicate the experience of reading *Kapitanskaia Dochka*. Rather, seriously examining

Baydas' translation practice shows how Baydas used translation to accomplish goals specific to his own historical and literary context.

## PLOT CHANGES

Baydas makes a number of changes to the actual plot of the novel. In the opening description of Buṭrus and his family, Baydas makes Buṭrus' father a rich nobleman (*amīr*) instead of a middling bureaucrat like we find in Pushkin's text. Baydas also elevates the voice of the mother in this opening scene. She protests loudly at the father's decision to send Grinëv to Orenburg. Even after the letter sending Buṭrus to the border outpost is completed, she continues her protestations. Baydas has Buṭrus' mother give voice to a sense of foreboding at Buṭrus' departure, having her say, "Because my spirit is upset about our son's travel to those parts, and my heart tells me that behind this lies something that will spoil our peace and eliminate our happiness and therefore you see me so flustered and distraught."<sup>77</sup> All of these protestations are missing from the Russian version of the story. In Pushkin's text, Grinëv's mother only ever speaks in short phrases, and spends most of her time sobbing and sighing instead. As we will see in other aspects of Baydas' translation, everything that is ordinary and mediocre in Pushkin's novel (though often ironically so) comes out ideal in Baydas' translation. He creates an ideal family situation for his hero, and removes all of the conflict that we find between the three members of the family in Pushkin's opening scene. As a consequence, Buṭrus easily becomes an idealized representative for a patriotic, loyal citizen of a modern country.

---

<sup>77</sup> "إن نفسي غير راضية عن سفر ابني إلى تلك النواحي وقلبي يناجيني أن وراء ذلك ما يكدر صفاءنا ويزيل هناءنا لذلك تراني حائرة النفس مسلوية اللب

This principle seems to govern many of the choices that Baydas makes throughout his translation of *Kapitanskaia Dochka*.

Baydas' translation, as I have pointed out, is much shorter than the original. Much of the compression comes in eliminating the lengthy descriptions of the Russian countryside that characterize Pushkin's novel. There are, however some key scenes that Baydas eliminates entirely from his translation that are so conspicuous in their absence that these decisions beg investigation. The first eliminated scene in Baydas' translation is the dream that Grinëv has during his travel to the fort at Belogorsk. Grinëv introduces the dream to his imagined reader in the following passage:

“I had a dream that I shall never forget, and in which I see something prophetic even now, when I compare it to the strange circumstances of my life. The reader will forgive me, for you undoubtedly know how easily a person gives in to superstition, despite all possible condemnation of fortune telling”<sup>78</sup> (60).

Grinëv goes on to describe the dream, in which he is called home urgently to visit his dying father on his sickbed. When Grinëv arrives at the house, he is surprised to find that, “In place of my father, I see in the bed that a man (*muzhik*) with a black beard is laying there glancing at me cheerfully”<sup>79</sup> (61). Grinëv protests to his mother, at which she insists, “All the same, Pëtrusha, this is your surrogate father; kiss his hand, and let him leave you a blessing”<sup>80</sup> (61). The scene quickly becomes a nightmare, the room filling with dead bodies, and Grinëv struggling to escape as the man leaps up from the bed and laughs.

---

<sup>78</sup> “Мне приснился сон, которого никогда не мог я позабыть и в котором до сих пор вижу нечто пророческое, когда соображаю с ним странные обстоятельства моей жизни. Читатель извинит меня: ибо, вероятно, знает по опыту, как сродно человеку предаваться суеверию, несмотря на всевозможное презрение к предрассудкам.”

<sup>79</sup> “Вместо отца моего вижу в постеле лежит мужик с черной бородою, весело на меня поглядывая.”

<sup>80</sup> “Все равно, Петруша, — отвечала мне матушка, — это твой посажёный отец; поцелуй у него ручку, и пусть он тебя благословит.”

This dream sequence plays a particularly important role in Pushkin's novel, setting up the complicated relationship between Grinëv and Pugachëv. In Pushkin's narrative, Pugachëv emerges as a complicated and often sympathetic figure. This dream alerts the reader to the many different roles that Pugachëv will play in the narrative. Having established this narrative as belonging to the genre of family memoirs (*semeistvennye zapiski*), Pushkin plays with Grinëv's relationships with all of the characters in the book, couching all of these relationships in familial terms. Thus, Pugachëv as father, and particularly as a 'surrogate father' (*posazhënniy otets*) situates him clearly within the political scene defined by his uprising. Russian political history has more than one 'pretender' to the throne, and Pushkin puts Pugachëv in this category, while simultaneously granting him a great deal of respect, acknowledging the popular nature of his authority during the uprising. In this role, Pushkin's Pugachëv serves as an interesting foil to the main character, Grinëv as they each learn to navigate the traditions of popular and official authority that defined Russian political life. In sum, Pushkin creates a highly nuanced portrait of Pugachëv, especially in comparison to his record of the rebel leader in *Istoriia Bunta Pugachëva*.

Grinëv's dream also serves to mark a distinct division between the safety of home and the unknown dangers of military service at the border outpost of Belogorsk. The dream fits naturally into the otherworldly experience of the blizzard on the step that leads to Grinëv's initial encounter with Pugachëv. In Baydas' text, the relationship between Pugachëv and Buṭrus is much more straightforward and clear-cut—Buṭrus is the hero, and Pugachëv is the villain. In addition, Baydas chooses to characterize Pugachëv quite differently from Pushkin. Neither Pushkin nor Baydas provide a portrait of Pugachëv tied



too tightly to the historical figure, but both use his character for important purposes within their respective narratives. In Pushkin's story Pugachëv is a strange foil to Grinëv, the narrator. He vacillates between the noble hero of a romantic story and a villainous traitor/criminal. In Baydas' version, however, the character of Pugachëv plays a very different role. From his first appearance in the story, Baydas intimates to the reader that this character is not to be trusted. He writes, "This man's build and his movements indicated slyness and deception"<sup>81</sup> (288). Later in the same scene Baydas brings attention to Pugachëv's "movements, and gestures, and the features of his face that hinted at vileness and misery"<sup>82</sup> (288). Baydas goes to great lengths to characterize the owner of the building in the same manner, ascribing to him "vileness and an air of brigandry" (289). This blunt description takes the place of the more complicated scene Pushkin writes in which the secret code language shared by Pugachëv and the proprietor.

The alterations that Baydas made to Pugachëv's character are distinct enough that we can treat them as deliberate departures from Pushkin's text. Further strengthening this assumption, Baydas' alterations feed directly into the central themes of patriotism and service to country that he sought to emphasize in his translation. Where Pushkin's Pugachëv plays a sympathetic foil to Grinëv, Baydas' Pugachëv plays the role of the villain exclusively—one who would usurp authority from the state, and go to any lengths to do so. By writing Pugachëv as a clear-cut villain, Baydas brings Buṭrus' patriotism into sharp relief. Baydas has no interest in exploring the nuances of loyalty and authority that Pushkin treats. Instead, he works to create a narrative that illustrates the importance of patriotism in the modern world in an entertaining way.

---

<sup>81</sup> وكانت هيئة هذا الرجل وحركاته تدل على مكر وخداع  
<sup>82</sup> حركاته وإشاراته وملامح وجهه الدالة على خبث ورياء

In Baydas' text, the concepts of government and country also figure prominently into the relationship between Pugachëv and Grinëv. In *Kapitanskaia Dochka*, Pushkin gives equal standing to the competing concepts of popular authority (as symbolized by Pugachëv and his followers) and official authority (as depicted by the government and the military). By not favoring either of these, Pushkin is able to present the conundrum of loyalty within Russia—both forms of loyalty carry real weight and have merit, so the decision between them is never an easy one. Pushkin's Grinëv is suspended between these two conceptions of authority, drawn to both, but ultimately not completely bound by either. For Baydas, on the other hand, Pugachëv's rebellion against the ruling government is a great evil, a threat that must be opposed at all costs.<sup>83</sup> Mentions of Pugachëv's name in Baydas' text often come together with reminders that he stands in opposition to the government. For example, in the scene before Pugachëv's attack on Belogorsk, Baydas outlines the motivating forces behind Pugachëv's uprising in very specific terms. He labels Pugachëv's followers "foolish"<sup>84</sup> and describes the uprising as taking "revenge against the government for the strictness with which it had treated them"<sup>85</sup> (324). These descriptions are immediately followed by Buṭrus' impassioned speech before the military leaders. He proclaims, "Be certain, Captain, that the threat of terrors and impending dangers will never frighten us nor will it terrify us as long as the fire of patriotism burns in our hearts . . . and we will not surrender the fort to this pretender, the leader of these robbers"<sup>86</sup> (324). Time after time, Baydas uses the

---

<sup>83</sup> Contrast this attitude with that displayed in his translation of *Temporal Power*, discussed below, in which the heroes of the story are the socialist revolutionaries working to overthrow the government. At this early stage in his life and career, Baydas sincerely believed in the possibility of living happily as a citizen of the Ottoman Empire.

<sup>84</sup> ذوي العقول الساذجة

<sup>85</sup> انتقام من الحكومة على ما عاملتهم به من الصرامة والقساوة

<sup>86</sup> ثق أيها القبطان بأن مقارعة الأهوال وركوب الأخطار لا تهولنا ولا تروعنا ما دامت جذوة حب الوطن مشتعلة في أفئدتنا . . . فلا نسلم

relationship of each of these two men to the Russian government as an opportunity to demonize Pugachëv and valorize Buṭrus' devotion to the Russian government. This straightforward dichotomy is much simpler than the complex relationship between Pugachëv and Grinëv that Pushkin depicts, and the dream sequence that Baydas eliminates from his translation contributes nothing to it.

The next major scene that Baydas chooses to eliminate from his translation is the duel between Grinëv and his fellow soldier Shvabrin. This duel is central to the Russian plot, advancing the conflict between Grinëv and Shvabrin and foreshadowing the final conflict between the two men, and is precipitated by the two men's competing interests in Masha. When Shvabrin speaks disrespectfully about Masha, Pëtr feels compelled to defend her honor in a duel.

In Baydas' text, the tension between the two men over Masha is preserved. Baydas writes that they were the best of friends until "the scorpions of conflict crept between them and their spring became murky after being clear. Shvabrin began to envy Buṭrus because of his high position in the eyes of the Captain and his family, especially Mar'ia"<sup>87</sup> (301). Baydas goes on to explain that Shvabrin had a complicated relationship with Mar'ia "because he had asked her hand in marriage in the past, but her father refused him"<sup>88</sup> (301). After the two argue about Mar'ia, the narrator notes, "And thus the bonds of friendship that had been so strong unraveled between these two friends"<sup>89</sup> (322). After that point, there is no more mention of the animosity between Shvabrin and Buṭrus.

---

القلعة لهذا الزعيم زعيم هؤلاء العصاة.  
<sup>87</sup> عقارب الخلاف قد دبّت بينهما وتكررت عينهما بعد الصفاء. وذلك لأن لشفايين حسد بطرس لما رآه رفيق المنزلة عند القبطان وذويه ولا

سيما ابنته ماري  
<sup>88</sup> لأنه كان في ما مضى من الزمن قد خطب ماري من أبيها فرده خائباً  
<sup>89</sup> وهكذا صرم حبل الصداقة الذي كان متيناً بين هذين الصديقين

The duel form a central thematic element of Russian society as depicted in the Russian literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is a set scene that a Russian reader of the period would expect in the situation that Pushkin crafts. For Baydas, however, incorporating the duel scene would require a good deal of extra explanation, but seems like a natural opportunity to depict an ‘exotic’ scene of Russian life, as Baydas would do in other translations. In order to explain this decision, we must first look at a similar choice that he makes in a later scene in the novel.

After Pugachëv takes the fort at Belogorsk in the original novel, Pushkin includes a grisly scene in which Pugachëv’s men execute a number of people from the fort, including the elderly Mironovs. Pushkin describes this scene in harsh details that stand in stark contrast to the light, ironic tone he uses in the rest of the novel.

“At that moment, a woman’s cry rang out. A handful of robbers dragged Vasilisa Egorovna, tousled and stripped naked, out onto the porch. One of them managed to dress up in her petticoat. The others dragged mattresses, boxes, dishes, linens, and other rubbish from the house. ‘Dear God!’ the poor woman cried. ‘Leave a soul to repent. I beg you—take me to Ivan Kuzmich.’ Suddenly she looked up at the gallows and recognized her husband. . . . ‘Silence the old witch!’ said Pugachëv. At that, a young Kazakh struck her in the head with his saber, and she fell dead on the porch step”<sup>90</sup> (127).

Pushkin’s vivid description of the violence carried out by Pugachëv’s men marks a complete break from the wry irony of the rest of the novel.<sup>91</sup> This violent scene is also eliminated from Baydas’ translation. Baydas chooses to retain all of the gravitas and bravery of those who resisted Pugachëv, but does so without portraying any of the

---

<sup>90</sup> “В эту минуту раздался женский крик. Несколько разбойников вытащили на крыльцо Василису Егоровну, растрепанную и раздетую донага. Один из них успел уже нарядиться в ее душегрейку. Другие таскали перины, сундуки, чайную посуду, белье и всю рухлядь. «Батюшки мои! — кричала бедная старушка. — Отпустите душу на покаяние. Отцы родные, отведите меня к Ивану Кузмичу». Вдруг она взглянула на виселицу и узнала своего мужа. . . . «Унять старую ведьму!» — сказал Пугачев. Тут молодой казак ударил ее саблей по голове, и она упала мертвая на ступени крыльца.”

<sup>91</sup> Paul Debreczeny discusses the jarring effect of this scene in his essay, “The Execution of Captain Mironov: a crossing of tragic and comic modes.” *Alexander Pushkin: Symposium II*. Eds. Andrej Kodjak, Krystyna Pomorska, Kiril Taranovsky. New York U Slavic Papers 3. Columbus OH: Slavica, 1980. 67-78.

violence of their fight. Baydas renders Captain Mironov’s words against Pugachëv word for word, but declines to depict the hanging within his text. He writes, “I do not recognize you as a king, because you are a robber and a miscreant—Death is better for me than scandal and disgrace”<sup>92</sup> (360). In describing the plight of Vasilisa Egorovna, he leads right up to the violence quoted above, but cuts away from the scene without including any actual violence against the woman. Baydas’ text reads,

“Woe unto you, you heartless people! What have you done to my husband? Oh Mironov, where have you gone? Let there be no gain for the killer, the wretched villain and immoral robber that he is!”<sup>93</sup> (360).

Pugachëv then orders her death, but Baydas does not describe any other action around the incident. Baydas goes to great lengths to remove all of the ‘on-stage’ violence from the story, at least in this early work. Pushkin uses this violence to complicate the portrait of Pugachëv that he puts forward in the novel; since so much of the story paints a more sympathetic portrait of the rebel leader, this scene reminds the reader of the darker side of the rebellion that he detailed so extensively in his previous historical work on the uprising.

## PATRIOTISM

In *ibnat al-qubṭān*, Baydas focuses most directly on the ideals of patriotism and nationalism in modern society. There are many instances throughout the novel in which Baydas inserts various calques for the concept of patriotism into his translation—most often “*maḥabbat al-waṭan*.” Pushkin never mentions or discusses the concept of patriotism explicitly. In fact, the ideals of patriotism and military service suffer at the hands of Pushkin’s irony throughout the story. For example, Baydas first uses the term

---

<sup>92</sup> لست أعرفك ملكا لأنك لص ومحتال فالموت عندي أهون من الفضيحة والعار  
<sup>93</sup> ويلكم يا قساة القلوب. ماذا فعلتم بزوجي أواه يا ميرانونف أين أصبحت الآن . . فلا دُرُّ القاتل وأف له من وغد لنيم ولص محتال

when describing Zurin through Buṭrus' eyes. Buṭrus sees Zurin as “Well spoken, as if projecting through his behavior and conversation the fact that he is of honorable origin/lineage and noble descent—a chivalrous and patriotic individual”<sup>94</sup> (276). Baydas also gives extra lines to Zurin in which he comments on the great patriotism of Grinëv's father in sending his son to such a remote military post. We find several instances of such emphasis in the descriptions of Grinëv toward the end of his adventures. When Baydas describes Grinëv's reasons for leaving Mar'ia and his family to help Zurin, he cites his patriotism several times (420).

Patriotism also plays a key role in the contrast that Baydas constructs between Buṭrus and Pugachëv. In addition to the scene discussed above, when Buṭrus confronts Pugachëv toward the end of the novel, we see the concept of patriotism brought to the fore. Baydas renders their conversation as follows.

“There is no doubt of that, but it is God's prerogative to do as He will, and I cast my hopes on my creator and serve my homeland (*waṭanī*) and never let it be said about me in the future that I betrayed my dear homeland (*waṭanī al-'azīz*) that my fathers, and their fathers before them, have purchased/earned with rivers of blood”<sup>95</sup> (383)

This response wins Pugachëv over because of “Buṭrus' steadfastness in loving his homeland,”<sup>96</sup> and he agrees to let him go, but asks pleadingly, “Go where you will, but do not be my enemy”<sup>97</sup> (383). Buṭrus responds, “I told you that I am bound to serve my country and my homeland, and to follow whatever my leaders command me—I will not hesitate to obey their command no matter how impossible it might be”<sup>98</sup> (383).

<sup>94</sup> حسن المحاضرة وكأنه يظهر من هيئته وكلامه أنه شريف النسب منيف الحسب صاحب شهامة ومحبة وطنية.  
<sup>95</sup> لا مرء في ذلك، ولكن بأمر الله الذي يفعل ما يشاء أما أنا فألقى اتكالي على خالقي وأخدم وطني وحاشا أن يقال عني فيما بعد أني خنت وطني العزيز الذي اشتراه أبائي وأجدادي بأنهر من الدماء  
<sup>96</sup> لما رأى من اعتصامه بحب وطنه  
<sup>97</sup> انطلق إلى حيث تشاء ولكن لا تكن من أعدائي  
<sup>98</sup> قلت لك إنني مقيد بخدمة الدولة والوطن ومهما يأمرني أولياء أمري لا أتأخر عن آجابة الطلب ولو كان دون ذلك خرط القتاد

Toward the end of the novel, Baydas again inserts patriotic feelings into places missing from Pushkin's text. In the buildup to the final battle at the village, Pushkin's general does not respond excitedly to the call to defend the village. Certain that it is a lost cause, he instead leaves things to happen as they will. In Baydas' translation, by contrast, the general passes from his initial doubt to enthusiasm after Buṭrus delivers a lengthy speech laced with patriotic sentiments. The soldiers respond "long live the tsar!" (395) and the general begins to prepare the defenses. All of this makes the letter indicting Buṭrus at the end of the novel even more powerful for among its accusations it includes the phrase, "The General Buṭrus Grinëv of city N. has betrayed his homeland (*qad khāna waṭanahu*) and sided with the rebel Pugachëv"<sup>99</sup> (431). In the patriotism-obsessed text that Baydas produces, the accusation of treason is a much bigger surprise than in Pushkin's more nuanced novel, and makes the final resolution of the story much more dramatic.

Like many of his contemporaries, Baydas believed strongly in the didactic power of the novel. In a revised version of his 1908 manifesto on the importance of prose fiction, he wrote:

"the true novel—the artistic novel—is that which strives for morals of wisdom and literary aims; that which strives for the glorification of virtue and the criticism of vice, for the cultivation of morals and the enlightenment of intellect, the purification of hearts and the reformation of actions."<sup>100</sup> (1924 4)

This was not an uncommon view of literature among Arab authors and translators in the *nahḍah*. It becomes particularly relevant in the present discussion because of the way it

---

<sup>99</sup> أن الضابط بطرس غرينوف من أهالي مدينة ن قد خان وطنه وانحاز إلى الثائر بوكاتشوف  
<sup>100</sup> الرواية الحقيقية، الرواية الفنية، هي التي ترمي إلى المغازي الحكيمة أو الأغراض الأدبية؛ إلى تمجيد الفضائل أو التنديد بالردائل؛ إلى تهذيب الأخلاق وتوير العقول؛ وتنقية القلوب وإصلاح السيرة.

illuminates Baydas' translation practice. In translating *Kapitanskaia Dochka*, many of the changes that Baydas makes serve to emphasize the message and moral that he wishes to communicate. In this section I will examine some instances of this practice that have previously been misread as evidences of his lack of literary skill to show that Baydas was very much in control of his text as he manipulated it through his translation.

*Kapitanskaia Dochka* is characterized by the pervasive irony that Pushkin inserts into the story. Debreczeny highlights the irony in the text that derives from the way that Pushkin leads the reader into anticipating certain scenes and actions, only to undo these expectations at each turn (1983 261-270). As Pushkin draws upon various conventions of romantic and adventure literature surrounding the concepts of an officer of the guard, life in the southern republics, life in rural Russia, battle, romance, and adventure, he upsets each of these expectations by inserting unexpected turns into each generic expectation. He is able to simultaneously evoke the dramatic potential of the exotic landscape in which his story is set—from the ferocity of a blizzard on the steppe to life in a rural outpost among the Cossacks—and diffuse that wonder by injecting everyday realism into each scene.

In Baydas' translation, however, we lose the sense of irony present in the structure of Pushkin's text. We can either read this as a deliberate misinterpretation of the source text, Baydas wanting to take certain aspects of the story and adjust them to suit his needs in his situation, or we can see it as an unintentional misinterpretation of the source text. As a young translator, perhaps Baydas simply chose those aspects of the story that seemed most interesting and held together in the most compelling storyline. A close



examination of the elements that Baydas eliminates from his translation will give us insight into this question.

In *Kapitanskaia Dochka*, Pushkin upsets the conventions of Russian historical fiction by leading the reader into anticipating certain scenes and actions, only to undo these expectations at each turn—either through grisly realism or sharply critical satire. Critics have praised Pushkin’s novel for the way that his relentless irony disrupts every standard of the genre.<sup>101</sup> The humor present in *Kapitanskaia Dochka* depends largely upon the ability of the audience to recognize how the story should be told and to feel the divergences from this pattern in Pushkin’s text. Baydas’ translation eliminates the humor and irony found in Pushkin’s novel, the type of alteration that is often interpreted as a deficiency in the translation by critics. In this section, I wish to show that the flattening of Pushkin’s irony is another example of Baydas’ deliberate manipulation of the source text to serve his own literary, social, and political goals. In place of the ambivalent attitudes toward the military service and Pugachëv’s rebellion that we find in Pushkin’s novel, Baydas’ translation contains a straightforward romantic narrative that champions the concepts of patriotism and service to the homeland.

For example, the early scene in which Grinëv’s parents discuss his future service is quite different in the two texts. In Pushkin’s *Kapitanskaia Dochka*, the scene is played for comic effect. Picturing himself serving in the military, Pëtr Grinëv exclaims, “The thought of military service brought with it to my mind thoughts of freedom and the pleasures of St. Petersburg life. I imagined myself an officer of the guard, which, in my

---

<sup>101</sup> The most extensive treatment of irony in Pushkin’s prose works comes from Paul Debreczeny’s *The Other Pushkin* and Monika Greenleaf’s *Pushkin and Romantic Fashion*.

opinion, was the height of human experience” (46).<sup>102</sup> Notably missing from Grinëv’s enthusiasm for military service is any hint of the more noble concepts of duty, honor, or service. Indeed, when he learns of his father’s decision to send him instead to a small border outpost, Grinëv laments, “And thus, all of my bright hopes were crushed. In place of the happy Petersburg life, boredom awaited me in the silent, distant countryside. The service about which I had thought with such joy now seemed to me a heavy sorrow” (48).<sup>103</sup> This thread plays out more completely in Grinëv’s first moments en route to his place of service, where he immediately gets wrapped up in drinking, gambling, and other dubious forms of entertainment with a soldier who eggs him on, saying, “You have to get used to the ‘army life’.”

In place of the tongue in cheek introduction to army life that Pushkin provides, Baydas’ tone is completely serious from the very beginning. When Buṭrus is informed that he will be serving in a remote outpost instead of St. Petersburg, Baydas’ narrator reports that “Buṭrus was overcome with anger. He had heard a lot about the barbarity of the people who lived in that region and the coarseness of the Cossacks who lived there. Still, he did not utter a word because he did not dare to contradict his father”<sup>104</sup> (275). This report conveys none of the ironic humor that is present in Pushkin’s text. Instead, Baydas quietly respects his father, who explains his decision in these words, “I don’t want my son to go to St. Petersburg because he won’t learn a single thing there”<sup>105</sup> (264).

---

<sup>102</sup> Мысль о службе сливалась во мне с мыслями о свободе, об удовольствиях петербургской жизни. Я воображал себя офицером гвардии, что, по мнению моему, было верхом благополучия человеческого.

<sup>103</sup> Итак, все мои блестящие надежды рушились! Вместо веселой петербургской жизни ожидала меня скука в стороне глухой и отдаленной. Служба, о которой за минуту думал я с таким восторгом, показалась мне тяжким несчастьем.

<sup>104</sup> أما بطرس فكاد يتميز غيظا إذ أنه سمع كثيرا عن توحش سكان تلك النواحي وما يحدث فيها سنويا من فظاظة وأعمال القوزاق المنبئين فيها إلا أنه لم ينبس ببنت شفة كونه لا يجسر أن يخالف أباه.  
<sup>105</sup> لأنني لا أريد أن يتوجه ابني إلى بطرسبرج إذ لا يتعلم هناك شيئا

Though the father in Pushkin's version relates the same sentiment, in Baydas' translation the context is changed because Grinëv's expectations are different, as Buṭrus is left no room for rebellion – or even rebellious thoughts – in the conversation between his parents.

The liberties of *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf* discussed in Chapter One have traditionally been read as deficiencies in the translation. If we concern ourselves with Baydas as a translator instead of fidelity to the source text, we can read them differently. First, one must remember that Baydas' target audience did not have the same familiarity with the generic concerns of the Russian historical novel. As Pushkin's disruption of literary genres does not read well in the Arab context, nor does it serve Baydas' goal in publishing this translation, he makes the necessary changes. By removing the literary irony from the story, Baydas can focus on the elements of Pushkin's story that connect most directly with the intellectual trends in the Levant at this time. In place of the ambivalent attitudes toward the Russian nobility and Pugachëv's rebellion that we find in Pushkin's novel, Baydas produces a straightforward romantic narrative that champions the concepts of patriotism and service to the homeland.

Throughout his translation, Baydas uses many different techniques to include necessary extra information about the unfamiliar aspects of the Russian context for his readers. For example, each time that he uses the word “*jawāz*” to mean passport, he gives in parentheses the explanatory note “*tadhkarat murūr*” (literally “ticket of passage”). Unsure that his readers would be familiar with the term “*jawāz*,” Baydas give a synonym. Both terms are still commonly used in this same way today.

### **Poetry and Language**

*Kapitanskaia Dochka* contains a significant amount of poetry and idiomatic Russian. Baydas makes different decisions concerning these texts in translating the story into Arabic. Pushkin begins each chapter with a brief epigraph, usually taken from a Russian folk song or a piece of poetry. Baydas eliminates the epigraphs that appear at the beginning of each section in Pushkin's version. While this could be a question of space and formatting constraints, it also dodges a difficult piece of translation. Baydas also neglects to translate the examples of poetry that dot Pushkin's text, (most conspicuously Grinëv's love poem to Masha).

At the same time, Baydas does sometimes go to greater lengths to produce an approximation in Arabic for idiomatic phrases and snippets of poetry in the text. For example, at the beginning of the story, Pëtr Grinëv's father gives him several pieces of advice as he is leaving to begin his service. He ends his advice by repeating the saying, "Care for your clothes from the time they are new, and for your honor from your youth"<sup>106</sup> (*beregi plat'e snovu a chest' smolodu*) (48). Baydas does not attempt to translate this saying into Arabic, but does insert a similar phrase that captures the feeling of the original. He writes: "Take care, my son, for those who indulge in venial sins are bound to be drawn to heinous crimes"<sup>107</sup> (*Ḥidhār, ḥidhār yā bunayy fa-inna man yastarsilu fī al-ṣaghā'iri yastadriju ilā al-kabā'iri*) (276). This phrase seems to be Baydas' own, not an established idiom, and replicates the rhythm, rhyme, and meaning of the original phrase.

At the same time, Baydas inserts poetry into other parts of the story where none is found in Pushkin's text. In response to Mar'ia's letter that he receives on the eve of the

<sup>106</sup> "береги платье снову, а честь смолоду."

<sup>107</sup> حذار حذار يا بني فان من يسترسل في الصغائر يستدرج إلى الكبائر

final battle at the village, Butrus recites the following lines from the Abbasid poet Ibrahim bin al-Mahdi to himself: (396).

Perhaps He who guided Joseph's family to him  
And exalted him when he was captive in prison  
Will answer our plea and bring us together  
For God, the Lord of the world, is all powerful.<sup>108</sup>

Baydas' insertion of these lines of poetry into the story is an example of his desire to make his translation match the taste of his readers. It is a piece of poetry that would be familiar to many of his readers, and even if they did not know this particular couplet, it is clearly a piece of classical Arabic poetry, lending legitimacy to his translation. The poetry does match the situation, as Butrus contemplates the prospect of never being with Mariia again.

Beyond such instances of catering to the literary tastes of his intended audience, many of the additions that Baydas makes serve his didactic purposes. Baydas' insistence on inserting patriotism into Pushkin's text, as discussed above, forms one major example of this phenomenon. Baydas continues this theme throughout the novel, casting military service as a shining example of patriotism.

The starkly different depictions of military service in each text mark another profound change that Baydas makes to Pushkin's text as he translates. For Pushkin, nothing is off limits, and he portrays almost every aspect of military service with a dose of ironic humor and sarcasm. Baydas, on the other hand, is very solemn in presenting the importance of military service and everything that comes with it. In Pushkin's story, Grinëv makes his entrance at the fortress where he will serve, and is greeted by the following scene:

---

<sup>108</sup> وعسى الذي أهدى ليوسف أهله \ وأعزّه في السجن وهو أسير \ أن يستجيب لنا ويجمع شملنا \ والله رب العالمين قدير

Nobody met me. I entered the porch and opened the door to the entryway. An old invalid, sitting at the table, stitched a blue patch onto the elbow of a green uniform. I commanded him to announce my arrival. 'Go on in, sir,' the invalid answered. 'Our folks are home.' . . . At the window sat an old woman in a jacket and with a scarf on her head. 'What can I do for you, sir?' she asked, laying aside her activity. I answered that I came to serve, and had come to fulfill my duty to the Captain, and with this word I turned to the bent elderly man whom I took for the commander, but the woman interrupted my memorized. 'Ivan Kuzmich is not here,' she said. 'He went to visit Father Gerasim, but that hardly matters, sir, I'm his housewife. Please be so kind as to sit down, sir.'"<sup>109</sup> (70-71)

This domestic scene is the opposite of what Grinëv had expected upon reporting to the fortress. In Pushkin's narrative, this is just one in a string of events that upset the reader's expectations at every turn as Debrecezny describes. Though his story follows the basic outline of a typical romantic adventure story, Pushkin does not compose such a work.

Baydas, on the other hand, removes all of the twists that give Pushkin's story its unique irony, leaving behind a very stereotypical adventure story. When his hero arrives at the fort, he is met with the following scene:

Buṭrus came to a large plaza in which the captain was drilling a huge army of cavalry and they took their places until the captain completed his work after Buṭrus instructed his servant to dismiss the coachman and wait for his return with the captain. They then took up observing those soldiers and the military maneuvers in which they were engaged. Buṭrus was surprised by their skill in all of the equestrian maneuvers and watched them carefully when suddenly they broke into three groups with the Captain in the middle, commanding in a strong voice that all immediately obeyed.<sup>110</sup> (299)

<sup>109</sup> Никто не встретил меня. Я пошел в сени и отворил дверь в переднюю. Старый инвалид, сидя на столе, нашивал синюю заплату на локоть зеленого мундира. Я велел ему доложить обо мне. «Войди, батюшка, — отвечал инвалид, — наши дома». . . . У окна сидела старушка в телогрейке и с платком на голове. Она разматывала нитки, которые держал, распялив на руках, кривой старичок в офицерском мундире. «Что вам угодно, батюшка?» — спросила она, продолжая свое занятие. Я отвечал, что приехал на службу и явился по долгу своему к господину капитану, и с этим словом обратился было к кривому старичку, принимая его за коменданта; но хозяйка перебила затверженную мною речь. «Ивана Кузмича дома нет, — сказала она, — он пошел в гости к отцу Герасиму; да все равно, батюшка, я его хозяйка. Прошу любить и жаловать. Садись, батюшка.

<sup>110</sup> ساحة كبيرة حيث كان القبطان يمرن جيشا عرمرما من الفرسان والمشاة فتربعا ريثما يفرغ من عمله بعد أن أوعز بطرس لخدمه أن يصرف الحوذي و ينتظر عودته مع القبطان وأخذا بحدقان بهؤلاء الجنود وما يأتونه من الأعمال الحربية. فدهش بطرس من مهارتهم في جميع ضروب الفروسية وتأمل فيهم مليا وإذا هم منقسمون إلى ثلاث فرق والقبطان في الوسط يأمر وينهي بصوته الجهوري والجميع طوع وإشارته.

Baydas is particularly careful to smooth out those aspects of Pushkin’s story that portray the people involved in military service as anything short of outstanding. Buṭrus’ story becomes a much more traditional *bildungsroman* in which he progresses from a naïve young man to a noble soldier. Not only does the above section contrast starkly with Grinëv’s initial entrance into the fortress in Pushkin’s rendition, but it departs even further from the scene at the drilling yard in Pushkin’s story. Pushkin writes,

“Approaching the Commander’s home, we saw in the courtyard about twenty elderly invalids with long whiskers and in three-cornered hats. They were standing in formation. In the front stood the commander, a tall, vigorous old man, in a cap and silk gown. We stopped to watch the drills, but he asked us to continue on to see Vasilisa Egorovna, promising to follow us shortly. ‘There’s nothing,’ he added, ‘for you to see here.’”<sup>111</sup> (74)

All of these alterations that we find point to Baydas’ concern with *al-waṭan*; the phrases “service of the *waṭan*” (*khidmat al-waṭan*) and “devotion to the *waṭan*” (*mahabbat al-waṭan*) repeat again and again throughout his translation. How can we understand what he means by *al-waṭan*? As a citizen of the Ottoman Empire, he could easily be referring to that state as his homeland, or *waṭan*. At the same time, as an Arab and as an Orthodox Christian, Baydas belonged to several other distinct groups within Ottoman society that did not always see eye-to-eye with the government in Istanbul. As we look at the articles Baydas published on the topic in *al-nafā’is*, we can begin to answer the question of which geographical locations and communal identities formed Baydas’ *waṭan*. What we find in these articles is a radical shift in Baydas’ conception of

---

<sup>111</sup> “Подходя к комендантскому дому, мы увидели на площадке человек двадцать стареньких инвалидов с длинными косами и в треугольных шляпах. Они выстроены были во фронт. Впереди стоял комендант, старик бодрый и высокого роста, в колпаке и в китайчатом халате. Увидя нас, он к нам подошел, сказал мне несколько ласковых слов и стал опять командовать. Мы остановились было смотреть на учение; но он просил нас идти к Василисе Егоровне, обещаясь быть вслед за нами. «А здесь, — прибавил он, — нечего вам смотреть».

homeland: he moves from Ottomanist conceptions of citizenship in the issues of *al-nafā'is* that predate World War One to a more distinctly Arab and Palestinian definition of *waṭan* in the post-war issues of the journal.

Discussing expressions of Palestinian national identity in this period always evokes passionate debate. While some scholars contend that there are no explicit expressions of Palestinian nationalism before the end of the First World War,<sup>112</sup> this opinion is highly disputed. Most discussions of the topic tie the emergence of Palestinian national identity to political Zionism. For example, ‘Adnān Abu-Ghazāleh writes in his work on Arab cultural nationalism,

“There seems no doubt that the very literary revival itself was a function of the Palestinian consciousness of the Zionist threat, and consequently, the literature of the Mandate period derives much of its inspiration from Palestinian and Arab nationalism” (69).

In such a construction, Palestinian national identity is reduced to a response to the threat of Zionist activity in the region. Rashid Khalidi traces the process of identity formation in Palestine to a much earlier date, citing the interplay between Ottoman and Palestinian identity that begins as early as the 18<sup>th</sup> century. While recognizing that the construction of national identity always involves such conflict with an outside Other, Khalidi writes, “Although the Zionist challenge definitely helped to shape the specific form Palestinian national identification took, it is a serious mistake to suggest that Palestinian identity emerged mainly as a response to Zionism” (2010 20). Focusing the present discussion on the work of Khalil Baydas, we can see elements of both his Ottoman connections and his concern with political Zionism in his writings.

---

<sup>112</sup> Among literary scholars, I have found this opinion expressed clearly in the works of Matti Moosa and Reuven Snir.



Reading Baydas' fiction as translations, and in relation to the texts from which he was translating, we can see more clearly the expressions of national identity that are present in so many of the works (both fiction and non-fiction) that he published throughout his career. Like *ibnat al-qubṭān*, many of these strong expressions of patriotism and nationalism come long before World War One, the British Mandate, or the firm establishment of political Zionism. These early works show the continuity in Palestinian national thought as expressed before and after the War. While the texts discussed below clearly show the development of Baydas' thinking on the issue of nationalism, they also link the emotional response to political Zionism to trends that were already present in the decades leading up to the 1917 Balfour Declaration.

In the issues of *al-nafā'is* published before the First World War (1908-1914), Baydas repeats the phrases connected with patriotism and service to the homeland that he used in his translation of *Kapitanskaia Dochka*. Baydas concludes his introductory essay to the first issue (November 1908) with the sentence, "Our aim for lovers of learning and literature is that they will accept this project of ours easily. We ask God to guide us in the right path and to grant us success in what will bring benefit (*nafa'*) to the homeland (*al-waṭan*) and the country (*al-bilād*)" (2).<sup>113</sup> Baydas again repeats the same sentiment in the introduction to the seventh issue of *al-nafā'is* (December 1908), taking a moment to thank the other newspapers who have responded so positively to his new enterprise. He concludes his thanks by imploring God to guide him to "that which has the widest benefit for the nation (*al-ummah*) and the homeland (*al-waṭan*)" (117-118).<sup>114</sup> Thus, in the first year of publication, we see that Baydas retains his concern with serving the homeland

<sup>113</sup> فمأمولنا في محبي المطالعة والأدب أن يتلقوا مشروعنا هذا بالارتياح والقبول ونسأل الله أن يهدينا إلى سبيل الرشاد ويوفقنا إلى ما به نفع الوطن والبلاد

<sup>114</sup> والله المسؤول أن يسدنا إلى ما به عموم النفع للأمة والوطن وهو حسينا

through literary work, though there are still no clear indications of how he conceives of his *waṭan*, or homeland, from the works published in *al-naḡā'is*. One of the most challenging elements of Baydas' preoccupation with nationalism comes out of the historical context. In the period immediately following the 1908 constitutional reforms in the Ottoman Empire, it is not always clear where the allegiances of the Arab writers lie. So when Baydas writes about *al-waṭan*, what political/cultural entity is he referring to?

In the second year of publication, 1909, however, we begin to see more extended discussion of this central term. In the first issue of the second year, under the section entitled "*āthār adabiyyah*" ("Literary Works"), Baydas gives praise to a number of contemporary periodicals, recommending that his subscribers read them. Among these we find the well-known journal *al-waṭan*, which Baydas describes as being "diligent in serving the homeland,"<sup>115</sup> together with the journal *jāmi'at al-funūn*, which he describes as "an Ottoman journal dealing with a wide variety of contemporary arts,"<sup>116</sup> and also *ḡadīqat al-akhbār*, which he describes as being "the oldest Arab newspaper in Syria" (62-63).<sup>117</sup> At this point in his career, Baydas distinguishes between these different identities, but does not totally separate them. He refers to "the two countries of Egypt and Syria" (*al-quṭrayn miṣr wa-sūriyyā*), but does not apply the term *waṭan* to them directly. In the first two years of *al-naḡā'is*, Baydas never expresses a clearly Arab version of nationalism.

We do, however, find many instances through the first few years of *al-naḡā'is* in which Baydas explicitly writes himself into the Ottoman context. For example, in an article printed in 1911, Khalīl Sa'ad refers to "our Ottoman government" several times

<sup>115</sup> مجتهدة في خدمة الوطن

<sup>116</sup> مجلة عثمانية تبحث في سائر الفنون العصرية

<sup>117</sup> أقدم الصحف العربية في سوريا

(1911 106). At the same time, Sa'ad criticizes the oppressive tendencies of the Ottoman regime, and places them in the same camp as other oppressive regimes that have divided the Syrian people in the past. He writes, "Corrupt rulers in various times have been very influential in establishing divisiveness in the body of Syrian society. Religious differences, which in the Middle Ages almost led to national unity, have helped in this process" (1911 107).<sup>118</sup> This shift away from clear support of the Ottoman rulers begins very quickly after the first year of *al-nafā'is*. In Chapter Five I will consider this trend more fully in conjunction with Baydas' 1909 translation *ahwāl al-istibdād*, which is clearly meant to criticize 'Abd al-Hamīd II and his regime.

Another important commentary on national identity comes in a poem written by Is'āf al-Nashāshībī that Baydas published in the first issue of the second year of *al-nafā'is*. The poem, "*Dhikrā Fatāt Makdūniyyā*," praises the deposition of the monarch, and calls on the East to rise up in this new era of possibilities. He writes, "Oh East, your sleep has gone on too long, rise up / to nobility and greet the coming day"<sup>119</sup> (1909 51). This call quickly turns to the heroes of the Young Turk movement, mentioning Shawkat, Niazi, and others by name. In describing the removal of the sultan from power, al-Nashāshībī's language intensifies. He writes:

They removed the oppressor of the country, the one who brought  
injustice to the people, the perfidious, the deceiver.  
They toppled down the highest among his towers  
so the glorious is now in ruins.  
Oppression was destroyed the day he left  
And, overwhelming and swaggering, justice was restored.<sup>120</sup> (1909 51)

<sup>118</sup> فقد كان لفساد الأحكام في أزمنة مختلفة اليد الطولى في تأصيل الأنشقاق في جسم الاجتماع السوري وساعد على ذلك الاختلافات الدينية التي كادت في العصور الوسطى أن تؤدي بالرابطة القومية.

<sup>119</sup> أيها الشرق طال نومك فانهض للمعالي وصافح الإقبالا

<sup>120</sup> أنزلوا ظالم البلاد ومردى  
فوضوا من صروحه كل عال  
هلك الظلم يوم راح وولى  
الناس بغيا والناكث الختالا  
فغدت بعد نضرة أطلالا  
وأتى العدل باهرا مختالا

In these lines, al-Nashāshībī decries the old Ottoman regime in familiar terms of pride, vanity, oppression, and ruin, or decay. This poem illustrates the optimistic outlook of Arab intellectuals after the 1908 constitutional reforms. Later in the poem, al-Nashāshībī refers to the title character of the poem as “the girl of the struggle” (*fatāt al-niḍāl*), emphasizing the degree to which this struggle against oppression is ingrained into the peoples who suffered under Ottoman regime.

Overall, al-Nashāshībī’s poem fits well within the discourse that blames the backwardness of the Arab world during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries on oppressive Ottoman rule. The tension, however, comes in the fact that at this early stage after the constitutional reforms of 1908 al-Nashāshībī still aligns himself with the emerging Ottoman regime. That is to say, instead of championing an emergent Arab national identity, the title character of his poem is still Macedonian. His praise is for the Turkish generals who brought the reforms to pass, not for the end of the Ottoman rule, but for its transformation into something new. This complicated attitude toward Ottoman rule is common in the early years of *al-naḥā’is*, though it would shift again only a few years later.

At the same time, Baydas envisioned a Syrian people that existed within the framework of this Ottoman nation. In the 1913 volume of *al-naḥā’is* he published an article by Bulūs Sa’ad entitled “*sukkān sūrīyā*” (“The Inhabitants of Syria”) begins with the phrase, “There is no people (*sha’b*) among the Asian peoples whose branches are so various, and whose groups and sects are so numerous as the Syrian people (*sha’b*)”<sup>121</sup> (1913 324). This sense of the scattered and fractured nature of the nation to which Baydas

---

<sup>121</sup> ليس بين الشعوب الآسيوية شعب اختلفت أصوله وتشعبت فروعه وتعددت طوائفه ومذاهبه كالشعب السوري.

felt that he belonged appears in several different contexts within *al-nafā'is*. Some of the articles expressing this view that were printed in *al-nafā'is* call for forms of government and governance that deemphasize the various divisions in Syrian/Ottoman society. Most notably, this group called for completely secular forms of government in order to avoid any of the sectarian strife that had already defined politics in the region.

In the sixth issue of the 1912 volume of *al-nafā'is*, Baydas includes a small article from Būlus al-Kafūrī's newspaper *al-Muhadhdhib* on the popularity of articles concerning socialism in other Arabic-language newspapers. This article decries the publication of such articles, and gives the following explanation: "Are we not all participants in Ottoman nationalism?"<sup>122</sup> (1912 193). This attitude would give way to frustration with the British as World War One swept across the Middle East.

The complex nature of these relationships is also manifest in the series that ran in 1913 on the nations of the Balkans. Baydas sets himself the task of giving the background of each of the nations that make up the Balkans, since "The Balkan War is today the talk of the people and the principle concern on their minds" (1913 3).<sup>123</sup> Baydas chooses first to describe the Turks (*al-atrāk*) in the following words: "They are originally the Mughal Tatar tribes that inhabited the western parts of Mongolia several centuries before the advent of Christianity"<sup>124</sup> (1913 3). This description draws a distinct division between the Turks and the Arabs. The remainder of Baydas' history of this nation follows their ascension to power in Constantinople and the eastern parts of southern Europe. In this geographical construction, Baydas describes his own people and nation as being on the

---

<sup>122</sup> أو لسنا كلنا شركاء في الوطنية العثمانية؟

<sup>123</sup> الحرب البلقانية هي اليوم حديث الناس وشاغل الأكبر للأفكار

<sup>124</sup> هم في الأصل قبائل مغولية تنرية كان قاطنة قبل التاريخ المسيحي بقرون عديدة

same side of history as the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, oppressed by the Turkish foreigners who have foreign roots.

With the end of World War One, Baydas turns the content published in his journal to more direct criticism of the Ottoman government and speaks forcefully of the power and potential of alternatives to the Ottoman regime. He continues to publish articles in which the authors use various terms in referring to these possibilities, including *ummah*, *waṭan*, and *sha'b*. In addition to his growing criticism of the Ottomans, Baydas began to construct an Arab national identity in Syria by contrasting this group with the Zionist movement that had become so prominent. Baydas' new attention to this phenomenon shows a marked shift in Arab political thought in the Levant.

World War One had a profound impact on the work of Khalil Baydas. Before the war, he went to great lengths to preserve the exclusively literary character of his journal, refusing to print explicitly political comments in its pages. When *al-nafā'is* resumed printing in 1919, it had a markedly different tone. While the journal still contained a number of purely literary pieces in each issue, Baydas also filled the pages of that year's issues with articles on Zionism, international politics, and nationalist rhetoric. In these later issues, we find a wealth of information related to the issue of national identity in Baydas' career.

The new rhetoric around nationalism even appears in some of the advertising published in the post-war issues of *al-nafā'is*. This advertisement for the Budūr Brothers tobacco shop echoes Baydas' rhetoric of nationalism and service to the nation. The title of the shop as given in the advertisement is "*ma'mal al-dukhān al-waṭanī li-budūr al-ikhwān*" ("The Budūr Brothers' National Smoke Shop"). In this case, these individuals

claim to be serving their nation (*al-bilād*) by “providing the finest varieties of pure tobacco.”<sup>125</sup> Even here, the knowledge that allows them to pursue such honorable service of their nation comes after “studying the craft for several years in the United States.”<sup>126</sup> What’s more, they write, “We have made all of our workers local (*waṭaniyyīn*), and among them are many women and girls who have been compelled to work in order to take care of their families.”<sup>127</sup>

Here the use of “*waṭaniyyīn*” is particularly interesting. Normally, this word is used in the sense of ‘nationalist,’ or individuals subscribing to a certain political ideology. The author of this advertising copy is clearly using the word to mean ‘members of our own *waṭan*,’ or nation. This shows how flexible these terms were, even in 1921. The company also uses this concept of *waṭan* to tie themselves to the collective suffering of the people that came as a consequence of the First World War by commenting on the fact that many of their local workers had been forced to work because of the difficult circumstances in the country.

In addition, the works published in the second decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century reflect the growing concern with the influence of political Zionism in Palestine. The appearance of Zionism as a major concern sets the 1919 volume of *al-naḡā’is* apart. Baydas’ silence during the war years makes it difficult to trace the introduction of this concern into his writing, but when *al-naḡā’is* reappears in 1919 Zionism clearly occupies a prominent place in Baydas’ writing. In an article entitled “*al-yahūd fī al-quds*” (“Jews in Jerusalem”) Baydas writes, “The Zionist issue today is the mother of all issues that concern Palestine and the people of Palestine whatever their sect or religion or race. Just

<sup>125</sup> أننا نقوم بخدمة البلاد بتقديم أجود أنواع الدخان

<sup>126</sup> وقد درسنا هذا الفن سنوات عديدة في الولايات المتحدة

<sup>127</sup> وجعلنا العملة كلهم وطنيين وفيهم جمهور كبير من النساء والبنات اللاتي يدفعهن الاضطراب إلى العمل لإعالة ذويهن

as it is one of the complex issues, nay, problems that political leaders in Europe and America are working to solve” (1919 82).”<sup>128</sup> Here we can see that the nationalist strands that are observable in Baydas’ earlier writings (all the way back to *ibnat al-qubṭān* in 1898) began to take a different turn. Whereas Baydas previously defined national identity in positive terms, an identity expressed through loyalty to the government and a sense of pride in one’s community, *al-yahūd fī al-quḍs* marks the first time that Baydas began to define Palestinian national identity in opposition to an outside identity, and outside threat. This oppositional turn infuses Baydas’ understanding of national identity with a new vitality, a force that transcends “sects, religions, and races.” Baydas’ description of Zionist groups is filled with respect for their organization and the many different ways that they support those who wish to immigrate to Palestine.

By 1921, however, the tenor of articles concerning nationalism and colonialism had changed dramatically. In a short set of thoughts entitled “*naẓarāt*,” Baydas expresses strong opinions on these very topics. The tone and strength of these articles is much more intense than anything we find in the pre-war years of *al-nafā’is*. Baydas had clearly come to define Palestinian nationalism in opposition to political Zionism. This is particularly clear in two items from this issue that deal with naming. The first concerns the renaming of the street that leads to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in the old city of Jerusalem. There were some present who wished to rename the street “*shāri’ al-nāṣirī*” (“street of the Nazarene”). Baydas commented, “Fine. This is also a type of reform in our happy new era. For, did they not write on the cross upon which the Messiah was hung, ‘Jesus of

---

<sup>128</sup> المسألة الصهيونية اليوم هي أم المسائل التي تهتم فلسطين وأبناء فلسطين على اختلاف المذاهب والأديان والعناصر. كما أنها من المسائل المعقدة بل المشكلات المعضلة التي يشتغل في حلها دهاقنة السياسة في أوروبا وأميركا.



Nazareth [*al-nāṣirī*], King of the Jews?”<sup>129</sup> (1921 62). This punch line aims at the growing tension between the Jews and Arabs living in Palestine at the time.

In the next selection of *nazarāt* in this same issue, Baydas reports that “the Zionist members [of a government council] had requested that ‘Palestine,’ the country’s current, famous name, be substituted with the name ‘the Land of Israel,’ presenting many evidences from the Bible” (1921 62). Tongue firmly in cheek, Baydas responds, “They are right. The name of this country was Israel.” He goes on to list all of the other names by which that land had been known over the centuries, and finally suggests,

“So we must either call the country by all of these names, or take from each name a single letter, and make a new name from all of these letters, or choose one of these names at random. Or perhaps we should just call it Balfouria, a name both new and beautiful”<sup>130</sup> (1921 62).

In addition, Baydas speaks out against foreign colonialism in this same section of this issue. Here is a selection of the article:

We do not know when Palestinians were consulted concerning this issue, or when they disassociated themselves from the government of their Syrian brothers, though they are children of one nation (*umma*) bound by language and customs and culture and history and geography to say nothing of the bonds of blood relation and the connections of the womb and the unity of interests. . . . There is no crime in the fact that the Palestinians know with certainty that it is a great oppression that they cut the bonds of the country and that something come between a man and his brother and his cousin and his own people in order to realize the unrealistic aims and colonial dreams that any sound mind rejects and against which any true knowledge sounds a warning, nor does it agree with the morals of the devoted, loyal people of the country.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>129</sup> قلنا لا بأس. هذا أيضا من باب الإصلاح في عهدنا الجديد السعيد. أو لم يكتب على الخشبة التي علقت عليها المسيح: "يسوع (الناصري) ملك اليهود؟"

<sup>130</sup> فأما أن نسميها بعد الآن بكل هذه الأسماء. أو نأخذ من كل اسم حرفا ونأخذ اسما جديدا من مجموع هذه الأحرف. أو نأخذ أحد هذه الاسماء بالقرعة. أو نسميها "بلفوريا"—وهو اسم جديد وجميل معا.

<sup>131</sup> نحن لا ندري متى استفتى الفلسطينيون في هذه المسألة ولا متى تبرأوا إلى الحكومة من إخوانهم السوريين، وهم أبناء أمة واحدة تربطهم اللغة والأخلاق والعادات والتاريخ والبيئة فضلا عن أواصر القربى وصلات الرحم ووحدة المنفعة وغير ذلك. . . لا جرم في أن الفلسطينيين يعلمون حق العلم أن من الظلم الفادح أن نقطع أوصال البلاد وأن يحال بين المرء وأخيه وبني عمه وذويه لتحقيق أماني وهمية وأحلام استعمارية يبنيها العقل السليم وينبه عنها العلم الصحيح ولا تتفق ولا بوجه مع أخلاق أهل البلاد الودعاء المسالمين. (١٩٢١ ص. ٦٢)

This article marks the first time that Baydas published such forceful condemnation of foreign involvement in Arab affairs. His desire to speak out against foreign intervention moves him to declare his vision of Arab nationalism very clearly—he refers specifically to the “government of their Syrian brothers,” using the term “*sūriyyīn*” instead of “*bilād al-shām*.” Zachs notes that this appellation had greater currency among those Arabs who envisioned a secular state that could include members of all the different religious groups in the region (2001 159). In the passage cited above, Baydas has taken the idealistic images of nationalism and patriotism present in *ibnat al-qubṭān* and developed them into more concrete expressions of affiliation and kinship specific to his own historical, political, and geographical context. This shift leaves no room for confusion on the issue of Ottomanism versus Arab nationalism, for it had already become clear that Ottoman rule was not to continue much longer. Given these circumstances, we see Baydas aligning himself clearly with the emerging nationalist movements centered in Beirut. This transition represents a major shift away from the more abstract expressions of nationalism present in Baydas’ early literary works like *ibnat al-qubṭān*.

Reading Baydas’ translation of *Kapitanskaia Dochka* against this cross section of articles treating issues around Palestinian nationalism sheds new light on the development of these ideas in Baydas’ mind. In the larger context of Palestinian nationalism, this text sheds light on earlier expressions of national thinking than are often acknowledged in the literature. While the earlier texts like *ibnat al-qubṭān* do not show the same concrete forcefulness in their nationalist rhetoric, pairing them with the post-war texts from *al-nafā’is* shows that this line of thinking was already present in the Palestinian context in an earlier era. It is easy to overlook earlier expressions of

nationalism, like those that fill every page of *ibnat al-qubṭān*, because they do not center so clearly on defining a Palestinian national identity in opposition to an outside Other, or because they are not so clearly constructed in opposition to political Zionism as the post-war articles printed in *al-nafā'is*. At the same time, reexamining the materials in this early translation shows the clear continuity of Baydas' thought concerning nationalism. Baydas composed an entire translated novel based on the concepts of patriotism and service to the homeland in 1898—long before most histories begin discussing nationalism in the Palestinian context.

Baydas' translated work *ibnat al-qubṭān* has every mark against it in the rubric of the canon of modern Arabic literature—it is a translation that has been radically altered and severely abridged. It does not deal with Arab characters or an Arab context. For these reasons, *ibnat al-qubṭān* (and so many similar texts from the *nahḍah*) have never received close critical attention. This chapter is just a brief example of the tremendous untapped body of information and insight available to literary historians and scholars of literature within these early translations. By reading them carefully against not only their source texts, but also within their particular social and historical context, we can begin to see the agendas, ideas, and abilities of their translators emerge.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### *Shaqā' al-Mulūk: educating a new nation*

Much of the literature produced during the *nahḍah* had a strong tendency towards didacticism, and Baydas' interest in education goes beyond the typical tendency to preach and expound found in literature of the period and into substantial consideration of the institutions of modern education. In all of Baydas' published literary works, both original and translated, we can clearly see close connections between literature and education. Baydas' career as an educator led him to be even more explicit and outspoken on matters of education than some of his contemporaries. Furthermore, his close professional association with the IOPS schools and other educational institutions in Jerusalem lend additional credence to his observations and ideas about education in Palestine. This chapter will explore the connections between literature and education by reading the spaces between Baydas' translated novel *shaqā' al-mulūk* (1908) and the novel from which it was translated, Marie Corelli's *Temporal Power* (1902). The alterations that Baydas makes to *Temporal Power* as he translates embody his philosophy of literature and its role in society very clearly. More specifically, they highlight the strong connection that he saw between education and a successful national movement, a theme about which he published many essays and articles in the pages of *al-naḥā'is* over the years. In addition, the book details the workings of a radical socialist (*ishtirākiyyah*),

anarchist (*fawḍawiyyah*)<sup>132</sup> group as they seek to overthrow an oppressive monarchy—a plot that mirrors (and predicts) events within the Ottoman Empire over the first 15 years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Given the historical context in which Baydas completed his translation, this becomes a very important issue. In addition to reading Baydas’ translation of *Temporal Power* closely, I will cite evidence from his journal *al-naḡā’is* that deals with the topic of education in modern society and its connection to the emerging nationalist movements in the Arab provinces during this same period.

Khalil Baydas’ dual careers in literature and education were closely tied together. While Baydas’ emphasis on the power of literature to educate and enlighten while entertaining is far from unique in the *nahḡah* context, we see in his translations and publications a much more intimate concern with the actual institutions and impact of formal education on Palestinian society. Baydas’ translated novel *shaḡā’ al-mulūk* engages with a wide variety of *nahḡawī* concerns—everything from the role of government to the place of women in modern society—all wrapped up in a fast-paced adventure story. Comparing the work to the text from which he was translating, however, we can begin to see just how much material explicitly related to formal education he inserts into the translation, and how much he chooses to leave out of his translation. To further illustrate the prominence of this concern in Baydas’ work, this chapter includes a discussion of the non-fiction articles about education in Palestine that appeared alongside *shaḡā’ al-mulūk* on the pages of *al-naḡā’is*. These articles form a key part of the debates around education and government that were taking place in Palestine during the early part

---

<sup>132</sup> The fact that Baydas uses these specific terms is extremely significant, as both were coined by Salīm al-Bustānī in his influential Beirut journal *al-jinān*. This shows that Baydas was not only heavily invested in the issues of contemporary Russian culture, but also read and followed the major Arab periodicals of his day, as would be expected of an individual in his position.

of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. More importantly, they serve to illustrate Baydas' deep commitment to these issues, and serve to bring these themes to the foreground in the alterations he makes to British author Marie Corelli's novel *Temporal Power* as he translates it into Arabic.

Baydas included installments of this translation at the end of each issue in the 1908-1909 year of *al-naḡā'is*. *Shaqā' al-mulūk* was Baydas' first novel-length literary translation, more than four times as long as *ibnat al-qubṡān*, discussed in Chapter Three. As with *ibnat al-qubṡān*, we find in *shaqā' al-mulūk* the same extensive and open alteration of the source text that was common to translation during the *naḡdah*. At the same time, *shaqā' al-mulūk* exhibits a different set of concerns motivating the changes that Baydas makes to his source texts as he translates. This chapter will read his translation closely for the evidences of his attitudes towards education that can be found in the changes that he made to his source texts as he translates. In order to substantiate my reading of *shaqā' al-mulūk*, I will then choose articles from *al-naḡā'is* that treat the subject of education and make clear Baydas' intention to transform Corelli's novel into a primer for citizens of a nascent modern state in the Levant.

Baydas must have begun translating *shaqā' al-mulūk* in the years leading up to the Young Turk revolution of 1908, under the oppressive regime of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd II. During those tumultuous years, he could not speak openly against the Sultan or the state of affairs in the Ottoman Empire, but his views come through clearly in his translation. His novel reads like a textbook for Ottoman subjects, instructing them in the roles and responsibilities of both the ruler and the ruled in modern society. It exemplifies Baydas' concern with education – both the intrinsic power of fiction to educate, and his explicit

concern with the institutions of formal education as they pertain to life in a modern nation state. These concerns are a far cry from the philosophies and political positions that underlie Corelli's original work.

The year 1908, when Baydas began publishing *al-naḡā'is*, was a year of change and hope in the Ottoman Empire, particularly among the liberal educated elements of Arab society. The constitutional reforms ushered in with the Young Turk revolution promised new freedoms and an increased measure of autonomy to the Arab provinces. Indeed, these very reforms made it possible for Baydas (and so many others from among his contemporaries) to begin careers in publishing and journalism. The rule of Sultan 'Abd al-Ḥamīd II in the years leading up to 1908 had been especially oppressive, engendering early nationalistic resistance movements within Arab society.<sup>133</sup> The changes of 1908 opened the door for Baydas and his contemporaries to take Arab journalism and print culture to a new level of sophistication and accessibility. Because this opportunity followed 'Abd al-Ḥamīd II's reign so closely, the burst of journalistic activity in 1908 also carried with it a power political charge.

### **Baydas and the Novel**

In the inaugural issue of *al-naḡā'is* in 1908, Baydas presents his new readers with a manifesto of sorts on the role of fiction in society. In this essay, he focuses particularly on the *riwāyah*, a word that has become common today, but whose meaning was still being negotiated at the turn of the century. The term *riwāyah* is now used exclusively to talk about novels, but originally referred to a much broader range of prose fiction genres, including drama, short stories, and novels. These literary forms were quite innovative in

---

<sup>133</sup> See Abdelaziz Ayyad's work *Arab Nationalism and the Palestinians: 1850-1939*, particularly the second chapter, "The Arab Liberation Movement: the formative years" for a detailed history of the secret societies beginning to organize in the Arab world in these years.

the 19<sup>th</sup> century Arabic scene, and not exactly trusted by the literary or religious establishments. Baydas' opinions on the subject are close to those of many of his contemporaries, such as Niqūla Haddād (Egyptian novelist), Ya'qūb Sarrūf (one of the editors of the periodical *al-Muqataṭaf*), Jurjī Zaydān, and others. Each of these authors (and many of their contemporaries) justified the new genres of prose fiction on the basis of their potential to influence people to make good choices in their own lives. A few selections from Baydas' 1908 essay will give a clear picture of his philosophy of literature. He writes,

“The profound influence that novels, in all their subjects, have on the heart and mind is no secret; indeed, it is considered that they are the greatest pillar of civilization (*al-madaniyyah*) due to the wisdom and culturing (*tathqīf al-akhlāq*) that they contain, in addition to the morals and lessons that they hold, which enlighten the mind.”<sup>134</sup> (1908 1).

This same philosophy would come to shape Baydas' translation practice, informing the decisions that he made when working to bring a foreign text to an Arabic-reading audience. As discussed in the second chapter of this dissertation, such concern with the moral and didactic potential of the novel was often voiced among its supporters during the *nahḍah*. They felt that the novel's ability to clearly present moral truths in a real-life setting/situation outweighed the criticism leveled at the introduction of a foreign genre into Arabic literature.

Baydas' introductory statement goes further than a straightforward concern with morality. In the last sentence of his introduction he writes, “We ask God to guide us to the paths of wisdom and to grant us success in that which benefits the nation (*al-ummah*) and the country (*al-bilād*)” (1908 2). Baydas clearly felt that the power of literature to

<sup>134</sup> فلا تخفى ما للروايات على اختلاف مواضعها من التأثير الخطير في القلوب والعقول حتى اعتبرت أنها من أعظم أركان المدنية بالنظر إلى ما تستبطنه من الحكمة في تثقيف الأخلاق وما تنطوي عليه من العبر والمواعظ في تنوير الأذهان.



influence society went beyond simply commanding the right and forbidding the wrong in the lives of individuals. His experience with Russian literature led him to closely identify a strong national identity with a strong national literature.<sup>135</sup>

***Temporal Power – Pod Bremenem Vlasti – shaqā’ al-mulūk***

In the same issue that he published this manifesto, Khalil Baydas published the first installment of his own translation of Marie Corelli’s novel *Temporal Power* (1902) – the first major novel to be published serially in *al-nafā’is*. Marie Corelli was one of the best selling British authors of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. She wrote many novels, and they were wildly popular with readers in Great Britain and abroad. Her works spanned a variety of genres, from popular romances to philosophical novels. Critics were not kind to Corelli, citing her overwrought descriptions and predictable plotlines. Her works were translated into a variety of languages, and made into several different films in Europe, the United States, and abroad. *Temporal Power* is not one of Corelli’s better known works today, though it was widely read in its day. In this novel, Corelli is primarily concerned with exploring the questions of power and authority in modern society. She divides this question into temporal power, which rests with the monarch in her novel, and spiritual power, which rests in the hands of the church. Her book contains a great deal of radical socialist preaching and philosophizing. As she tells the story of an underground socialist group preparing to overthrow the government of an imagined European country, she

---

<sup>135</sup> There is certainly more work to be done on this point, but it falls far outside the scope of this dissertation — the role of the poet and the role of the author in Russian society and in Russian nationalism is quite unique—the poet as prophet, the author as seer is not necessarily a view shared in all modern Western literary traditions. In his memoir *Sab’ūn*, Nu’aymeh gives further evidence of this atmosphere being present in the IOPS schools when he laments the state of Arabic literature in comparison to Russian literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

makes clear her disdain for the existing English form of government and the influence of the Catholic Church in European political matters.

The gap between Baydas' Arabic translation and Corelli's text is made more interesting by the fact that he is translating from a translation. Baydas did not read English, and therefore had no access to the original text. In the introduction to his translation, he writes:

This novel contains, in the guise of entertainment and diversion, enough wisdom and teaching to make it one of the most precious treasures, for it represents the state of kings and their relation to their subjects, and their duties towards them, in addition to the relationship of the subjects to the king, and their rights before them, in addition to the related matters of men of state, the royal court, and the power of the people (*al-sha'b*) in a variety of realistic depictions. Together with all of this, it has an exciting plot and philosophical discussions of society that are pleasant to hear and enticing to the soul.

Mary Corelli, the English author, composed the novel, and Z. Zhuravskaia conveyed (*naqalat*) it into Russian, entitling it *Under the Burden of Power*. We have Arabized it (*'arrabnāhā*) from Russian under the title *The Miseries of Kings*, and have altered it (*tašarrafnā fīhā*), adding, deleting, changing, substituting, dividing, etc. in order to make it agreeable to the tastes of the readers. We hope that speakers of Arabic (*abnā' al-'arabiyyah*) will find it interesting and appealing. We put our trust in God.<sup>136</sup>

His indication that he is working from Z.N. Zhuravskaia's Russian translation of Corelli's text is curious, because her Russian translation appeared in book form in 1916, eight years before Baydas began publishing his translation. Baydas must have read Zhuravskaia's translation first in one of the Russian 'thick journals' of the time, though it is unclear where it first appeared.<sup>137</sup> The fact that Baydas not only subscribed to these

<sup>136</sup> هذه الرواية تتضمن من العبر والحكم تحت ثوب اللهو والفكاهة ما يجعلها من أنفس النخائر، فإنها تمثل بأسلوب شائق حالة الملوك ونسبتهم إلى الرعية وواجباتهم نحوها، ونسبة الرعية إليهم وحقوقها عليهم، وما يتصل بذلك من شؤون الملك وأحوال رجال الدولة والبلط وفوة الشعب، بصور مختلفة تنطبق على الحقيقة. وفي خلال كل ذلك حوادث مشوقة ومباحث فلسفية اجتماعية يستعذبها السمع ويتعشقها الطبع.

ألفتها ماري كورلي الكاتبة الإنجليزية ونقلتها ز. جورافسكايا إلى اللغة الروسية بعنوان (تحت نير السلطة) فعريناها عن الروسية باسم (شقاء الملوك) وتصرفنا فيها بزيادة وإسقاط وتغيير وإبدال وتوبيخ وغير ذلك لتوافق ذوق القراء. فعسى أن يتلقاها أبناء العربية بما هي أهل له من الإيثار والإقبال. . . وعلى الله الاتكال.

<sup>137</sup> We have testimonies from Krachkovskiĭ and other Russian orientologists that Baydas and other graduates of the IOPS schools subscribed to such journals, though I have not yet been able to identify positively the

journals, but followed them so closely shows just how deeply he was involved with contemporary Russian culture. While Corelli's novel is not an obvious connection to Russian literature, this instance shows the degree to which Baydas' view of Western Europe was filtered through Russian cultural sources. We do not have any other examples of Arabic translations of Corelli's work from this early date, but she had already become very well known on the international literary scene. Baydas experienced world literature through the Russian journals and books that he read. Nevertheless, his focus in writing and translating always rested on the audience for which he was writing; his primary goal was to present Arab readers with pieces of literature in form and context that would be agreeable and beneficial for them.

At only 261 pages, Zhuravskaia's translation considerably condenses the English text, which runs 559 pages long. A significant proportion of this discrepancy comes from differences in typesetting and layout of the two books. Nevertheless, Zhuravskaia cuts many of the extended descriptions of nature and the environment that dominate Corelli's narrative. At the same time, she stays remarkably close to Corelli's text in terms of the characters' relationships and the radical socialist politics contained in Corelli's text. As the focus of the present study is on the choices that Baydas makes as a translator, I will include discussion of the Russian translation only in those instances that Baydas' text diverges from the English original.<sup>138</sup> Unlike Zhuravskaia's alterations, which primarily serve to condense the novel, Baydas makes major changes to the text as he translates it. In addition to further condensing the plot, Baydas softens Corelli's revolutionary tone

---

journal in which Zhuravskaia's translation first appeared in print, or the initial date of its publication.

<sup>138</sup> As the Russian translation was also completed on the eve of tremendous political change in Russia, it will be interesting in a future study to read all three texts together in their respective historical contexts. While this work was not one of Corelli's most important works within the context of British literature, it seems to have resonated in other societies experiencing great political change.

and focuses instead on producing a work that educates his audience about the relationship between rulers, the ruled, and the law in modern society. In studying the spaces between these texts, this chapter will focus on Baydas' lifelong interest in education. After examining his translation of *Temporal Power*, I will connect the trends visible in this translation by exploring its relationship to Baydas' comments on education, literature, and modern society that found in the essays and articles that he publishes in *al-nafā'is*.

The liberal translation practice known as *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf* (discussed in chapter 2) defines Baydas' translation practice in this case as in the previous works discussed. In the introduction to Baydas' translation of *Temporal Power*, he writes, "We have altered the text in this translation, adding and subtracting, changing and substituting, dividing the text, and other changes in order to agree with the readers' taste"<sup>139</sup> (3). As we investigate this statement through a close reading of Baydas' translation, it will become clear that some changes were indeed made to "agree with the readers' taste," but the majority of them clearly serve very different purposes. In translating *Temporal Power*, Baydas reshapes Corelli's socialist-leaning Romantic adventure novel, transforming it into a manual on the responsibilities of kings and citizens in a modern government. His text preserves some of the strong condemnations of oppressive governments and radical calls for social and political change that fill Corelli's novel, but also inserts material specific to the political situation in Palestine and the Ottoman Empire at the time he was writing. In addition, we find more evidences of Baydas' continual concern with civic and legal issues. Baydas' alterations to Corelli's text belie his concern with the institutions of modern government and their relationship to rulers and the ruled in a modern state. In *shaqa' al-muluk* we find the common traces of a

---

<sup>139</sup> ونصرفنا فيها بزيادة وإسقاط وتغيير وإبدال وتبويب وغير ذلك لتوافق ذوق القراء.

project of culturing (*tathqīf*) that he saw his journal carrying out among its Arab readership, but also the more ambitious project of *tamaddun*, or becoming civilized. In Baydas' translation practice, we find traces of his desire to instruct his readers not only in the moral realm, but also (and perhaps more urgently) in the civic.

British author Marie Corelli (1855-1924) was one of the best selling and most well known authors of her time. Her books sold throughout Europe and were translated into many languages. She was known as the "Queen of Victorian Bestsellers" (Ransom 1), though her books were never well-received by literary critics. Of all of Baydas' literary translations, *Temporal Power* was the most contemporary piece that he translated, in addition to being the first translation of Corelli's work into Arabic. The very short period of time between the publication of *Temporal Power* (1902) and Baydas' translation, *shaqā' al-mulūk* (1908) indicates how quickly Corelli's work spread.

Despite her fame and success during her lifetime, Corelli's works largely fell out of circulation later in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Though *Temporal Power* may not occupy the same place in today's literary canon as *The Captain's Daughter*, or even *Prince Serebryaniĭ*, Baydas took the translation seriously and was very proud of the finished product. When *shaqā' al-mulūk* was published in book form in 1922, Baydas made several different announcements in the pages of *al-nafā'is al-‘aṣriyyah* publicizing the new volume. He gave more space to this novel than to other volumes of his stories and translations that he also published in book form and advertised in *al- al-nafā'is al-‘aṣriyyah*. Shortly after the book became available separately, he included the following summary in the "āthār adabiyyah" section of *al-nafā'is*:

"*The Misery of Kings*: It is among the best social-literary novels, if not the very best of them all. It is our advice to each reader, male and female alike, among the

readers of these lines to strive to obtain it and to read it together with his family once or twice, and to guard it as they would guard the most precious treasure that they have to sustain their soul.”<sup>140</sup> (1922 272)

Even taking into account the hyperbole in what amounts to advertising copy, this statement is, in fact, unique among the advertisements for literary works published in *al-nafā'is*. Baydas' repetition of the superlatives describing the novel is not common in his assessments of literary works. The detailed and explicit instructions on how the book is to be read give us additional insight into Baydas' view of his translation of *Temporal Power*. Baydas clearly intended the work to be read as a textbook or guide for the Arabic-language audience, and the changes that he makes while translating the text reflect this fact.

Corelli writes an adventure novel infused with the rhetoric and imagination of radical socialism. The novel is set in an unnamed imaginary European kingdom,<sup>141</sup> ruled by a king who is given to philosophical meditations but surrounded by unscrupulous politicians who seek only to profit from their positions. Prompted by his discontent with the status quo, the King of the land goes undercover to learn the true state of affairs in his kingdom. Going incognito, he discovers the existence of a secret revolutionary socialist organization operating in his kingdom, and gradually comes to realize how disconnected he has become from his subjects. Eventually, he gives himself fully to the cause of the revolution (still working in disguise), recognizing the changes that he needs to make to his government in order to better serve the people. Eventually, the people of the kingdom come together under the influence of the socialist revolutionaries, and seek to overthrow

<sup>140</sup> هي من أفضل الروايات الأدبية الاجتماعية إن لم تكن أفضلها كلها. ونصيحتنا إلى كل قارئ وقارئة من قراء هذه السطور أن يبادر إلى اقتنائها وأن يقرأها هو وأهل بيته المرة والمرة وأن يحرص عليها كما يحرص على أعز ذخيرة لديه لغذاء نفسه.

<sup>141</sup> Though the actual kingdom is clearly imaginary, characters in the novel travel to France, Russia, and Germany over the course of the novel.

the monarchy. It is only at this point that the King reveals himself as an operative of the secret society, and reforms the government in accordance with the society's socialist beliefs. Clearly, Baydas' choice of this novel as the first full-length translation in *al-nafā'is* is not a chance event. The descriptions of the socialists' meetings are extensive and vivid. In many respects, they echo the secret societies that were functioning in Istanbul and throughout the Arab world. Baydas (and his readers) must have been aware of these groups, which would only make reading a novel about them even more appealing. In addition, the unique way in which the king is involved in the revolutionary group allows Baydas to present all of their anti-monarchical rhetoric while shielding himself from retribution because it was couched deep inside the plot of a foreign novel.

The plot plays out in two strands, one for each side of the king's dual life. On the one hand, Corelli details the life of the king and his court in a time of intrigue and unrest within the kingdom, and on the other, she follows the king's alter ego, "Pasquin Leroy" as he moves deeper and deeper into the socialist group. The pun behind this name seems to have been lost on both Zhuravskaia and Baydas. The name 'Pasquin' has a long tradition in classical literature, referring to a battered Roman statue that became a mouthpiece for works parodying royalty. It eventually came to be an appellation for any mouthpiece of satire directing at the royal or the ruling. Corelli puts this explanation in the mouth of Zouche, the genius, though inebriated, poet of the revolutionary group. Corelli gave her readers clues as to this connection, by having the poet Zouche declare, "'Pasquin' stands for the beginning of a jest--so we may hope he will be amusing,-- 'Leroy' stands for the king, and so we may expect him to be non-political!" when Pasquin Leroy and his companions make their first appearance among the socialists (72).

The King's choice of alias indicates the tension within his life as king—in order to finally fulfill his calling as king of the land, he must undercut his own authority, uniting himself with the very elements of society that seek to depose him and his government. The surname Leroy is easily recognizable as a corruption of the French *le roi*. Baydas renders the name as “*lerwā*,” (لروا) indicating that he did, in fact, understand the clue hidden in the surname. For some reason, Baydas also renders the first name as if it were a French name, giving “*Bākin*” (باكن) in place of Pasquin. The responsibility for this decision rests entirely with Zhuravskaia, as the meaning of the names that Corelli chose disappears in the Russian translation, and thus would not be accessible to him. The king's dual personalities are particularly important for Corelli's novel because of the opportunities they provide her for giving a voice to the oppressed elements of society within the kingdom. As Pasquin Leroy moves through the country, he serves as a guide for the readers. Because he is encountering each situation for the first time, he often prompts explanations from the other characters in the novel that the reader overhears.

The titles of the different versions of this work provide convenient windows into the various projects of each respective author/translator. In Corelli's case, *Temporal Power* sets up the driving conflict behind the events and ideas of the novel. The power and authority of the king and his government are rooted firmly in the classical virtues of secular rule based in creating stability and prosperity for the people. While the government depicted is a monarchy, it also contains significant representative characteristics. In contrast to the king's rule, Corelli sets up three alternate types of power. The first oppositional force that she sets against the ideal of enlightened temporal



power is that of organized religion. Within the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, Corelli finds an oppressive power that corrupts both true spirituality and the foundations of secular power. In the world of *Temporal Power*, the Catholic Church seeks to burden the people with taxes, consolidating its own power and riches by manipulating the rulers and pacifying the populace through the tools of religion. The second opposition to positive temporal power that Corelli presents is the corrupting influence of wealth. This tendency is portrayed very unflatteringly through the character of David Jost, a wealthy Jewish media magnate. Corelli uses a wide variety of anti-Semitic stereotypes and labels in depicting Jost as he uses his money to buy influence and his newspaper to shape policy decisions and public opinion within the kingdom in order to increase his own profits.

Most importantly, Corelli highlights the portion of temporal power of the people, and voices her understanding of this power through the speeches, actions, and philosophies of Sergius Thord and Lotys, the leaders of the revolutionary socialist group that was planning to overthrow the monarchy and establish a utopian society in which social injustice and poverty are eliminated. She puts the king in direct contact with this element of society, bringing together the official authority expressed in the king with the popular authority that rests with the people. As the plot moves forward and the events around the revolution come to a head, Corelli makes this union permanent after the death of the king. The marriage of his son, the crown prince Humphry, to Gloria, who infuses this combined authority with the purity and power of nature, places these elements at the head of the new government in this utopian society.

Baydas, in contrast, moves away from the focus on temporal power and focuses instead on the king himself and his relationship to the people he rules. Baydas' change in

the title of the novel instantly informed his intended reader of the tone and topic of the novel. He entitles his work *shaqā' al-mulūk*, a departure from the English original and the Russian translation (*Pod Bremenem Vlasti*, or “*Under the Burden of Power*”). Where the Russian title refers equally to the rulers and those who suffer under the rule of others, Baydas’ title can be read in two very different ways. Most directly, it focuses exclusively on the kings themselves and their ‘misery’ (*shaqā'*) – the burden of governing. When introducing himself before the socialist group, the king tells his history in the following words:

My name is Pasquin Leroy. As for my nationality, I was born a slave. Perhaps you wonder at my words and say to yourself, “But slaves are black skinned” but I say to you candidly that there are many countries in the world in which people purchase one another, even though they are of the same lineage [literally, blood] and the same color—and they force others to work and to toil after having fixed them in one place and controlled them (*istabaddū bihim*) until their dying breath”<sup>142</sup> (57).

In this passage, Baydas retains the double-entendre of Corelli’s original. The reader sees how the king is talking about his own situation as royalty, but the words apply equally to the most destitute individuals in society. For Baydas, the miseries of kings are wrapped up in the relationship that they have with their people – the mutual duties and responsibilities that they share (or should share) towards each other. The second layer of meaning found in Baydas’ title speaks to the situation in the Ottoman Empire in the years before the 1908 revolution. The title *shaqā' al-mulūk* can also be interpreted to mean the misery that kings cause—the misery of being subject to a king. Although Corelli’s title is loaded in terms of religious meaning, Baydas has no interest in criticizing organized

---

<sup>142</sup> اسمي باكن لروا وأما جنسيتي فقد ولدت عبدا ولعلكم تتعجبون من كلامي وتقولون إن العبيد إنما هم سود البشرة فأقول لكم بصراحة إن في الكون بلادا كثيرة يشتري الناس فيها بعضهم بعضا مع أن الجميع من دم واحد ولون واحد ويرغمونهم على الشغل والكد بعد أن يقيدوهم في موضع واحد ويستبدوا بهم حتى النسمة الأخيرة من حياتهم.

religion in the outspoken way that she does, and in his translation the distinction between temporal and spiritual that comes up so often in Corelli's text disappears completely.

The title of Baydas' translation also serves as an opportunity to discuss the style of the language into which he translates. His title is striking for its lack of adornment, as this was a period in which most works still received rhyming titles, following the traditions established in earlier Arabic literature. For example, al-Ṭaḥṭāwī gave his 1867 translation of *Les Aventures de Télémaque* the title, *Mawāqī' al-Aflāk fī Waqā'i' Tilimāk*,<sup>143</sup> and Buṭrus al-Bustānī followed suit with his 1861 translation of *Robinson Crusoe*, which he entitled *Kitab al-tuhfah al-bustaniyyah fī al-asfar al-kuruziyyah*.<sup>144</sup> In contrast to this traditional form of title, Baydas always gives his translations simple, straightforward titles. As was discussed in Chapter Three, Baydas did not alter the title of Pushkin's novel at all in translating it—*Kapitanskaia Dochka* became *ibnat al-qubṭān*, a direct translation. In the case of *shaqā' al-mulūk*, Baydas' decision not to render either Corelli's or Zhuravskaia's title directly gives us our first insight into the types of alterations that he will be making to the text as he brings it into Arabic.

While Zhuravskaia's Russian translation highlights Corelli's radical politics and revolutionary fervor, Baydas pushes the question of social justice and class into the background, and brings the political relationships of the story to the foreground, taking the novel closer to the didactic "Mirror for the Princes" genre. In his case, however, the lesson is no longer just for the rulers, but for the ruled. Baydas shapes the text in specific ways in order to educate his readers about living in a modern society and the mutual responsibility necessary to make a strong relationship between the ruler to the ruled. He

<sup>143</sup> "مواقع الأفلاك في وقائع تلماك"

<sup>144</sup> "كتاب التحفة البستانيّة في الأسفار الكروزيّة، أو، رحلة روبنسون كروزي"

highlights the ways in which state institutions benefit citizens of the state, and also the ways in which citizens contribute to the functioning of a healthy, modern nation state. Corelli's story provides the perfect vehicle for such an undertaking, as her undercover king details his experiences with both the general populace and the ruling classes.

For example, early in the novel *Sergius Thord*, the revolutionary leader in Corelli's novel, gives an inflammatory speech to a crowd participating in a religious festival. Thord heads the revolutionary committee of the socialist group that is working to overthrow the government in the novel. In front of the town cathedral, he gives a stirring speech on the evils of the current government and the corrupt and oppressive nature of the clergy. Thord urges his audience to prepare themselves for the changes that are to come. In the Russian text, Thord regales the crowd on a wide range of social issues. In Baydas' Arabic text, he inserts several sentences not present in the Russian or the English texts. In this scene, Corelli has Sergius Thord speak boldly about education. He exclaims,

“Learn, learn all you can, my brothers--take the only good thing modern government gives you--Education! Education is thrown at us like a bone thrown to a dog, half picked by others and barely nourishing--but take it, take it, friends, for in it you shall find the marrow of vengeance on your tyrants and oppressors! The education of the masses means the downfall of false creeds,--the ruin of all false priests!” (Corelli 75)<sup>145</sup>

In Corelli's text, Thord speaks out specifically against the role of religion in oppressing the people and interfering in politics. His speech is aimed entirely at the clergy, and he holds secular education to be the antidote to the ways in which the Church profits off of the people and keeps them from rising up. For Thord, education is equated with freedom from false ideas and false priests.

---

<sup>145</sup> Zhuravskaia's translation follows Corelli word for word: “Учитесь, братья, учитесь всему, чему только можете, берите единственное хорошее, что вамъ даетъ современное правмиельство,-- образование. Образование массъ означаетъ гибель ложныхъ учений и лживыхъ учителей.” (39)

When we read the correlating passage in Baydas' translation, we see how his goals in translating this novel differ from Corelli's specific concerns with the role and influence of the Church in the affairs of government. Baydas injects his particular concern with the relationship between education and the strength of the nation into Thord's monologue. In the Arabic text, the sentence quoted above becomes a lengthy paragraph on the relationship of education to nation:

“Learn, my brothers, for knowledge (*al-‘ilm*)—the one good thing that the current government has served you with—will be for you a shining light in the darkness of your lives, and whenever you increase your knowledge, you increase your power. For knowledge is the foundation of civilization and the source of all power—through it you reach the highest levels of glory, and nothing is done in the country (*al-bilād*) without it. For you tire yourselves and gather together in vain if knowledge is not the introduction to your demands and the opening of your works. For it is through knowledge that you elevate your affairs, and refine yourselves to the highest degrees of perfection, and become a nation (*ummah*) that others fear and hold in respect. Through knowledge you enlighten your intellects, and raise your minds and learn the value of the homeland (*al-waṭan*), and serve it with all your might and dedicate your souls to it. Through knowledge you learn the truth, and follow it, you learn of evil and distance yourselves from it. And then your country (*bilādukum*) will become happy, you will enjoy your life, and false teachings will disappear from among you, and false teachers will be destroyed and you will become a happy nation (*ummah*) that knows its duties towards God and man. But if you remain an ignorant nation (*ummah*) with no trace of knowledge or learning, then the power of the bloodthirsty hypocrites will increase and the oppressive tyrants' claws will seize you and you will have no weapon with which to defend your life and your rights.”<sup>146</sup> (46-47)

Where Corelli is concerned with the unhealthy relationship between religious authority and secular power, Baydas makes the more abstract connection between knowledge and power explicit, and expounds on this relationship exclusively as it pertains to the secular realm. Religion disappears entirely from Baydas' rendition of the speech, a testament to

<sup>146</sup> تعلموا يا إخواني جهديكم، فإن العلم—وهو الحسنة الوحيدة التي تصدقت بها عليكم الحكومة الحالية—يكون لكم بمنزلة المصباح الساطع في ظلمة حياتكم وكلما ازددتم علما ازددتم قوة، لأن العلم هو أساس العمران ومصدر كل قوة، فيه تصلون إلى أسمى مراتب المجد، ولا تقوم للبلاد قائمة إلا به. إنكم باطلا تتعبون وباطلا تجتمعون، إذا لم يكن العلم مقدمة مطالبكم وفتاحة أعمالكم. فبالعلم يعلم شأنكم وترتقون إلى أعلى درجات الكمال وتصيرون أمة يخشى بأسها ويعز جانبها. بالعلم تستنير عقولكم وتسمو مدارككم وتعرفون قيمة الوطن، فتخدمونه بكل جوارحكم وتقودونه بأرواحكم. بالعلم تعرفون الحق فتتبعونه والشر فتتبعوه عنه. وحينئذ تسعد بلادكم وتهنأ عيشتكم تتلاشى من بينكم التعاليم الكاذبة ويهلك المعلمون الكذبة وتصيرون أمة سعيدة عارفة واجباتها نحو الله والناس. أما إذا كنتم أمة جاهلة لا حظ لها من العلم والمعرفة، فتزداد عليكم سلطة المنافقين السفاحين وتنتشب فيكم مخالب الطغاة الظالمين، وليس في أيديكم سلاح تدافعون به عن حياتكم وحقوقكم.

the different role that religious identity played in Palestinian society, and Baydas' own particular sensitivity to religious issues. Baydas is more concerned with creating a viable nation than with overthrowing any particular oppressive regime. This is typical of his writing and publishing during the early years of the British Mandate, when Baydas applied the modernizing power of education equally within the Ottoman context and independent of it.

Corelli's loathing for organized religion runs throughout her entire novel. In his translation, Baydas removes all of these attacks on the institutions of organized Christianity. Early in the novel, when the King (disguised as Leroy) gives a toast during a meeting of the socialist group, Corelli has him talk very explicitly about Christianity and the differences between the 'theory of Christianity' as outlined in the New Testament versus the practice of Christianity under the organization of the Church (primarily the Catholic Church, though not exclusively). Leroy calls Jesus Christ the "Divine Socialist," and condemns the Catholic Church, proclaiming that "the Christian Church itself has become a mere system of money-making and self-advancement" (Corelli 74). Baydas' translation of this speech covers most of the same material, but eliminates every explicit reference to Christ and Christianity, choosing instead to refer to religion in general terms. He does quote from the New Testament at the end of his toast, paraphrasing Jesus' words from Matthew 7:23. Baydas' translation does not exactly echo the Arabic translations of the Bible available at that time. In his text, the King says, "*Innanā lā na'rifukum . . . idhhabū 'annā ya fā'ilī al-ithm*" (65) (We do not know you . . . depart from us oh ye that work iniquity). Corelli, on the other hand, quotes directly from the King James Version of the English Bible, "I never knew you: Depart from me ye that work iniquity" (73).

This change is significant, because Corelli has Jesus speaking those words to the leaders of the Christian churches of her day. Baydas, on the other hand, never mentions Christ in his translation, though the Russian translation follows Corelli closely. Baydas instead puts these words of authority (and the authority to break down the oppressive churches that teach corrupt doctrine) in the hands of the people. For this reason, the sentence quoted from the Bible shifts into the first person plural, and the people collectively reject those who would oppress them to get gain. A subtle shift in the language, but it reflects a profound difference in the two texts. Although Corelli's politics may have been more explicitly socialist and radical, Baydas actually makes the more radical move by including his readers in the movement that calls for the overthrow of tyrannical leaders. For Baydas, the explicit connection to religion is not as important as the message of reform and renewal that it contains. In fact, his revolutionary cause is better served by leaving Christ out of the speech, even when quoting the Bible, because it allows him to be more inclusive in an Ottoman context.

Another scene in which Corelli and Baydas illustrate the power and authority of the king comes with the first journey to the islands. In the novel, the islands are part of the kingdom, but their physical separation from the mainland reflects their cultural and philosophical distance from society. The islands represent a kind of Eden—a lost innocence only remotely connected to the complications of modern life. The journey of the king's party to the islands presents a picture of internal colonialism. Comparing this section of Corelli's text to Baydas' translation shows the close connections between these concepts and approaches to education in the Levant at the same time. As the party arrives at the island, Corelli writes, “‘It is very lovely!’ she [the Queen] said, more to herself

than to any of her companions; ‘The world must have looked something like this in the first days of creation,--so unspoilt and fresh and simple!’” (153). This preserved Eden is in fact the retreat to which the crown prince has removed himself to find meaning outside of the restraints of kingship. Baydas does not preserve this explicit connection to Eden. Instead, he focuses on the fact that the islanders have been exposed to the teachings of the socialist radicals, and have adopted them wholeheartedly. In this way, they come to represent the ideal combination of sincere innocence and pure socialism that ultimately reunites the kingdom in the end of the novel. As in the passages discussed above, Baydas accomplishes this without explicit references to religion; where the Eden imagery is very important to Corelli, it does not appear at all in Baydas’ translation.

In opposition to the pure innocence of the islanders, Corelli presents the corruption of politics in the capital city. The financier David Jost plays an important role in both Corelli’s text and Baydas’ translation. His power derives not only from his control of finance and banking, but more directly from his monopoly of the media sources—principally newspapers. Jost wields this power to control popular opinion from behind the scenes. Given the preponderance of articles on the subject of newspapers within *al-nafā’is al-‘ašriyyah*, we might expect this scene to be altered in Baydas’ translation, but he clearly depicts the way in which Jost manipulates the newspapers through his riches. What is interesting, however, is the characterization of Jost. Corelli always relies on anti-Semitic clichés to characterize David Jost. Late in the novel, one of his coconspirators laments, “You must be pretty well cognisant of what a Jew's notions of ‘duty’ are! They can be summed up in one sentence;--‘to save his own pocket.’” (350). Later on, the villain Pérouse, who was also in league with Jost, refers to him as Shylock



(328) after learning that Jost had abandoned their scheme. Even in describing Jost upon first introducing him to the reader, Corelli relies on the same imagery, describing Jost as “one of the most flagrant money exhibitors” in the city, controlling all of the newspapers in the kingdom and using them as tools for his own profit (184).

While Jost remains an important figure in Baydas’ translation, he tones down the anti-Semitic rhetoric that runs throughout Corelli’s novel. Baydas does introduce Jost as “one of the richest of the Jews”<sup>147</sup> (105), but even though he makes Jost out to be a very selfish and greedy man, he never explicitly ascribes these characteristics to his race the way Corelli does. Instead, Baydas makes Jost’s peculiar lack of scruples something unique to his character. He writes, “He loved money to the extreme, so much that he would only print items in his newspapers that would bring him profit. He did not care about any other topics”<sup>148</sup> (105). While this description is anything but flattering, it lacks the direct connection between Jost’s ethnicity and his ethical code. This is particularly important to note because it is indicative of Baydas’ early literary and political work. During the years immediately following the Ottoman constitutional reforms of 1908, Baydas still felt very strongly that the questions of modernization were to be faced and solved by all members of Ottoman society working together. His reluctance to include the anti-Semitic strands of Corelli’s writing echoes his unwillingness to include the strong statements against particular religious sects that was discussed earlier. The divisive nature of these ideologies flies against the inclusive, positive rhetoric that Baydas consistently employs throughout this early period when discussing the questions of nationalism and

---

<sup>147</sup> وهو [المنزل الكبير الفخم] لرجل من أكابر أغنياء اليهود.  
<sup>148</sup> وكان محبا للمال إلى درجة قصوى فكان لا يكتب في جرائده إلا المواضيع التي تدر عليه المال غير مهتم بما سوى ذلك.

patriotism. These ideals are to be pursued in a diverse multi-national state in which the core ideals of patriotism and nationalism are primarily cultivated through education.<sup>149</sup>

What does remain throughout Baydas' translation is a preoccupation with the institutions of government that interact with the people. Baydas cleans away much of the overwrought prose that characterizes Corelli's novel (and is preserved in an abridged form in Zhuravskaia's translation), creating a powerful style that mirrors the "telegraphic style" pioneered by Zaydān and other leaders of literary journalism. For Baydas, the King becomes a guide who leads the reader through a discovery of the different powers behind the scenes in a modern government. Throughout the novel, the King makes a series of speeches as he confronts the various corrupt politicians, clergymen, and businessmen that threaten his government. In each case, Baydas makes the speech into an opportunity to draw attention to the benefits that modern governmental institutions bring to the people who live within that government's purview. For example, in the King's early confrontation with the Jesuit priest Del Fortis, Baydas has the king speak clearly about the possible advantages of secular institutions such as "governmental schools, free libraries, and art schools"<sup>150</sup> (28), pointing out the ways in which these secular institutions provide services that the religious schools and monasteries cannot. As Del Fortis objects to these claims, the King supports his argument by championing the progressive nature of society in very positivistic terms, claiming that "human intelligence

---

<sup>149</sup> Perhaps more interesting, but beyond the scope of this dissertation, is the development of anti-Semitism in Baydas' later writings. His novel *al-wārith (The Heir)*, first serialized in 1920, is full of blatantly anti-Semitic depictions of all of the Jewish characters in the novel. The primary antagonist in the novel is a Jewish woman who deceives the main character, a young Arab man, in an attempt to deny him his inheritance. As he grew more and more frustrated in his struggles against the British and the Zionist movement, Baydas became very cynical and racist. These later writings are a sharp contrast to the depictions that we find in his early writings, particularly his pre-World War One essays and translations.

<sup>150</sup> مدارس على نفقة الحكومة ومكاتب مجانية ومدارس فنية

constantly moves in the direction of progress and refinement”<sup>151</sup> (29). His idealistic picture of the power of governmental institutions finds an echo in the writings on education that Baydas publishes in *al-naḡā’is*.

### **Education in *al-naḡā’is***

Beyond his strong belief in the teaching power of fiction, Baydas had a powerful influence on education in Palestine from the first decade of the twentieth century. In the pages of *al-naḡā’is*, Baydas writes more about education in its various forms than any other topic. The question of education comes up repeatedly in the articles that Baydas writes, in addition to the articles of other authors that he publishes in *al-naḡā’is*. Baydas writes his first extended article on the topic of education in the second volume of *al-naḡā’is*, published in 1909. Entitled “*al-tarbiyyah wa-l-ta’līm*,” this article outlines Baydas’ general philosophy of education, and then applies this philosophy to the situation in the Ottoman Empire at the time it was written. Translating this title into English is problematic; in contemporary usage, these two Arabic terms—*al-tarbiyyah* and *al-ta’līm*—come as an almost inseparable collocation. Together, they mean ‘education.’ More accurately rendered, they indicate two different aspects of education: *al-tarbiyyah* being closer to upbringing in that it symbolizes the moral and cultural aspects of education, while *al-ta’līm* signifies the acquisition of knowledge through study—book learning. It is precisely the distinction between these two terms that Baydas takes as the organizing principle of his article. Baydas expounds on these two sides of education, emphasizing the importance of giving each child access to both types of education early in life. After giving brief summaries of the different ways in which a person receives these types of education, he arrives at the school, writing the following: “Finally—the

---

<sup>151</sup> الفكر الإنساني يتقدم على الدوام في طريق النجاح والرفقي

school, which has the greatest effect on all of the child's faculties, both physical and mental. . . . For the school is nothing more than the prime support of progress, and the most important pillar of civilization" (*al-nafā'is* 1:2, 38). Though Baydas writes a great deal about *al-ta'līm* and its importance to the modern nation, he never dwells on objective measures such as literacy or graduation rates, but rather speaks in broad terms about the importance of education.

Baydas frames this article as a second introduction to the purpose of his journal, a parallel piece to his initial introductory essay on the place of literature in society discussed earlier. He concludes this initial article on education with the statement, "These are some general words that we have placed here as a foreword to the useful essays and articles that will come on the topic of education (*al-tarbiyyah wa-l-ta'līm*)"<sup>152</sup> (1908 39). Baydas makes good on this promise, publishing a very large number of articles on education in the ensuing years of *al-nafā'is*. In addition, many of the literary works that he publishes deal explicitly with the themes of education, both in the home and the schoolhouse.

In the eighth issue of this volume, Baydas returns to the issue of education, this time in a brief essay addressed to the fathers who read his journal. Baydas emphasizes education's power for freeing the individual, writing, "You must help these souls (your children) become complete and free"<sup>153</sup> (1910 434). Baydas takes the model of natural selection, describing the way that creatures progress from being weak and helpless at birth to becoming mature and powerful. Baydas extends this reading of Darwin, applying it to nations as well. He writes, "It is known that the laws of nature do not change, and

---

<sup>152</sup> وهذا كلام أجمالي أثبتناه هنا توطنه لما سيجيء من الفصول والمقالات المفيدة في موضوع التربية والتعليم  
<sup>153</sup> ويجب عليك أن تساعد هذه النفوس لتصير حرة وكاملة

that the powerful dominates the weak. The powerful nation (*al-umma*) dominates the weak nation and rules over it. . . . Every nation wants its children to be strong and fierce”<sup>154</sup> (1910 435-436). Interestingly, he later expresses this his social Darwinism into the language used to criticize Ottoman rule when he warns fathers that a child whose education is neglected “will walk in the path of humiliation/abasement and decline/stagnation (*inhiṭāṭ*)”<sup>155</sup> (1910 436). This is the very vocabulary that Arab intellectuals were beginning to use to describe Ottoman rule when seeking to understand the great disparity they perceived between Western civilization and Arab society.

Later in the second volume of *al-naḫā’is*, Baydas published a lengthy article by Amīn Za’rab entitled “National Education” (*al-tarbiyyah al-qawmiyyah*). This topic recurs frequently in *al-naḫā’is*, for it was one of the prime concerns of *naḫḫawī* intellectuals. Note that in this article, Za’rab is concerned with *al-tarbiyyah*, the aspects of education tied to moral education, or the raising of a child. In the first part of this article, Za’rab focuses on the importance of educating women and the role that they play in shaping the lives of their children. In the second part of the article, he focuses on the detrimental effect that sectarian divisions had on schools throughout the Ottoman Empire at that time. Because his subject is national (*qawmiyyah*) education, it is interesting to note the various national groups to which Za’rab refers in his article. In the opening lines of the article, he takes as his subject “the Ottoman peoples” (*al-shu’ūb al-’uthmāniyyah*), an interesting construction that does not occur elsewhere in *al-naḫā’is* *al-’aṣriyyah*. The use of the term *sha’ab* contrasts sharply with the adjective *qawmī* that Za’rab uses in the title of his article. The former describes the many different ethnic and linguistic groups

<sup>154</sup> والمعلوم أن نواميس الطبيعة لا تتغير فالقوي يسود الضعيف والأمة القوية تسود الأمة الضعيفة وتتسلط عليها . . . وكل أمة ترغب في أن يكون أبنائها أقوياء أشداء.  
<sup>155</sup> "فأنه يسير في سبيل الهوان والانحطاط"

that belonged to the Ottoman Empire, while the latter, seems to refer to “something” (*amr*) unified on a much more fundamental level. Za’rab uses this contrast to strengthen his call for a unifying force within the Ottoman lands that is somehow missing. He writes,

“The Ottoman citizen feels that he needs something that is lacking in it (the Ottoman Empire) as a nation (*ka-ummatin*) and must see that it has been aware of this lack for a long time, and has begun to search earnestly for it but in vain because it does not know what this thing is that it lacks”<sup>156</sup> (1910 532-533).

Za’rab goes on to argue that this missing link is a unified form of national education. It is within the schools, he writes, that the values, culture and patriotism so vital to a modern state can be encouraged and inculcated.

Za’rab does not subscribe to the opinion that the differences between East and West are absolute, but rather locates the difference between East and West in the education that young people in the West receive. He boldly proclaims:

“Nor are they more intelligent than we, nor are they more capable of working, nor do they have any advantage over us except in proper education (*al-tarbiyyah*) to the effect that they have not achieved all of that except through raising up the conditions of the mothers to the point that they became capable of carrying the great responsibility that they have towards their children the pillars and framework of the homeland (*al-waṭan*)”<sup>157</sup> (1910 535).

Rather than pointing to differences in the formal education system in order to explain the gap between Western scientific achievements and the state of science in the Arab world, Za’rab focuses his attention instead on the home, and the values that are taught to children in the home. He places the bulk of the responsibility on the parents, calling on them to bring up their children in a different way.

<sup>156</sup> باحتياجها إلى أمر غير موجود عندها كأمة ولا بد أن يرى أنها قد تنبعت منذ مدة وجيزة إلى هذا النقص وأبتدأت تفتش عنه بجد واجتهاد ولكنها لم تجده لأنها لم تعرف ما هو ذلك الضال الذي تبحث عنه.  
<sup>157</sup> وليس أهلها أذكى منا ولا أقدر على الأشغال وليس لهم ميزة علينا إلا بالتربية الصحيحة بيد أنهم لم يحصلوا على ذلك إلا بترقية حال الأم حتى أصبحت قادرة على القيام بأعباء المسؤولية العظيمة التي عليها لأولادها عماد الوطن وعدته

At the same time, in concluding his article Za'rab issues the following call to Ottoman administrators:

In conclusion, we are in need of a new education that keeps religion from passing out of the doors of the mosques, the churches, and the monasteries, lest they kick up the dust of divisions and animosity. It will clear away the old prejudices from the minds of the people, making the members of all the different sects a single hand in service of the homeland (*al-waṭan*)<sup>158</sup> (1910 562).

The role of education, and specifically *tarbiyyah*, then, is to replace historical animosities between different groups with a new discourse and identity that transcends historical differences to create a more enduring loyalty. Za'rab writes his article to parents, but places the primary responsibility for instigating this change in the moral/ethical aspect of national education (*al-tarbiyyah al-qawmiyyah*) on the mother, an interesting distinction between his article and Baydas' article from the same year that was explicitly addressed to fathers.

The articles on education that appear in *al-nafā'is* are always tied to questions about the relationship between Western countries and Eastern countries. In an article signed only "I.N." (presumably Is'āf al-Nashāshībī) we are presented with an imaginary conversation between 'sharqī' (an eastern man) and 'gharbī' (a western man). The subject is education, and it quickly becomes a one-sided conversation in which the *gharbī* pontificates, referring to his interlocutor in rather condescending terms. This imaginary westerner proclaims confidently,

“For this age is an age of schools, my Arab brother, or if you will, an age of knowledge (*al-ilm*) and all those who are not guided by it (knowledge) are lost and all those who do not walk its path stumble and all those who hope to be

---

<sup>158</sup> والخلاصة أننا محتاجون إلى تربية جديدة تجعل الدين أن لا يتعدى أبواب الجوامع والكنائس والخلوات إلى ما يثير غبار الشنآن والعداوات وتزيل التعصبات القديمة من أذهان العامة وتجعل جميع أبناء الطوائف يدا واحدة في خدمة الوطن.

victorious in this life by some other way will be disappointed in those hopes and they will not succeed”<sup>159</sup> (1911 44).

This exhortation to education is universal, and could have emerged from any period of Arab history, but coming from the symbolic Western educated individual, it encapsulates the relationship between Arab society and the West during the *nahḍah*. To make this point clear, the author follows this exchange with a few lines of poetry that end with the phrase, “for the strong will prevail” (“*wa-al-fawz lil-aqwiyā*”), echoing Herbert Spencer’s social extension of Darwin’s thought that had come to Arab society through the positivistic philosophies of science and knowledge that had become so popular with Arab intellectuals in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The author’s imaginary Western interlocutor leaves his Arab cousin with a stern warning. He turns to his companion and remarks,

“And so I have given you guidance, and made everything clear. If you follow my guidance, and take heed of my advice, then you must undoubtedly walk the path that we have walked, and be glorious just as we have. If, on the other hand, you discount my advice, then you will remain our slaves, for the ignorant, oh cousin of mine, is the slave of the learned in every time and place.”<sup>160</sup> (1911 34)

It is clear, then, that the learning to be pursued is western learning, and the path to be followed is Europe’s path. The learning of the West is ‘guidance’ that has been offered to the Arabs, and it is only up to them to accept it and go forward on the course that it lays out in front of them. In the field of education, Baydas repeated this refrain many times in his journal, particularly in the early years of its publication, before the British Mandate period. In the pre-War era, as was shown in chapter three, Baydas still imagined himself a citizen of an Ottoman kingdom that had the potential to assimilate modernity from its

---

<sup>159</sup> فالعصر يا أبا العرب عصر المدرسة وإن شئت فقل عصر العلم فكل من لم يهتد به ضل وكل من لم ينتهج مناجه زل وكل من رجا الفوز في هذي الحياة بغيره خاب رجاؤه وخسرت أمنيته ولم تريح.  
<sup>160</sup> وها أنا قد هديت وبينت فإن أتبعتم هديي واسترشدتم بنصحي فلا بد أن تسودوا كما سدنا وتمجدوا كما مجدنا وإن اشتريتم بقولي ثمنا قليلا ظللتم لنا عبيدا والجاهل يا ابن عمي عبد العالم في كل زمان ومكان.



European neighbors. Even in this early period, however, we can see a special concern with the question of national education (*al-ta'lim al-qawmī* or *al-tarbiyyah al-qawmiyyah*). This concern would carry over into the more explicit nationalist ideologies of the Mandate period discussed in chapter 3.

Ten years later, Baydas published an article entitled “Foreign and National Schools: Which of them is Better?” by Najīb al-Hawāwīnī. By 1921, this issue had become inextricably linked to the decisions that the British were making about the future of Palestine. al-Hawāwīnī makes his opinion clear from the start. He writes, “Foreign schools are extremely harmful, the nearest proof of this being what we see in our own country, which I will summarize in what follows”<sup>161</sup> (1921 47). Even as he speaks out so forcefully about the detrimental effects of foreign schools in Palestinian society, al-Hawāwīnī remains firmly rooted in a world-view that seems to make it impossible for modern education to have come to Palestine in any other way. He outlines the matter of education and knowledge along the East/West axis, writing, “It is no secret that knowledge (science) came to the East from foreigners first for natural and social reasons, the most important of which is the mixing of foreigners among the easterners”<sup>162</sup> (1921 47). If the Western genesis of knowledge is, as he argues, no secret and knowledge is the goal, we are led to ask where the negative effects of the foreign schools come from.

al-Hawāwīnī singles out the ulterior motives behind the foreign educational institutions in Palestine in the following remark,

“their goal in this [establishing schools in Palestine] is the spreading of their language among us, and making it easier for them to rule over us. They have

---

<sup>161</sup> المدارس الأجنبية مضرّة جداً، وأقرب برهان على ذلك ما نراه في بلادنا مما سأسبّطه في ما يلي.  
<sup>162</sup> لا يخفى أن العلم جاء الشرق من الأجانب أولاً لأسباب طبيعية واجتماعية، أهمها اختلاط الأجانب بالشرقيين.

succeeded in these hopes and sown their principles in the education of our minds, training us as they wished, according to their interests”<sup>163</sup> (1921 47)

Al-Hawāwīnī bemoans the fact that the different interests and agendas of each educational institution lead to a situation in which every person’s background and education differs from her/his neighbor’s. His preoccupation with the concept of unity (*al-wiḥdah/al-ittiḥād*) is much more pronounced than in earlier articles on the same subject printed in *al-naḡā’is*. It leads him back to the idea of national schools (*al-madāris al-waṭaniyyah*), the only institution that is interested in “spreading progress among all members of society”<sup>164</sup> (1921 47). al-Hawāwīnī puts the responsibility for making this happen directly on the Palestinian government (such as it was at the time), holding it to be the only group capable of making education free and compulsory. The curriculum that he would have a national education system teach lines up almost word-for-word with the previous nationalist sentiments we have read from Baydas’ translations. In addition to the usual rhetoric about the ways that modern education shapes the minds and morals of pupils, al-Hawāwīnī writes that national education will

purify their minds from the pollution of sectarianism (*al-ta’aṣṣub*), hatred (*al-tabāghuḍ*), and envy while planting the seeds of nationalism in their breasts that they might be set on the path of intellectual freedom, self-reliance, and mutual love; that they might know that they are all children of a single nation, just as they are all children of the same humanity—that the single tie that binds them is the tie of the nation and morals (*al-adab*), not the tie of religion. (1921 48)<sup>165</sup>

al-Hawāwīnī’s article is noteworthy for the connections that he makes between the education system and power. He sees clearly the ways that elementary schools’ curricula

---

<sup>163</sup> ولقد فازت بما أملت وبذرت مبادئها في تربية عقولنا وخرجتنا على ما تريد وما توافق مصلحتها.  
<sup>164</sup> الأمم لا ترتقي إلا إذا عم الرقي أفرادها على السواء، ولا يقوم بهذا التعميم إلا المدارس الوطنية، والحكومات الوطنية التي بإمكانها أن تجعل العلم إجباريا ومجانا.  
<sup>165</sup> تطهير عقولهم من رجس التعصب وإبعادهم عن أسباب التباعد والتحاسد وبذر بذور الوطنية في صدورهم لينشأوا على الاستقلال الفكري والاعتماد على النفس ومحبة بعضهم بعضا، ويعلموا أنهم جميعا أبناء وطن واحد، كما أنهم أبناء إنسانية واحدة، وأن الرابطة الوحيدة التي تربطهم هي رابطة الوطن والأدب وليست رابطة الدين.

shape the relationships between neighbors within a single city or village. The divisiveness that he laments was not unfamiliar in towns and cities that had schools representing more than one of the foreign powers working in the region. Rivalries between the supporting nations spilled over into sectarian tensions between the graduates of the various schools, and were further exacerbated by the linguistic differences that these schools introduced into Arab society.

Time and again Baydas ties the question of education to Palestinian nationalism by way of the Arabic language. In his 1923 article on the subject, he commends those building national education for their “dedication to knowledge and to this language upon which we have built our lives” (1923 299). This quotation is important because it hints at the constructed nature of national identity, particularly in its linguistic manifestations. In a city like Jerusalem, in which so many different religious and ethnic backgrounds mix, Baydas saw the use and adoption of Arabic as a national language to be the one tie that could bind people from so many different backgrounds.

Bringing these concerns—institutions of formal education, upbringing of the new generation (*al-tarbiyyah*), and national identity—together with Baydas’ translation of *Temporal Power* we can understand his translation practice better. The adjustments and decisions that he makes as he translates Marie Corelli’s novel show his firm dedication to the establishment of a modern state in the Arab Levant. Baydas brought his lifelong involvement with education into the pages of *al-nafā’is* in both literary translations, like *shaqā’ al-mulūk*, and the non-fiction articles that he published alongside such literary works. Marie Corelli’s novel is all about the king learning to bring himself in line with the unity that already existed among his people. When he successfully understands the

popular voice and unites himself to it, his kingdom prospers and everyone becomes very happy. Baydas is less concerned with the distinction between the King and the people, and more interested in the relationship between the two. In translating Corelli's novel, he transforms the plot into a tool for communicating the importance of cooperation between the rulers and the ruled in a modern state. In order for such cooperation to exist, as we see him arguing in the many articles discussed above, the populace must be educated—not only in matters of formal education (*al-ta'lim*), but also in the broader understanding of moral upbringing (*al-tarbiyyah*). In this way, education becomes a matter of national concern not only for the educators and administrators with whom he worked closely in his career at the Russian schools in Palestine, but also in the homes of Palestinian families. Leaving the principal outlines of the plot intact, he makes Corelli's story a vehicle for preaching a very specific message to his Arabic-speaking readers about the role of education in modern society. At the same time, Baydas creates a text that can carry a bold statement about the relationship between the government and the people. *shaqā' al-mulūk* paints a very clear picture of how oppressive governmental regimes cannot sustain themselves in the face of a popular uprising. On the heels of the Young Turk revolution, and in a day when so many secret societies were taking shape in the Arab world, *shaqā' al-mulūk* must have felt especially relevant and exciting to its readers.

The fact that Khalil Baydas produces such a polished novel-length translation as early as 1908 is remarkable. Doubly stigmatized for being a translation and a piece of low-brow fiction, this translation has received no critical attention. This brief chapter shows just one aspect of the information that can be gleaned from *shaqā' al-mulūk* and

similar texts from this period. In addition to the focus on government and educational institutions highlighted in this chapter, this text is replete with information on and insight into other important topics in *nahḍawī* thought. For example, the three characters of Lotys, the Queen, and Gloria could serve as fascinating studies of the role of women in Baydas' thought. The propensity of Corelli's novel to travel into revolutionary contexts (Russia in 1905, the Ottoman Empire in 1909) speaks to the power of Corelli's rhetoric, but raises questions about the different receptions that the novel has received in these different contexts. Giving additional attention to such works, in connection with the social and historical context in which they were produced provides a large body of literature and information about the intellectual debates that define the *nahḍah* as an intellectual moment in Arabic history. As they have gone largely unstudied up to this point, they stand as an important field of future research.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Translating History, Fictional and Otherwise

Many of the works that Baydas translated and published were pieces of historical fiction. This genre was particularly popular across the Arab world during Baydas' career, so it is not surprising that Baydas translated a great deal of historical fiction. In this chapter, I will use György Lukács' work on historical fiction to compare Baydas' translation *ahwāl al-istibdād* (1909) with the work from which it was translated, Alekseï Tolstoï's novel *Kniaz' Serebrianiï* (1863). Both Tolstoï and Baydas manipulated history in ways that benefit and reflect the respective historical contexts in which they were working. As my focus in this setting is more particularly on Baydas' translation, I will give it a greater amount of attention. *ahwāl al-istibdād* was first published in a period that saw Baydas giving more and more attention to history on the pages of *al-nafā'is*. Interestingly, 1909 was also the year in which Baydas expanded his journal to regularly include historical essays on important events and individuals from the Levant and from abroad. His commitment to this practice is illustrated by the addition of the adjective *tārīkhiyyah* (historical) to the subtitle of *al-nafā'is*. Previously, the subtitle had only included the words *adabiyyah* (literary) and *fukāhiyyah* (entertaining). Baydas' translations of historical fiction have received no meaningful critical attention, being doubly marginalized within the history of modern Arabic literature because they are not only 'just' historical fiction, but also translations. As discussed in Chapter Two, both of

these areas of literary activity are highly suspect in the eyes of various Arab nationalist literary critics looking to define a national literature written in Arabic. In this chapter, I will read selections of the historical articles published alongside *ahwāl al-istibdād* in conjunction with Baydas' translated novel in order to shed light on the evolving place of historiography and historical topics within Baydas' journal *al-nafā'is* over the years that *ahwāl al-istibdād* was published (1909-1910).

*Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* (*Prince Serebrianiĭ*), Alekseĭ Konstantinovich Tolstoĭ's well-known historical novel, has been a popular piece of Russian historical fiction since its initial publication in 1863. This novel fits squarely within the genre of historical fiction, mobilizing historical content in fictional form to educate, inform, and entertain audiences. Tolstoĭ writes that he hoped to give his readers a clear picture of what life was like during the later years of the reign of Ivan IV (the Terrible) (1530-1584). In his introduction to the first edition of the novel, Tolstoĭ writes,

“The story presented here has as its goal not the description of any particular events as much as the depiction of the general character of an entire epoch and the reproduction of the understandings, beliefs, morals and the degree of culture of Russian society in the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century”<sup>166</sup> (ii).

In this sentence, Tolstoĭ distances himself from the measuring stick of historical accuracy, creating a larger space in which he could exercise his own agency and express his own philosophies. While Tolstoĭ does not explicitly cast this decision as a consequence of the audience for which he was writing, he does go on to address this intended audience in the same paragraph, as we will see in greater detail later in this chapter. Not unsurprisingly, Tolstoĭ was quite free with some of the chronology and

---

<sup>166</sup> Представляемый здѣсь расказъ имѣеть цѣлю не столько описаніе каких-либо событій, сколько изображеніе общаго характера цѣлой эпохи и воспроизведеніе понятій, вѣрованій, нравовъ и степени образованности русскаго общества во вторую половину XVI столѣтія.

characters involved in the historical narrative he presents. In many ways, the alterations made to historical events and timelines in the process of composing a piece of historical fiction like *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* reflect the liberal translation practice of *al-tarjamah bi-taṣarruf* that has been the primary subject of this dissertation. As with the works discussed in the previous chapters, in preparing his translation of *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ*, Baydas made his own alterations to the history that underlies Tolstoĭ's novel. For this reason, Baydas' translation of Tolstoĭ's novel is particularly interesting, because the result of his work is a history obscured by two layers of translation/interpretation.

In this chapter, I will focus on the second layer of alteration and the agency that Baydas exercises in creating his historical narrative.<sup>167</sup> First, I read Baydas' translation against Tolstoĭ's original text to examine the ways in which he infuses a foreign historical novel with a patriotic message for an Arabic-speaking audience. Second, I read this translation within the context of Baydas' relationship to history in general as reflected in the historical articles that he first published in these same issues of *al-naḡā'is*. Contextualizing the translations in this way illuminates the close connections between Baydas' translation practice and his work in creating a historical consciousness capable of facilitating a modern national movement in Palestine. Baydas came to focus more and more on history over the lifetime of his journal *al-naḡā'is al-‘aṣriyyah*.

### **Theorizing Historical Fiction**

György Lukács' Marxist treatment of historical fiction in his 1937 book *The Historical Novel* stands as one of the primary pieces of the theoretical framework for

---

<sup>167</sup> In actuality, both Tolstoĭ and Baydas exercise a significant amount of creative license in crafting their respective historical narratives. A more complete version of this study will take the time to consider both sets of alterations in detail, examining the changes that Tolstoĭ makes to the historical record and comparing them with the adjustments that Baydas makes as he translates.



discussing historical fiction. Lukács draws attention to what he terms the “historical consciousness” manifest in a given piece of historical fiction when interpreting a work of historical fiction. He locates the beginning of the genre in the work of Walter Scott (1771-1832). While Scott’s work came after many works that are easily recognizable as fictional narratives set in the past, it is in Scott’s work that Lukács finds the first instance in which an author worked to portray the characters of a historical novel as actual participants in the historical setting, rather than contemporary characters projected backwards into a particular historical setting.<sup>168</sup> He cites Scott’s greatest achievement as being his “capacity to give living human embodiment to historical-social types” (35). Thus, Lukács seems to move to the opposite extreme, valorizing Scott’s ability to personify historical movements and moments in discrete fictional characters. This becomes important as Lukács shifts his rhetoric from an abstract discussion of the historicity of fictional characters to a conception of historical authenticity portrayed through the characters in a given work. He criticizes early historical novels (particularly those composed before Scott) for “not see[ing] the specific qualities of their own age historically” (20). This transition from ‘mere costumery’ (Lukács 19) to literature in which authors began to depict historical characters within their appropriate historical context marked an emergence of a new historical consciousness. The sense of historical authenticity is so important for Lukács because of the connection it provides to the

---

<sup>168</sup> This position is well summarized in the following comment on Lukács’ work: “The true historical novel emerges with the work of Sir Walter Scott, whose novels of the Scottish clans portray the disintegration of archaic social forms in the face of capitalist transformation. Scott went beyond dressing modern characters in kilts, and instead drew his characters in such a fashion that the various details of their personalities were linked with the basic conditions of their existence.” “Marxist Marginalia” blog accessed May 2012. <http://hernaphta.wordpress.com/2010/02/28/lukacs-on-the-historical-novel/>

present; the clear (dis)connection between the way things were and the way they are now allows readers to see their own society as a piece of history that is susceptible to change.

For Lukács the connection between history and the present is intimately related to the Marxist paradigm that he espoused. Through the power of historical consciousness, he writes,

“the reasonableness of human progress develops ever increasingly out of the inner conflict of social forces in history itself; according to this interpretation history itself is the bearer and realizer of human progress. The most important thing here is the increasing historical awareness of the decisive role played in human historical writing” (27).

As historical novels began to present the difference between the past and the present, Lukács holds that the reader becomes aware of the ways in which history and historical change are constantly taking place. This, in turn, allows the reader to see the causal link between the decisions and actions of individuals from history and the historicized context in which they (the audience) now live. Lukács relies upon the fact that historical characters will inevitably be foreign to the reader, challenging the audience to engage with historical change in a new way, and to perceive the possibilities for change and revolutionary action within their own context. For Lukács, the authenticity of a character in a historical novel is directly related to the sense of otherness that the reader experiences when reading a work of historical fiction. In other words, successful historical fiction depicts the differences between the past and the present, locating the cause of this difference in the agency and activity of its characters.

Lukács’ argument also has a linguistic dimension that resonates with Baydas’ intellectual context. In the section of his study entitled “The Crisis of Bourgeois Realism,” Lukács comments on the inherent linguistic differences between epic and

historical fiction. He locates this difference in the language and style used, arguing that “the linguistic means of the historical novel are *in principle* no different from those of the contemporary novel” (196). Lukács considers this a linguistic side of the ‘necessary anachronism’ that defines historical fiction in his eyes, even though it seems to contradict his definition of authenticity in historical fiction. Ironically, the author of a historical novel must strive to efface enough of the inherent difference between the reader and the subject of the novel, so that its message can be understood. Lukács writes that the author must “bring the past period *near* to a present-day reader” (195). In this phrase we can hear the resonance of modern translation theory and its concern with the role of translation. Put into the language of Schleiermacher and Venuti, Lukács understands the historical novel to be a “domesticating translation” of a history that would otherwise be foreign and inaccessible to the reader. Though the historical difference intimated by this ultimately unassailable, it is the aim of historical fiction to make the threads connecting events in history with present conditions that the reader becomes aware of her own existence as a point along a historical timeline that is constantly susceptible to change and revolution. The historical authenticity that Lukács advocates is not so complete as to render the subject inaccessible to its intended readers, but rather communicates effectively the differences between the past and the present, along with the factors that brought about those changes between the two time periods.

This standard of judgment is at once very similar to and different from the standards applied to early prose fiction in the Arabic-language context. In both the European and the Arab cases, these approaches turn on a particular understanding of authenticity. Lukács takes historical authenticity as a sign of a greater historical

consciousness from which socialist revolution could emerge. Historical fiction played a prominent role in the emergence of novelistic literature in the Arabic context. The concerns with the moral and practical value of western-style literature prevented many important publications from including fiction in their pages, at least at first. We can see the clear relationship between these concerns and historical fiction in an 1895 article published in *al-hilāl*. The first volume of *al-hilāl* (1892) had included in its pages a work of fiction, written by the editor of the journal, Jurjī Zaydān - *istibdād al-mamālīk*. The editors of the journal “thought better of it [printing fiction in their journal], and printed the second and third years without a novel” (1895 23). Clearly, the decision to print fiction in a respectable periodical was not without controversy. In 1895, *al-hilāl* resumed the practice of including fiction in its pages, and the editors introduced that year’s serial novel with the following words:

A group of readers and literati (*udabā*) have implored us to return to our original intention. Within their letters, they call on us to resume printing novels in these words “Your historical novels contain only interesting history that the curious can read without growing bored, and history is among the most important and useful topics that *al-hilāl* covers.”

In reality, we refuse to print novels if any page is void of one or more historical facts, as witnessed by the novels that we have printed up until now, especially *al-mamlūk al-shārid*, *asīr al-mutaḥaddī*, and *istibdād al-mamālīk*. Several authors have asked our permission to translate *al-mamlūk al-shārid* into Russian, and another into English. (1895 23-24)<sup>169</sup>

For the editors of *al-hilāl*, historical fiction was admissible because of the intrinsic value of history as an academic pursuit that contributed to modern society. Even then, they relied on (or at least masked their decision behind) the insistence of educated readers

<sup>169</sup> فصدر الهلال في سنته الثانية والثالثة بلا رواية ثم أوعز إلينا جماعة من القراء والأدباء أن نعود إلى عزمنا الأول ومما كتبه إلينا بعضهم يدعوننا إلى إعادة نشر الروايات قوله "لا نعدُّ رواياتكم التاريخية إلا تاريخاً طلياً يقرأه المطالع بغير ملل والتاريخ من أهم مواضيع الهلال وأفيدها."

والواقع أننا نتوخى في تأليف الروايات ان لا تخلو صفحة منها من حقيقة تاريخية أو أكثر وقد شهد بذلك من طالع رواياتنا التي نشرت حتى الآن وخصوصاً "المملوك الشارد" و"أسير المتمهدي" و"استبداد المماليك" حتى استأذنتنا بعض الكتاب الأدباء في ترجمة إحداها "المملوك الشارد" إلى اللغة الروسية وآخر الإنكليزية.

(*udabā'*) when they reintroduced regular prose fiction into their publication. This strategy mimics Baydas' constant refrain of "popular taste" (*al-dhawq al-qurrā' al-'arab*) guiding his decisions as a translator. In the second paragraph quoted above, the editors reaffirm their own dedication to the high cultural standards of the journal, and create a space for the inclusion of historical fiction in this high culture. This reification of the potential academic/didactic power of literature as its only redeeming quality is common throughout *nahḍawī* commentaries on literature. In the case of historical fiction, the clear way in which the literary works can contribute to Arab society by educating their readers gained them a measure of respectability, but did not earn enough respect to bring them into the ranks of the literary canon as it would be formed in the post-colonial period.

The canonical histories of modern Arabic literature are deeply entangled with nationalist paradigms that value certain kinds of authenticity in expression. For example, while Jurjī Zaydān (1861-1914) published many historical novels in *al-hilāl* and other venues the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, literary critics studying Arabic literature consistently dismiss them as novelistic expression. The formulaic nature of his plots and distant settings in which he placed his characters denied them of. Instead, they hail the publication of Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal's *Zaynab* (1913) as the watershed moment in which modern Arabic novel appeared, citing the fact that it was the first novel to depict Egyptian characters in an Egyptian setting. The authenticity in question in this context is a nationalist voice—the degree to which a certain work contributed to an acceptable and effective narrative of national development and devotion.

The different concerns highlighted in these the European and Arab contexts represents a potential paradox in interpreting Baydas' translations of historical novels; in

both instances critics are concerned with the authenticity of the material portrayed, but neither provides a broad enough framework to accommodate the characters of translated fiction like Baydas produced. If we take Lukács' approach, we can begin to appreciate the potential located in the extreme difference between the characters, setting, and historical events that Baydas depicts in *ahwāl al-istibdād* and his intended audience. The profound distance between Russian history and Baydas' 20<sup>th</sup> century Arab readers gives power to the narrative, leading Baydas' audience to draw conclusions about the difference between their society and the one depicted in *ahwāl al-istibdād*. This factor is even more potent in the case of Baydas' translations because the historical connection between the characters of *ahwāl al-istibdād* and Baydas' intended readers is not direct, but mediated through European culture. They do not read scenes from a history that directly preceded their own, but rather a foreign history that Shaden Tageldin describes as being simultaneously seductive and repulsive (2011 1-32). The attraction of Russian culture did not carry the same burden of post-colonial baggage as did the British and French that Tageldin describes, yet the exotic lure of a foreign society whose power and culture seemed so incredibly advanced undoubtedly fueled the popularity of Baydas' translations from Russian literature. His readers filled in the gap between Russia's past and its present, just as Lukács suggests, but then also made an additional leap, deducing the potential future of their own society by comparing it with the narrative expressed in and through the text of *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ*.

In order to better understand what Baydas is doing as he translates historical fiction, we need to look at a different part of the translation process. His aims in translation, discussed at length in the previous chapters, line up very closely with those of

the first authors of historical fiction in European literature. Just as the historical novelists that preceded him, Baydas looked for opportunities to relate the stories of individuals who were distinctly other in such a way that he might convey a moral or a message to his readers. While Baydas' work is more explicitly didactic than Walter Scott's, we find similar didacticism in many of Scott's contemporary authors. In addition, we have a more sure record—an actual source text—against which to measure and examine the alterations and decisions that Baydas makes as he translates than we do in the case of an author penning a piece of historical fiction. While the liberal translation practice of Arab translators throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries has led to the disparagement of the translations that they produced, it can also be an asset as we seek to understand the ways in which Baydas' intellectual climate intersected with his literary career. As a consequence, when engaging in a close reading of a translated piece of historical fiction, we can compare not only two texts, but two sets of manipulations through which the historical narrative has passed—first at the hands of the original author, and then at the hands of the translator. Baydas takes *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* at face value in completing his translation, making no discernable effort to communicate the ways in which Tolstoĭ's text departs from the facts of Russian history, even though Tolstoĭ acknowledges these departures so openly in the introduction to his novel. Although this double layer of manipulation involves distortion of history at each stage of the process, it also

In composing *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ*, Tolstoĭ makes clear decisions about how to structure and present the historical material that will be used in the novel. Openly didactic manipulations of historical material in fiction prevailed in fiction produced in many different cultural contexts during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Oftentimes, these historical settings

provide opportunities for authors to comment on and criticize elements of society and government that might otherwise be off limits to literary critics. They also played important roles in the development of nationalist ideologies in many different contexts, from British literature to Russian to Arabic. In addition, we encounter the decisions and manipulations that Baydas makes as translator in transferring a piece of historical fiction from one context into another. The close connection between historical fiction and nationalism makes the translation of this fiction particularly interesting, as the endeavor entails not only the linguistic translation of the piece, but also a recontextualization of the original novel in a way that will apply to a new cultural context, one removed from the original national milieu.

We can see all of these factors at play in the historical fiction that Baydas translated and published in *al-nafā'is*. While Baydas translated a large number of different works, he seemed to have a special interest in historical fiction. Of the nine longer translations that he published, five of them are historical novels. In addition, Baydas published 10 non-fiction books on historical subjects, ranging from a history of ancient Russia (1898) to a book entitled, *The Arabs: their Heroes and Famous Events*<sup>170</sup> (1924). I have chosen to focus on *ahwāl al-istibdād*, the first piece of Baydas historical fiction to be published in *al-nafā'is*, as a case study for examining his translation practice in dealing with historical fiction. The gap between the historical record and Tolstoï's narrative clearly indicates the specific message that he hoped to communicate to his Russian audience. Similarly, the gap between Tolstoï's text and Baydas' translation gives us insight into Baydas' specific goals as a translator, an intellectual and an educator. Like so many of his contemporaries, Baydas' career straddled an interesting line between

---

<sup>170</sup> العرب: أبطالهم وأشهر حوادثهم



entertainment and education. Both his work as a translator and his career as a publisher reflect this balancing act in his life. *al-nafā'is*, though conceived of as a purely literary publication, contained multiple articles in each issue on prominent historical events and personalities. Some of these articles are labeled as translations, others as summaries, and some appear to be original compositions. Regardless, the presence of these articles on historical topics gives a better sense of the broad educational role that Baydas saw his periodical playing in Arab society. Just as he did in each piece of literature he published, Baydas worked in his journal to balance historical information that would be useful and beneficial for Arab society in confronting the issues it faced in the modern world with entertaining pieces that would attract readers' attention and create a space in which they could encounter and reflect on pieces of the modern world. For this reason, as I investigate Baydas' translation of *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* in this chapter, I will do so in the context of the historical articles that Baydas published in *al-nafā'is*. These two sets of texts exist side-by-side on the pages of the journal, and keeping them together in this analysis gives extra insight into Baydas' translation practices as represented by *ahwāl al-istibdād*.

### ***Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ***

Tolstoĭ's *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* was first published in 1863, shortly after the liberation of the serfs in what was generally a liberal atmosphere of reform. In this context, Tolstoĭ's historical novel reads as a warning against the damages that unlimited power can cause in the wrong hands. Though not necessarily considered one of the great works of Russian literature, *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* is very well-known and stands as one of

the primary examples of the historical novel the Russian tradition, even if it was published after the popularity of the genre had already begun to wane among Russian readers. Despite this fact, it remains a familiar and popular novel in Russia today. Written in the style of Walter Scott's historical fiction, the novel takes its name from the main character, Prince Nikita Serebrianiĭ. The Prince's surname means 'silver,' and Tolstoĭ holds him up as a shining example of true Russian national character. Baydas' translation of this work indicates a very close familiarity with the text, and a strong identification with its themes and characters. It is not unlikely that Baydas encountered this novel during his studies at the IOPS school in Nazareth, and consequently chose it to be one of his earliest novel-length translations.

In the 1909 edition of his translation, entitled *ahwāl al-istibdād*, Baydas provides a translator's preface to the work that outlines the familiar terms of *tarjamah bi-taṣarruf* spelling out his translation practice in working with Tolstoĭ's text for the reader. Baydas writes, "I have taken liberties in translating it [*Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ*], adding, deleting, altering, substituting, and reorganizing so that the novel will be agreeable to the tastes of readers of Arabic"<sup>171</sup> (2). This is one of the few translations Baydas completed that is mentioned by later critics of *nahḍawī* literature. As such, it serves as an interesting case study of the prejudice against translations from this early period in modern Arabic literature. In his discussion of *ahwāl al-istibdād*, Matti Moosa repeats the familiar condemnations of translations from this period. He writes,

"Even his version of *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ*, which was translated from Tolstoĭ's original, changed, omitted, and reorganized many sections of the novel. He claimed that he intended to render it more suitable and pleasing to the readers and to emphasize its dominant theme of tyranny and despotism." (102)

---

<sup>171</sup> ولقد تصرفت في تعريبها بزيادة وإسقاط وتغيير وإبدال وتبويب لتكون موافقة لذوق قراء العربية.

Moosa's criticism is in fact taken word for word from al-asad's lectures on Baydas (al-asad 63), and gives us no information that Baydas himself does not disclose in his introduction to the translation. Upon closer examination of the translated text, however, it is not clear that either al-asad or Moosa actually read *ahwāl al-istibdād* or compared it to Tolstoï's original text. The adjustments that Baydas makes in this translation are insignificant in comparison with the changes that we have observed in his other translations. In place of the wholesale changes that he made to *Kapitanskaia Dochka* (*ibnat al-qubṭān*) and *Temporal Power* (*Pod Bremenem Vlasti, ahwāl al-istibdād*), we find that Baydas actually makes only very slight changes to the Russian text in his translation. In translating *Kniaz' Serebrianiï*, Baydas proves a much less intrusive translator than with the other texts discussed above. The question then becomes, "What is it that is different about this text? Why did Baydas feel that it required so much less adjusting in order to bring it to his Arabic readers?"

We can begin to account for this difference in Baydas' translation practice by first considering Tolstoï's text. Tolstoï sets his novel the reign of Ivan IV (1533-1584), seeking to give his readers a general sense of life during this period (as discussed above). *Kniaz' Serebrianiï* is an adventure story that follows Prince Nikita Serebrianiï as he makes sense of life in Russia after returning from several years of war on the front in Lithuania. Prince Nikita's long absence from Russia gives the author (and the reader) the chance to explore this unsettled time through the eyes of one for whom the rapid changes taking place in Russia are as foreign as they would be for a 19<sup>th</sup> century reader. Tolstoï highlights the terror of living under Ivan IV and his *oprichina*, his personal brute squad that carried out the most violent and oppressive of his whims. Tolstoï sets Nikita apart as

a shining example (Nikita's surname, Serebrianiĭ, means 'silver') of Russian nobility and patriotism. Despite all of the horrors that he witnesses, Nikita remains loyal to the tsar, and is convinced that it is the undue influence of others in the tsar's circle that has brought about such horrible circumstances in the tsar's kingdom. Despite his loyalty, Nikita falls in with a band of noble thieves who resist the *oprichina* and struggle to support the people against the Tsar's oppressive policies. The Tsar never forgives Nikita's resistance to his rule and the *oprichina*, and Nikita is eventually banished to serve on the southern front, where he dies at the hands of the Tatars.

Much less innovative or complicated than Pushkin's *Kapitanskaia Dochka*, *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ* is a stereotypical European historical novel, chronicling the adventures of the protagonist as a string of episodes strung together in an almost picaresque fashion. While there is definitely a general story arc following Prince Nikita's return to Russia, the various episodes of the original Russian novel are self-contained in a manner that lends itself very well to the serial form in which it was originally published. As a result, Tolstoĭ's text comes much closer to the style of literature popular in the Arabic-language literary market for which Baydas was writing. Historical fiction was already an established literary genre in Arabic; the works of Jurjī Zaydān were already circulated widely among Arab readers in the decades previous to the establishment of *al-nafā'is*. As a consequence, Baydas did not need to make as many adjustments in making his translation "suitable for Arab tastes," as he put it in his translator's introduction. Many of his alterations to the original text merely serve to condense and abridge the original narrative. At the same time, Baydas makes subtle adjustments to the representation of Prince Serebrianiĭ's patriotism and his relationship to the despotic Ivan

IV that make the novel more applicable to the Palestinian situation at the end of the Ottoman Empire, and the initial encounters of Palestinian nationalism with political Zionism.

The structure of Tolstoï's novel depends upon the impact of his initial description of Serebrianiï. For Russian readers in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the horrors of Ivan IV's reign were a symbol of everything that could go wrong with the tsarist form of government. Tolstoï explains in his introduction that he is interested in depicting "the general character of an entire era and the production of understandings, beliefs, morals, and the degree of education of Russian society in the second half of the 16th century"<sup>172</sup> (5). He was concerned with (and troubled by) "the thought that such a society could exist that looked upon him [Ivan IV] without disgust"<sup>173</sup> (5). From the very beginning, then, Tolstoï creates a space in which he will act, representing and interpreting the events of this distant time for his audience. His deliberate manipulation and open acknowledgment of his role in (re)creating this unfamiliar setting allow him to position himself vis-à-vis his readership in much the same way that Baydas does. Both are performing a deliberate act of translation in order to educate and enlighten their respective readerships. Knowing how different these readerships were, we can expect the two writers to employ different textual strategies in achieving their goals.

From the very first chapter, Tolstoï presents Serebrianiï as an outstanding moral character who is simple enough to identify with the Russian everyman (*muzhik*) while at the same time functioning within Russian society during this turbulent period. In

---

<sup>172</sup> изображение общаго характера цѣлой эпохи и воспроизведение понятій, вѣрованій, нравовъ и степени образованности русскаго общества во вторую половину XVI столѣтїя.

<sup>173</sup> не столько отъ мысли, что могъ существовать Іоаннъ IV, сколько отъ той, что могло существовать такое общество, которое смотрѣло на него безъ негодованїя.

addition, Tolstoï introduces the reader to Serebrianiï as he returns from an extended absence in Lithuania, thus providing the reader with a sympathetic character through which s/he can experience the terrors of the period. Tolstoï makes it abundantly clear that Serebrianiï is the best of men so that the reader has a character within the story with which to identify as they struggle to understand the atrocities perpetrated by Ivan IV and his men. Serebrianiï's unfailing devotion to the figure of the tsar allows Tolstoï to package true Russian patriotism with the qualities of a hero, forcing the audience (and the hero) to grapple with the notion that loyalty to nation can come into conflict with one's personal sense of morality.

Baydas' translation is divided into much smaller sections than Tolstoï's original. These inserted divisions do not coincide with the sections printed in each issue of *al-nafā'is*. Most issues contain around five sections, and almost all of them end in the middle of a section, paragraph, or even sentence. The pages of the novels were numbered separately from the rest of each issue. They were included at the back of each issue, and it was understood that the reader would cut them out of the journal to have them bound together into a book. Baydas published *ahwāl al-istibdād* as a stand-alone novel a few years after its initial running. Earlier works like *ibnat al-qubṭān* did not receive this same treatment.

As he does in each of his book-length translations, Baydas writes about why he chose to translate this particular novel. In his introduction to the translation, he writes, "It is among the best of literary novels because of the lessons and wisdom that it contains, culturing morals and enlightening the mind and encouraging the human soul toward perfection, in addition to the historical scenes and interesting situations and exciting

events that it contains”<sup>174</sup> (2). These statements echo those often used by Arab writers of historical fiction in this period. What is potentially missing, however, is the nationalist component of original historical fiction published in Arabic during this period. Whereas the connection between Jurjī Zaydān’s historical fiction which is set in Egypt, and draws heavily on the local history for color and background and Egyptian nationalism, is quite easy to see, it is more difficult to understand how a translation of a piece of historical fiction set in a foreign context can be part of a nationalist discourse in its host setting.

Though Baydas' translation generally stays very close to the original text, the shift in context creates an alternative reading of *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ*. Working under the increasingly oppressive Ottoman regime of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd II (1876-1909), Baydas clearly identified with the protagonist of Tolstoĭ’s novel. Both versions of the novel begin with descriptions of Serebrianiĭ’s service in Lithuania that depict his character. Tolstoĭ sets Serebrianiĭ up as an ideal blend of a Russian nobleman and the traditional peasant values personified by the *muzhik*. Serebrianiĭ’s shortcomings in diplomatic affairs are depicted as a result of his outstanding character. “Serebrianiĭ was not born for negotiations. Rejecting the delicacies of the diplomatic science, he wanted to conduct the matter cleanly, and to the great annoyance of the secretaries who accompanied him, he did not allow them any intrigues”<sup>175</sup> (7). When the word comes from Moscow that the peace talks are to be abandoned, “He proved his service in military matters better than in the intellectual, and he received great acclaim from both the Russian and the Lithuanian

<sup>174</sup> وهي من خبرة الروايات الأدبية لما تتضمنه من العبر والحكم في تنقيف الأخلاق وتنوير الأذهان وحث النفوس على الكمالات الإنسانية فضلا عما تنطوي عليه من الحقائق التاريخية والوقائع المؤثرة والحوادث المشوقة.

<sup>175</sup> Серебряный не былъ рожден для переговоровъ. Отвергая тонкости посольской науки, онъ хотѣлъ вести дѣло на чистоту и, къ крайней досадѣ сопровождавшихъ его дьяковъ, не позволялъ имъ никакихъ изворотовъ,

peoples.”<sup>176</sup> (8). True to the Romantic strain so common to Russian historical fiction, Tolstoï’s Serebrianiï is a straightforward man of the people, one whose devotion to honesty and integrity in his dealings sets him apart from stereotypical politicians. These character traits transcend distinctions between the Russian and the Lithuanian nations, allowing both groups to recognize the special nature of his character. When Serebrianiï begins his journey home, it is marked by his intense love for his homeland and his devotion to the tsar. Throughout Tolstoï’s text, Serebraynni’s unflinching devotion to Ivan IV, despite the terrors of his reign, complete Tolstoï’s portrait of an ideal Russian—devoted to God, country, and tsar.

Baydas also presents Serebrianiï as a hero built to appeal to his audience. In place of the details about Serebrianiï’s diplomatic and military service that highlight his stubbornness and earthiness, Baydas’ hero defeats the Lithuanians in battle and then dictates the terms of the peace agreement “according to his desires” before returning home.<sup>177</sup> Baydas, on the other hand, seems less interested in Serebrianiï’s devotion to the Tsar, and downplays it in his initial description of Serebrianiï. In fact, Baydas’ description of Serebrianiï roots his joy at returning to his homeland (*rodina / waṭan*) in his desire to see his intended bride, Princess Elena. As Serebrianiï reflects on the prospect of reuniting with his beloved Elena, Baydas writes the following description, “He returned to his country, his soul overjoyed at the prospect of realizing the wishes that had been affecting it and the realization of the hopes that had occupied his heart”<sup>178</sup> (4). Baydas does not include any mention of the Tsar or other potential official recipients of

<sup>176</sup> Показаль онъ свою службу въ ратномъ дѣлѣ лучше, чемъ въ думномъ, и прошла про него великая хвала отъ русскихъ и литовскихъ людей.

<sup>177</sup> فيعد أن عقد شروط الصلح حسب هواه عاد إلى بلاده.

<sup>178</sup> عاد إلى بلاده جذلان يمني نفسه بإدراك الرغائب التي كانت تنتزع إليها وتحقيق الآمال التي كانت تشغل فؤادها.



Serebrianiĭ's devotion. By making Elena the embodiment of Serebrianiĭ's connection to his homeland, Baydas shifts the focus away from the individual at the head of the government in a given situation (in his case, 'Abd al-Ḥamīd II), and grounds it instead in his family relationships and his hope for a peaceful and productive future. This displacement of Tolstoĭ's emphasis on Serebrianiĭ's devotion to the Tsar Ivan IV is one of the primary alterations that Baydas makes in the text, and shows that even though Baydas' translation does not stray far from the original, the two texts read profoundly differently within their respective contexts.

The titles of these two works highlight the different aims of their respective authors. Tolstoĭ's title, *Kniaz' Serebriannyi (Prince Serebriannyi)* moves Prince Serebrianiĭ to the fore, giving particular attention to his name "Silver." Throughout his novel Prince Serebrianiĭ shines as an ideal example of service, loyalty, and devotion to everything that is good about the Russian monarchy. For Tolstoĭ, the Time of Troubles becomes a forge in which the true nature of Russianness and the monarchy emerge despite the threat of a ruler (Ivan IV) who did not understand how they were to be used. In the pages of this novel, Prince Serebrianiĭ brings about this change almost singlehandedly.

The title of Baydas' translation, *ahwāl al-istibdād (The Horrors of Tyranny)*, is much less optimistic. Both words in the title are significant, and the choice itself exposes much information about the context in which Baydas published his translation. The term that Baydas uses for tyranny, *istibdād*, was in broad circulation among *nahḍawi* thinkers who opposed Ottoman rule, in the wake of the publication in 1902 of 'abd al-Raḥmān al-Kawākibī's influential and subversive book *ṭabā'i' al-istibdād (The Nature of*

*Despotism*). The promise of the 1908 constitutional reforms had faded very quickly, and the rhetoric used to describe the regime had shifted from the hopeful tone of 1908 to a cynical condemnation of the Ottoman regime. It is in this period that the language of *inhiṭāt* (stagnation, decadence, or decline) begins to emerge in literary and intellectual spheres to describe the effect that Ottoman rule had on Arab cultural development. Baydas' choice of a very strong word to pair with *istibdād*, makes clear his assessment of the situation. His title undoubtedly invoked the consequences of the contemporary regime for his readers.

Where Tolstoï's original intent in portraying the horrors of life during the 'Time of Troubles' had been to give his readers a glimpse into the mindset that allowed such a situation to last so long, Baydas seems to have a different aim in mind. Taking advantage of the extra space between his intended audience and the subject matter of the novel, he makes the book into a warning for his Arab readers about what could happen if an authoritarian regime were given free reign indefinitely. Baydas' story reads much more like a call to action and a cautionary tale than Tolstoï's original. This distinction is most palpable in the different ways that each writer concludes his respective text. Tolstoï includes a brief epilogue after the events of the novel are complete in which he addresses his readers directly, and exhorts them to take away certain lessons from reading the story of Prince Nikita Serebrianiï. Tolstoï writes, "More than three hundred years have passed since the events described here, and there are few left in Russia who remember that time"<sup>179</sup> (365). He goes on to remind the reader that Ivan IV's reign included great cruelty but left lasting monuments of beauty and greatness in the churches and palaces

---

<sup>179</sup> Прошло болѣ трехъ вѣковъ послѣ описанныхъ дѣлъ, и мало осталось на Руси воспоминаній того времени.

that he built. Finally, he pleads, “May God help us to wipe from our hearts the last traces of that terrifying time, the influence of which like a inherited disease, lingered long in our life, from generation to generation!”<sup>180</sup> (366). Tolstoï concludes his narrative by transforming it into an act of collective penance, as if the process of remembering the wrongs of Ivan IV’s reign can aid the Russian people in moving past this period in their history. In this final epilogue, Tolstoï highlights the foreign nature of his narrative, encouraging the reader to recognize the need to create a better Russia for the future. He concludes his epilogue with the words, “Nothing in this world passes away, and every action, every word, every thought grows like a tree. Much of the good and evil, that, like a mysterious phenomenon exists currently in Russian life, has its hidden roots in the deep, dark abyss of the past”<sup>181</sup> (367). This haunting reminder bridges the gap between the reader and the strangeness of the historical narrative that s/he has just read. Suddenly, Tolstoï makes every archaic, foreign element of Ivan IV’s reign directly connected to the good and evil that the reader experiences in everyday life.

Baydas uses the conclusion of his translation to draw parallels between the plot of *ahwāl al-istibdād* and the historical context in which he is writing, but does so in a very different way. Baydas eliminates the epilogue described above, putting the final message of his novel instead in the mouth of the leader of the band of thieves, Persten. In place of the melancholy shadow that Tolstoï’s epilogue casts, Baydas has Persten exclaim, “Losing Prince Nikita is a terrible catastrophe for the entire Russian nation (*waṭan*)

---

<sup>180</sup> Да поможет Бог и намъ изгладить изъ сердець нашихъ послѣдніе слѣды того страшнаго времени, вліяніе котораго, какъ наслѣдственная болезнь, еще долго потомъ переходило въ жизнь нашу отъ поколѣнія къ поколѣнію!

<sup>181</sup> ничто на свѣте ни пропадаетъ, и каждое дѣло, и каждое слово, и каждая мысль вырастаетъ какъ дерево, и многое доброе и злое, что, какъ загадочное явленіе, существуетъ понынѣ въ русской жизни, таитъ свои корни въ глубокихъ и темныхъ нѣдрахъ минувшаго.

because it is through such men that nations become refined and rise up to the highest ranks of fame and importance. He was great in spirit, great in deed, and his memory and glory will not be forgotten nor shall they pass away until the end of time.<sup>182</sup>

Like *Captain's Daughter*, *ahwāl al-istibdād* highlights elements of government and civil/civic duty. It teaches about the relationship and conflict between noble individuals and corrupt institutions. Matti Moosa suggests that the book may have held special significance for Baydas because of the parallels between Ivan IV's reign and that of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd II in the Ottoman Empire (102). Though it is difficult to substantiate this claim from the text, Baydas' interest in the workings of a modern nation-state is evident throughout the novel. He is free with the term "*waṭaniyyah*" in several key parts of his translation. As Nikita and his companions are traveling through the forest in an early scene in the novel, they begin to sing a folk song. Tolstoï simply refers to the song as either "*pesnia*" or "*rusaskaia pesnia*." In Baydas' text, however, he consistently refers to their song as a national or patriotic song (*ughniyyah waṭaniyyah*) (19). For Baydas, Nikita's connections to his homeland are much more abstract and fundamental than his relationship with the personage of the tsar. Nikita's devotion is to his *waṭan*, to his beloved (both Russia and Elena), instead of being focused on the character of the tsar himself. This allows Baydas a degree of freedom over the course of the story to shape his depictions of Ivan IV as criticisms of the Ottoman government rather than leaving him as the complicated, sympathetic (at times) character that Tolstoï presents.

In addition to these alterations of the text itself, Baydas also includes extra-textual apparatuses in his translation to give information to his readers. The most interesting

---

<sup>182</sup> ن خسارة الأمير نيكيتا ليهي فادحة جسيمة على الوطن الروسي أجمع لأن بمثله تسعد الأوطان وبمثله ترتقي الأمم إلى أعلى مراتب الشهرة وعزة الشأن فقد كان عظيما بنفسه عظيما بأفعاله فذكره لا يفنى ومجده لا يبلى إلى منتهى الأزمان.

example of this practice comes at the beginning of Tolstoï's fourth chapter (section six in the Arabic translation), where Baydas includes a lengthy explanatory footnote. This chapter ("*Koldun*" – "*al-dajjāl*") describes an interaction between Viazemskiï and a miller who practices magic. He comforts his Arabic-language readers, who he assumes may find this material objectionable, by writing,

"If the readers find that this or other chapters of this novel a large amount of fantasy and ridiculous stories from the traditions that were prevalent at that time in Russia and held sway over the minds of the vast majority of the people, do not simply cast it aside and consider it disrespectful of the honor of the novel. If we attempted to rid the novel of all of this nonsense because it contains something detrimental (*fāsid*), then we would be as those who downplay the beauty of historical events . . . ."<sup>183</sup>

Even the way that Baydas translates the title of this chapter gives an indication of Baydas' attitude toward the incident. Instead of reproducing the Russian word (*koldovstvo* or sorcery), Baydas entitles the chapter *al-dajjāl*, a word indicating a charlatan, an imposter, or a fake. Where Tolstoï's sorcerer clearly has powers that he uses on behalf of the other characters in the story, Baydas undercuts his authority and abilities from the very beginning. Whatever this sorcerer's influence may be within the story, as Baydas relates the story to his audience, he anticipates their value judgment of the supernatural in this chapter and writes it into his translation. This is an interesting contrast to the major plotlines that Baydas eliminated from his translation of *Kapitanskaia Dochka* because they were potentially objectionable to the reading public, here he chooses to explain some of the differences and leave the 'objectionable' material in. In reality, this material fits in with the kinds of fantastical pulp fiction that were very

---

<sup>183</sup> إذا رأى القراء في هذه الفصل وفي غيره من فصول الرواية كثيرا من الأوهام والخز عبلات وما أشبهها من التقاليد التي كانت سائدة إذ ذاك في بلاد الروس ومتسلطة على عقول السواد الأعظم من القوم فلا يضربوا بها عرض الحائط ويحسبوا مقلة من الشرف الرواية ومحطة من شأنها. وإذا حاولنا تجريد الرواية من هذه الترهات لأن فيها شيئا فاسدا كنا كمن يقلل جمال الحوادث التاريخية المتسلسلة فيها لأن مؤلفها إنما أراد في إيرادها بيان ما كان عليه الروس في ذلك العصر من الجهل والغباوة. وسائر تلك الرؤى والأوهام كانت محترمة عندهم وشائعة في بلادهم ليس فقط بين السوق بل وبين الملوك والأمراء والأعيان كما يتضح ذلك من سياق الرواية.

popular in the Arabic press at this time, and especially when preceded by this kind of a warning, may have drawn extra readers to the text because of the exotic nature of the material.

It is also interesting to note the reversal of roles in this footnote. Baydas ascribes a whole host of clearly derogatory labels for superstitions and practices that were considered to be beneath any member of modern society—*awhām*, *khuzā'balāt*, *taqālīd*, and *turrahāt*—to Russian culture. He assumes that his Arabic-speaking audience will find the content of this scene objectionable, and needs assurance that the material that they are reading is not simply nonsense, but adds to the novel both aesthetically and in terms of historical accuracy. In negotiating the border between the foreign text and the target audience, Baydas treats his Arabic-reading audience as the logical, reasonable, rational group who finds the exotic and foreign nature of the Other (in this case, Russia) to be revolting and off-putting. Baydas takes it as his task to bridge this gap, and make this Other accessible. The power/knowledge structure that he assumes in this footnote is the exact opposite of the traditional orientalist paradigm. Russia has become the superstitious, irrational other, and the Arabic-speaking audience of the Ottoman Empire the rational, critical power manipulating the image of the Other for its own consumption. Baydas' note claims a place of power over Russian culture in terms of knowledge and understanding, his gaze backwards over the centuries of Russian history fixing Russian culture and (pre)judging it on behalf of his Arab readers.

By the time Baydas translated *Kniaz' Serebrianiĭ*, he had established a very clear and compact prose style. As with his earlier translations, *ahwāl al-istibdād* is free of

excess ornamentation, wordplay, and other devices so characteristic of early *nahḍawī* prose. Even in the more lyrical scenes of the novel, Baydas maintains a tight prose style that reads easily. He makes very few changes that would serve to domesticate the text, maintaining the Russian setting, character, and context for the events of the novel.

One exception to this rule comes in the form of the Arabic poetry that Baydas inserts into several scenes in this novel. These additions are never intrusive, but simply give some extra color to the events being described. At times, the poetry is of Baydas' own composition. For example, when introducing Elena at length for the first time, Baydas indulges in ten lines of original poetry. The tone and imagery of the poem are reminiscent of the song that Elena's handmaid sings in the Russian original, but are not an attempt at literal translation. Instead, Baydas brings the folksong into a familiar Arab poetical form, composing ten rhyming couplets. For example, Baydas begins the 88<sup>th</sup> section of the novel with the following couplet from al-Mutanabbī: "If death is inevitable, \ then it is useless to be a coward"<sup>184</sup> (297). This couplet comes towards the end of the story, when Ivan IV's false justice is being measured out to all of the different characters in the book. As the readers begin to sense the inevitability of Nikita's demise, Baydas inserts this bit of poetry, which describes Nikita's situation exactly.

These few additions notwithstanding, in composing *ahwāl al-istibdād*, Baydas follows his source text very closely. As described above, he goes to great pains to preserve the foreignness of the Russian text, only occasionally inserting explanatory footnotes or other marginalia to explain the unfamiliar elements of Russian culture in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Taking up Lukács' conception of the way in which historical fiction functions, we can see in Baydas' translation a text with a clear purpose—the outlining of

---

<sup>184</sup> وإذا لم يكن من الموت بدُّ فمن العجز أن تكون جباناً

a foreign history that illustrates the ability of determined individuals to resist oppression, and the positive impact that such individuals can have on future generations, even if the current struggle seems to be in vain. Baydas cultivated this sense of history in a political context that presented desperation similar to what the characters of Tolstoï's novel feel under the rule of Ivan IV. By translating this novel, Baydas could publish a text quite critical of the oppressive regime, yet avoid censorship or other repercussions from his criticism. In addition, he was able to craft a more hopeful call to action for his Arab audience than Tolstoï did in the original novel because of the extra layer of separation between Arab society and the Russian history outlined in the book. Baydas is able to connect the possibilities of the novel to the situation in the Ottoman Empire at the turn of the century without being strictly tied to actual historical events that formed part of the Arab conception of nationhood and identity. By importing a piece of a foreign history, Baydas preserved his ability to craft a message that fit his time and audience. We find further evidence of his concern for history and a broader sense of historical progress in the non-fiction articles that he selected for publication in *al-naḡā'is*. Just as he worked to reshape Tolstoï's fictional historical narrative into a thread that was meaningful for his Arab audience, Baydas' work as an editor and writer shaped the presentation of history on the pages of *al-naḡā'is* into a collection of narratives that similarly informed and reflected the struggles of Arab society in the Levant (especially Palestine) in the first two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

### **History in *al-naḡā'is al-‘aṣriyyah***

The historical articles that Baydas selected for publication in *al-naḡā'is* follow the same pattern as his translations of historical fiction – in each case, Baydas draws on the



history of European nations or individuals whose situations somehow mirrored that of Arab society, or held some other lesson that Arab readers could take from the historical narrative. This process may not be immediately recognizable as translation, but in fact Baydas was engaged in the same activity that he pursued in translating literature. Baydas worked to glean interesting narratives that contained useful lessons for his readers. In the literary examples explored above, we see how this played out in linguistic and literary terms. Turning attention to the process of adapting foreign histories to benefit the Arab nation shows how pervasive Baydas' drive to allow his people to benefit from lessons from all over the world was. The 1911 volume of *al-nafā'is* contains several examples of this phenomenon.

Many of the early history pieces in *al-nafā'is* profile famous people from history. Baydas's choices of historical figures for profiling fall into several distinct categories-- literary/philosophy figures, and political leaders. In 1911 and 1912, the bias definitely favors the literary and intellectual figures. In later years, Baydas gives more attention to strictly political figures. The first such article that Baydas printed in *al-nafā'is* was a brief biography of Lev Tolstoï printed in 1909. Baydas gives some idea of his historical project in the introductory sentence of this article, which reads,

“In the 19<sup>th</sup> century three of the greatest and most famous of men led the ranks of intellectuals—first, Goethe, the German upon whose every word the entire world hung with great enthusiasm and excitement. After Goethe, the throne of knowledge remained empty until the Frenchman Victor Hugo occupied it. After his death, the undisputed leader of world intellectuals became the Russian philosopher Tolstoï who is known and read in every part of the entire world”<sup>185</sup> (1909 3).

---

<sup>185</sup> في إثناء القرن التاسع عشر تولى قيادة عقول البشر ثلاثة رجال من أعظم وأشهر رجال الدنيا أولهم غوتي الألماني الذي كان ينصت العالم المتمدن بأسره إلى كل كلمة يقولها بكل شغف وارتياح وبعد غوتي بقي عرش العلم فارغا إلى أن رقيه فيكتور هيكو الفرنسي وبعد وفاته أصبح القائد الأكبر للعقول بلا منازع الفيلسوف تولستوي الروسي.

This comment is interesting for a number of reasons. First, it concentrates all of the intellectual activity of the entire world in Western Europe, as if that were the entire world. Baydas was most certainly among those Arabs who lamented the decline of Arab intellectual and cultural life under the Ottomans, and makes no excuses about giving primacy to thinkers operating outside of that sphere during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, even if they do represent some of the major colonial powers who would cause the Arabs so much grief in the following decades. Second, we can see that Baydas does not assume very much background knowledge on the part of his readers. Baydas focuses on the national identity of each individual, as if this identity is inseparable from the work and position of an intellectual in the modern world.

Baydas first roots Tolstoï in a physical space—his estate Iasnaia Poliana. He uses a thorough description of this setting to give the reader information about Tolstoï the man and the philosopher. Baydas also editorializes on the setting, highlighting the simplicity of Tolstoï’s lifestyle. He writes, “All of it is a paragon of simplicity and lack of extravagance despite the fact that its inhabitant is from the wealthy and the high class”<sup>186</sup> (1909 5). Having painted Tolstoï as a man that anyone would be comfortable meeting (he even notes that Tolstoï “receives every visitor in his home, whoever he may be”<sup>187</sup> (1909 5).

Baydas then moves to situate Tolstoï’s personal history. He gives a brief, but thorough, outline of Tolstoï’s family before moving on to Tolstoï’s studies. He emphasizes Tolstoï’s interest in the East, and the fact that he briefly studied Eastern languages at the university in Kazan. Baydas’ depiction of Tolstoï’s noble lineage only

---

<sup>186</sup> وكلها مثال البساطة وعدم الفخفة مع أن صاحبها من أهل الثروة والحسب الرفيع.  
<sup>187</sup> أنه يقبل كل زائر في منزله سواء كان من الخاصة أو العامة

serves to underscore why his choice to accept everyone is especially meaningful.

Throughout the discussion of Tolstoï's literature that concludes the article, Baydas continues to focus on the fact that Tolstoï had a special connection with the everyday concerns of normal people. His constant emphasis on this principle marks it as the take-home message for his readers from this article.

The next personality from history that Baydas presented to his readers in 1909 was Aristotle. As with the sketch of Tolstoï, Baydas introduces Aristotle by situating him in relation to modern European society. He writes, "Researchers into ancient thinkers and their philosophies agree that Aristotle is the most important philosopher and the teacher of all the learned. He is the one to whom every nation (*ummah*) of the earth turns no matter how advanced their learning or their knowledge" (1910 185). As with his presentation of Tolstoï, Baydas writes for an audience that may not be familiar with Aristotle, yet somehow takes it for granted that Western European society is the pinnacle of advancement and modernity. He chooses to quote Dante in underscoring Aristotle's importance, but feels it necessary to tell the reader who Dante is beforehand.<sup>188</sup> This curious tension characterizes Baydas' early historical essays throughout the pre-War years.

Whereas Baydas emphasized the confluence of simple sensibilities and great intellect in Tolstoï, in his portrayal of Aristotle a different focus quickly becomes apparent. Baydas goes to great lengths to show the reader the different ways that Aristotle cultivated his intellect from an early age. In part two of his portrait of Aristotle, Baydas returns to the familiar themes from his article on Tolstoï. He writes that the greatest

---

<sup>188</sup> Baydas would return to Dante later, publishing a brief biography in 1919, and then an extended explication of Dante's work and its relationship to Abū al-'Alā' al-Ma'ārrī's *risālat al-ghufrān* in 1921.

lesson we can take from Aristotle is in his dying wish, which was to provide for his slave Nikanor. Baydas cites this concern for a slave as being unique among all human history, and calls it the greatest lesson that we can take from Aristotle (1909 519). He goes on in a third installment in the portrait of Aristotle to outline a few of his philosophies and teachings.

If the historical articles in 1909-1910 are limited to these two brief portraits, they would grow to a much larger space of the journal in the years that followed. Baydas chose many famous personalities from world history, including Buddha, Shakespeare, Napoleon, Victor Hugo, Kaiser Wilhelm II, Goethe, Dante, but also included a disproportionate number of figures from Russian history, showing his continuing connection to Russian culture and society. Several of the Russians profiled in *al-nafā'is* stand out as unusual choices, we find profiles of Lomonosov (1912), a detailed history of each member of the Romanov Dynasty (1913), Rasputin (1921), and Nikolai II (1921). While these individuals were certainly not obscure, their inclusion shows the close connection to Russian culture that Baydas maintained throughout his career. Baydas also branched out to include articles dealing with historical topics and important events in addition to famous individuals. A few articles from the 1910-1911 volume of *al-nafā'is* illustrate this phenomenon. In looking at a number of these articles together, we can see that Baydas is quite concerned with the issues of the Arab/Ottoman society in which he was working, but often turned to European history to comment on these issues.

It was not until the end of the third year of *al-nafā'is* (1910-1911) that Baydas began to print lengthy articles on historical topics taken from Arab, Ottoman, and Islamic history. The first of these articles was a lengthy series on Islamic countries (*duwal*

*islāmiyyah*), divided chronologically (1911 473).<sup>189</sup> First Baydas presented the Ottoman rulers, then the kingdoms of North Africa and the Maghreb. This article is particularly interesting for the way in which Baydas presents the Ottoman rulers from his own lifetime. Baydas comments on the results of the constitutional reforms and his disappointment that they were not effective more quickly. He gives ‘abd al-Ḥamīd II the longest entry of any of the Ottoman rulers, and pays particular attention to the constitutional reforms that were carried out during his reign, being sure to note ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd’s propensity for overturning those reforms multiple times. It was during ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd’s reign that Baydas would have completed the better part of his work on *ahwāl al-istibdād*, and the connection between the title of this translation and the circumstances under which he did the work is surely no coincidence.

This ambivalent attitude toward the Ottoman rulers appears several times in the various articles that he prints. As was common in the period, he refers to the Ottoman rule as a period of *inhiṭāt* (decline, stagnation, or decadence) many times. This leads to the trope of lateness that is commonly applied to Arab modernity by later thinkers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. For example, in 1911 Baydas prints an article by Iliās Halabī in which he describes how he finds a parallel situation in Greek society, though in that case the lateness is attributed instead to physical circumstances. Halabī describes what he sees as “the relationship between this fever [malaria] and the lateness of this great nation [the Greek]”<sup>190</sup> (1911 237). Among the histories that Baydas includes in the 1911 volume of *al-naḫā’is*, we find a number of common themes. Baydas gives attention to the histories

---

<sup>189</sup> It seems that there was one previous installment of this series, but it does not appear in any of the copies of *al-naḫā’is* that I found. Perhaps the first installment dealt with early Islam in the Arabian peninsula and its initial expansion.

<sup>190</sup> علاقة هذه الحمى بتأخر تلك الأمة العظيمة

of those European countries that seem to have much in common with the history of the Levant. For example, his treatment of the history of Italy highlights the turbulent nature of life on the peninsula when it was comprised solely of competing city-states. His description lines up very well with the state of the Ottoman Empire in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Muḥammad ‘Alī had already established Egypt as an independent entity within the Ottoman Empire, and other Arab regions of the Ottoman Empire were becoming restless as European powers established new spheres of influence within the region. Baydas writes, “The entire country was a broad arena for wars and unrest that continued for many centuries in humiliation and servitude until it finally united and became a single kingdom”<sup>191</sup> (1911 550). This period of unrest seems to be Baydas’ primary interest in relating the history of Italy. Once he reaches its conclusion, he shifts into a simple list of kings’ birth and death dates. In relating the story of Italy’s unification, Baydas gives the French a starring role, giving Napoleon credit for singlehandedly bringing the warring city states into a unified political system. He clearly felt that outside influence could pave the way for unification and independence, though his views on the various European powers that were involved were not all entirely positive.

Baydas also gives space to discussion of the philosophy of history and historiography in the pages of *al-nafā’is*. In the 1911 volume of the journal he published an article by Michel Khawalī entitled, “A Glimpse into History” (*lamḥah fī al-tārīkh*). That describes various schools of thought on what the purpose of writing history is. Khawalī comes to the conclusion that history is a universal courtroom in which everyone will be judged for their deeds. He underscores the lesson that this fact holds for us as we

<sup>191</sup> كانت البلاد كلها ميدانا واسعا للحروب والقتال وظلت مئات من السنين في الذل والعبودية إلى أن اتحدت أخيرا وصارت مملكة واحدة.

look back into history, writing, “From this we conclude that the country that does not take justice as its foundation and virtue as its fence will quickly find its dominance shaken and see its invincibility vanish, for history is the strongest witness of these facts”<sup>192</sup> (1911 543).

In selecting these articles for publication, and in expanding the mission of *al-nafā'is* to include historical articles, Baydas exercises the same tendencies that we observe in his literary translation practice. In both cases, he works to bring in interesting narratives that instruct his implied reader about life in modern society. Baydas reaches into the history of foreign cultures (mostly European) to bring teaching examples to his readers. As he does so, he edits carefully to encourage the same principles that have come up time and again throughout this dissertation—national identity, patriotism, education, service and duty. This process of choosing and redacting historical narratives from foreign sources is itself a kind of translation activity, and mirrors Baydas’ translation practice in working with literary texts.

Pairing his translation of *Kniaz’ Serebriannyi* with a selection of these articles shows this process more clearly, especially when compared to Baydas other literary translations. The fact that Baydas chooses to stay so close to the Russian text in his Arabic translation gives us an important clue about Baydas’ translation practice in general. Were we to find that he always simplified and flattened out the complications of the literary works he translates, as witnessed in his translation of Pushkin’s *Kapitaniskaia Dochka*, we might take that as a sign of his inability as a translator. As it stands, however,

---

<sup>192</sup> فيستنتج والحالة هذه أن الدولة التي لا يكون العدل أساسها والفضيلة سياجها لا تلبث أن تنزع سطوتها وتتلشى منعها والتاريخ أكبر شاهد على كل ذلك.

by reading a broad range of his translations in tandem with his work in print journalism, we can see that Baydas is, in fact, very consistent and able in the work that he has set out to do. If he is free with some points of the texts and histories that he presents through translation, he is always upfront about doing so. In each case, the alterations that he makes to the literary texts he translates are deliberate, not haphazard.

In addition, reading Baydas' translation of *Kniaz' Serebrianniĭ* in combination with his changing attitude towards historical articles in *al-naḡā'is* illustrates the changes that were taking place in his intellectual life and in Palestinian culture in general during this period. Reaching into the history of both European and Arab cultures, Baydas shaped lessons from these historical narratives that served his readership in ways unique to the circumstances in which they were living. Through his editorship of *al-naḡā'is al-aṣriyyah* and his own career in letters, Baydas was actively engaged in fashioning an understanding of history that would serve the emergent nationalist movement in Palestine. Just as he freely reshaped literary narratives in his translations in order to make them more appropriate for his intended audience, Baydas actively shaped the histories that were told on the pages of his journal in order to make them more beneficial to his readership. In both cases, his *taṣarruf* can hardly be faulted, even if the product in both cases deviates from what would generally be accepted as good translation or good history in the eyes of traditional (western) understandings of these fields. Baydas' manipulations are not deceptions, nor are they indicators of sloppiness on his part. Rather, they give us a chance to glimpse the identity building process of *naḡdawī* intellectuals in a very intimate way.



## CONCLUSION

### Translation as Transition: the possibilities of *nahḍah* translation

Though he is perhaps not the most famous figure of modern Arabic literature, Khalil Baydas made an important contribution to Arabic literature through his translations and newspaper. The three novels discussed in this dissertation represent only a small part of Baydas' oeuvre. In summarizing Baydas' contribution to modern Arabic literature, Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad wrote,

“We do not know of anyone in this country whose translated and original stories number—in this period—as many as Baydas, or even half his number. We do not know of a journal before his *al-nafā'is* that paid such attention to the publication of translated and original stories” (Asad 17).

Despite such laudatory description of Baydas' career, his texts, like much of the literature produced early in the Arabic literary renaissance have received very little scholarly attention. Because neither translated nor popular literature fit easily within the literary canons that emerged in the Arab world during the post-colonial period, these texts have languished until very recently. What contribution, however, can be made to literary scholarship on the *nahḍah* through studying these types of texts? This dissertation is a preliminary example of the ways in which critical engagement with *nahḍawī* translations can yield new information about the connections between literary movements and the historical context in which these translations were completed, published, sold, and consumed. What's more, Baydas' literary journal *al-nafā'is al-‘aṣriyyah* represents an understudied repository of literary material both in terms of translated literature and also

as a concrete reminder of the profound impact that Russian culture had on the development of modern Arabic literature in the Levant.

Translations made up a huge percentage of Arabic literature published during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Their importance goes beyond sheer numbers, since they provided a flexible arena in which authors could experiment with new forms and styles. The above chapters have considered some of the ways in which the translator occupies a unique space in the literary world, suspended between two fixed texts, between two separate societies, s/he acts as a powerful agent of literary change and development. Through the choices that the translator makes in working with a foreign text, they shape the linguistic and cultural spheres of the target language community, often in profound ways. Baydas' entire career inhabits this peculiar space, and exemplifies its potentialities and pitfalls. In this dissertation, I have illustrated this dynamic by reading Baydas' literary translations as an artifact of the agency that he exercised in that space. When paired with the nonfiction that he published in *al-nafā'is*, these translations become traces of the huge amounts of energy he spent not only to bridge the gap between Arab culture and Russian culture, but to transform Arab culture through his literary career.

As a final example of this phenomenon, I would like to return briefly to the linguistic and stylistic idiosyncrasies of Baydas' literary work. All three of the translations discussed here exhibit one of the most compelling aspects of Baydas' translation practice—his lucid, direct prose style. Where much of early modern Arabic prose was often bogged down by the classical conventions of *saj'* (rhymed prose), Baydas eschewed such a style in all of his literary translations. Comparing Baydas' translations to his early original prose fiction shows how profoundly his work with

foreign literature shaped his own literary production. Maḥamīd equates the language in Baydas' translations with the "telegraphic style" associated with Zaydān, Ṣarrūf and Salāmā Mūsā. He writes, "One must also mark the simplicity of Khalil Baydas' language: he does not use *saj'* or traditional linguistic ornamentations" (2002 61). Even in his earliest translation, *ibnat al-qubṭān* (see chapter 3), Baydas writes in a powerful, unencumbered prose style that sets his work apart. This becomes particularly useful information when we read Baydas' translations together with his original prose, where Baydas employs a dramatically different style.

A brief consideration of two of Baydas' early prose works (both mentioned earlier in this dissertation) illustrates this difference. The first is the introduction to his work *tārīkh al-aqmār al-thalāthah* (*The History of the Great Hierarchs: [St. Basil, St. Gregory, and St. John Chrysostom]*). Published in 1898, this work preserves the earliest example of Baydas' original prose. In his translation of the religious text, the first thing that the reader encounters is Baydas' lengthy preface to the biographies. This introduction is very interesting linguistically; comparing it to the translated text allows us to tease out more information about Baydas and the decisions that he makes as he translates and presents this work. Baydas writes the introduction in a very elevated style of Arabic, flexing his literary muscles and proving himself adept at some of the most conventional rhetoric devices of the classical and neoclassical Arabic tradition. Baydas composes the entire introduction in *saj'*, rhymed prose in which the rhymed words echo each other not only phonetically, but semantically as well. *Saj'* differs from poetry in that it is not bound to a specific meter, and it is printed on the page in paragraphs, rather than separate lines as is traditional in Arabic poetry. For example, the introduction begins: "They are the shining

stars, even the radiant moons. The great hierarchs of the Church, and her distinguished scholars.”<sup>193</sup> In the Arabic, each pair of sentences rhymes: *al-lāmi’ah / al-sāṭi’ah* in the first pair, *al-‘iḏām / al-‘ilām* in the second. Similarly, the two pairs of sentences clearly illustrate the parallelism characteristic of *saj’*, with second sentence of each pair echoing the meaning of the first. This pattern continues throughout the introduction, just over three pages of text.

Baydas clearly claims the introductory section as his own composition, placing his name below it. After having established his authority and the importance of his subject by invoking the classical literary practice of *saj’*, Baydas shifts abruptly into a very straightforward, unadorned tone for the actual translated text. This shows, in microcosm, the transitional role of translation in Arabic literature during the *nahḍah*. In his preface to a translation completed in a very plain, lean and lucid prose, Baydas includes an introduction to his translation that clearly aspires to fulfill the expectations of a more classical literary style. In this way, the introduction serves as a buffer, establishing Baydas credibility as a serious man of letters (he was only 25 at the time this translation was published).

A second example of this same phenomenon comes from the introductory essay that Baydas published in the inaugural issue of *al-nafā’is* (November 1908), and then reworked and republished as the introduction to his first collection of short stories to be published in book form, *masāriḥ al-adhhān* (1924). In this essay, Baydas outlines the mission and potential of the novel as he understands them. Baydas outlines his expectations of the would-be novelist, setting the bar impossibly high. I have already

---

<sup>193</sup> هم الكواكب اللامعة، بل الأقمار الساطعة. آباء الكنيسة العظام، وجهابذتها الأعلام.

discussed the content of this article in relation to the didactic nature of Baydas' fiction in the chapters above. The style of this piece is also worthy of attention, especially in comparison to the literary translations that are discussed in Chapters Three through Five.

In contrast to the stripped down nature of Baydas' prose in his literary translations, Baydas' essay on the novel exhibits the same rhetorical flair that we find in his introduction to *tāriikh al-aqmār al-thalāthah*. The first few sentences give a taste of the rhetorical gymnastics involved in this essay. Baydas writes,

“No one is ignorant of the high place and powerful role of the novel among all literary books of all nations  
for it is among the greatest pillars of civilization  
and the most widely distributed and circulated publications  
and those firmly rooted in the heart and the soul  
and the most influential on morals and customs  
and the greatest force in building up and breaking down;”<sup>194</sup>

The translation above replicates the line breaks and layout as they appear in Baydas' original publication. Baydas eventually shifts into more recognizable paragraph breaks, but maintains the tendency toward parallelism and *saj'* style prose throughout the essay, which is 11 pages long. This is a unique document because of the inherent conflict between the manner in which it is presented, and the message that it would convey to the audience. Baydas writes in the most elaborate classical prose that he produces anywhere over the course of his entire career. The tension inherent in composing an essay championing the novel as the premier genre of the modern world in a distinctly pre-modern literary style captures the situation of *nahdawi* translation perfectly.

---

<sup>194</sup> لا يجهل أحدٌ ما للروايات من الشأن الخطير والمقام الرفيع بين سائر كتب الأدب عند جميع الأمم  
فهي من أعظم أركان المدنية  
وفي مقدمة المطبوعات انتشارا وتداولاً  
وأشدها رسوخاً في النفوس والقلوب  
وأثبثها أثراً في الأخلاق والعادات  
وأعظمها عاملاً في البناء والهدم

Literary translators working during the Arab *nahdah* functioned in a space between classical and modern literature. They worked in a literary marketplace in which the critics valued traditional forms, but the consumers wanted to buy novels and short stories that were completely different from what had come out before. In this position, translators like Khalil Baydas exercised their own agency to shape works of literature that vacillated between these two extremes. Baydas wrote his translations in unapologetically sparse prose that reflected his modernizing sensibilities. At the same time, he felt it was expedient (at least in the beginning of his career) to preface these translations with introductions that evoke traditional Arabic literature. Perhaps Baydas hoped that through such strategies he could secure the favor of literary critics of the period. The style he uses in his introductions certainly marks his activity as a literary endeavor, not always a given in the critical appraisal of translators from this period.

Thus, in modern Arabic literature, translation becomes transition. Baydas and his fellow translators constantly worked in the spaces between—between literatures, between nations, between historical eras. This dissertation attempts to recognize the agency of the translator operating in that space in a new way. Connecting Baydas' translation practice not only to the texts from which he was translating, but also to other texts published in his literary journal gives us a new appreciation for the skillful way in which he used the freedom accorded him as a translator to create literary works that addressed the social, political, and cultural concerns of his time. Focusing on his decisions and agency instead of how closely his translations match their respective source texts allows us to appreciate his translations for what they are, instead of dismissing them for what they are not.

### Bibliography

*al-naḡa'is al-'asriyyah*. Jerusalem. 1908-1914, 1919-1924.

Abu Ḥanna, Ḥanna. *ṡalā'i al-naḡdah al-'arabiyyah fi filisṡīn*. Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 2005.

Allen, Roger. *Modern Arabic Literature*. Ungar: New York, 1987.

---. *The Arabic Novel: an historical and critical introduction*. U of Manchester P, 1982.

Andreeva, Elena. *Russian and Iran in the Great Game*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Apter, Emily. *Translation Zones: a new comparative literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.

al-Asad, Nāṡir al-Dīn. *muḡādarāt 'an Khalīl Baydas: rā'id al-qišṡah al-'arabiyyah al-ḡadīthah fi filisṡīn*. Cairo: al-Madani, 1963.

---. *al-ḡayāḡ al-adabiyyah al-ḡadīthah fi filisṡīn wa-al-urdun ḡatā sanat 1950*. Amman: Mu'assasat 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Shūmān. 2000.

al-'Awdat, Ya'qūb. *a'lām al-fikr wa-al-adab fi filisṡīn*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Jerusalem: Dar al-Asra'. 1992.

Badawi, Muhammad. *Modern Arabic Literature and the West*. London: Ithaca, 1985.

---, ed. *The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Modern Arabic Literature*. Cambridge UP, 1992.

---. *A Short History of Modern Arabic Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

- Bardenstein, Carol. *Translation and Transformation in Modern Arabic Literature: the indigenous assertions of Muhammad 'Uthmān Jalāl*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005.
- Bartol'd, Vasiliĭ. *Istoriia Izucheniia Vostoka v Rossiĭ*. 1925.
- Baydas, Khalil. *Ahwāl al-Istibdād*. in *al-nafa'is*. 1909.
- . *Ibnat al-Qubṭān*. in *al-Manār*. Beirut. 1898.
- . *Masāriḥ al-Adhhān*. Cairo: al-‘aṣriyyah. 1924.
- . *Shaqā' al-Mulūk*. in *al-nafa'is*. 1908.
- . *Tārīkh al-Aqmār al-Thalāthah*. Ba' adba: al-Maṭba'ah al-‘uthmaniyyah. 1899.
- Baziiants, A.P., ed. *Stanovlenie Sovetskogo Vostokovedeniia*. Moscow: Nauka, 1983.
- Baziliĭ, K. *Siriia i Palestina pod turetskim pravitel'stvom*. St. Petersburg: NP, 1875.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." trans. Harry Zohn, in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968. pp. 69-82.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. "Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote." Trans. Andrew Hurley, in *Collected Fictions*. New York: Penguin, pp. 88-95.
- al-Bustānī, Buṭrus. *dā'irat al-ma'ārif*. Beirut. 1876-1900.
- Cachia, Pierre. *An Overview of Modern Arabic Literature*. Edinburgh UP, 1990.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000.
- Chamberlain, William Henry. "Russia between East and West." *Russian Review* 19, no. 4 (1960): 309-315.
- Corelli, Marie. *Temporal Power*. Dodd, Mead, and Co. 1902.
- . Trans. Z.N. Zhuravskaia. *Pod Bremenem Vlasti*. Petrograd, 1916.
- Davis, Lennard. *Resisting Literature: ideology and fiction*. London: Routledge, 1987.



Debreczeny, *The Other Pushkin: A Study of Alexander Pushkin's Prose Fiction*. Stanford UP: Stanford, 1983.

---. "The Execution of Captain Mironov: a crossing of tragic and comic modes."

*Alexander Pushkin: Symposium II*. Eds. Andrej Kodjak, Krystyna Pomorska, Kiril Taranovsky. New York U Slavic Papers 3. Columbus OH: Slavica, 1980. 67-78.

Derrida, Jacques. "Des Tours de Babel." in *Acts of Religion*. New York: Routledge, 2002. pp. 102-134.

Dmitriev, A.A. *Imperatorskoe Pravoslavnoe Palestinskoe Obshchestvo i ego deiatel'nost' za istekshuyu chetvert' veka*. St. Petersburg: Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society, 1907.

Dolinina, Anna. *Ocherki istorii arabskoĭ literatury novogo vremeni :Egipet i Siriĭa Publitsistika 1870-1914*. Moscow: Nauka, 1968.

Geraci, Robert and Michael Khadarkovsky. *Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversions, and Tolerance in Tssarist Russia*. Cornell UP, 2001.

Geraci, Robert. *Window on the East; National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia*. Cornell UP, 2001.

Haberer, Adolphine. "Intertextuality in Theory and Practice." *Literatūra*. 19:5 (2007). pp. 54-67.

Hafez, Sabry. *The Genesis of Arabic Narrative Discourse*. London: Saqi, 1993.

Haywood, John. *Modern Arabic Literature 1800-1970*. Lund Humphries: London, 1971.

Hine, Alan. "The Influence of Russian Literature in Two Twentieth Century Arabic Periodicals." *Eras*. December 2010. 1-24.

- Hope, John Preston. *Manifestations of Russian Literary Orientalism*. (unpublished dissertation). University of Michigan. 2003.
- Hopwood, Derek. *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine, 1843-1914: church and politics in the Near East*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
- Hourani, Albert. *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- IAmilinets, B. F. (Boris Fedorovich). *Rossiia i Palestina: ocherki politicheskikh i kul'turno-religioznykh otnosheniĭ (XIX-nachalo XX veka)*. Moskva: In-t vostokovedeniia RAN: Letniĭ sad, 2003.
- Imangulieva, Aida. *Gibran, Rihani, and Naimy: East-West interactions in early twentieth-century Arab literature*. Oxford: Inner Farne, 2009.
- Jayyusi, Salma Khadra. *Trends and Movements in Modern Arabic Poetry*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Kalinowska, Izabela. *Between East and West: Polish and Russian 19<sup>th</sup> century Travel to the Orient*. Rochester: U Rochester P, 2004.
- Khalid, Adeeb. "Response to Nathaniel Knight." *Kritika*.
- . "Russian History and the Debate over Orientalism." *Kritika*. 2001.
- Khitrovo, V.N. *Nedelia v Palestine*. St. Petersburg, 1879.
- . *Pravoslavie v Sviatoĭ zemli*. St. Petersburg, 1881.
- . *Palestina i Sinaĭ*. St. Petersburg, 1876.
- Knight, Nathaniel. "Grigor'ev in Orenburg, 1851-1862: Russian Orientalism in the Service of Empire?" *Slavic Review* 59, no. 1 (Spring 2000).
- . "On Russian Orientalism: A response to Adeeb Khalid." *Kritika*. 2001.
- . "Does Russian Orientalism have a Russian Soul?" *Kritika*.

- Knysh, Alexander. "Arabic and Islamic Studies in Russia." Unpublished paper. 2007.
- Kozhukhovskaia, A.A, ed. *Istoriia Otechestvennogo Vostokovedeniia s serediny XIX veka do 1917 goda*.
- Krachkovskiĭ, Ignatiĭ Iulianovich. *Izbrannye Sochineniia*. Moscow: Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1956.
- . *Nad Arabskimi Rukopisami: listki vospominaniĭ o knigakh i liudiakh*. Moscow: Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1946.
- Layton, Susan. *Russian Literature and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Lisivoĭ, Nikolaĭ Nikolaevich. *Russkoe Duxovnoe i politicheskoe Prisutstvie v sviatoĭ zemle i na blizhnem vostoke v XIX – nachale XX vekov*. Moscow, Indrik: 2006.
- Lukács, György. *The Historical Novel*. Beacon: Boston, 1963.
- Maḥāmīd, ‘Umar. *Filistīn Rūsiyyā: Alf ‘ām min al-‘alāqāt*. Jerusalem, 2008.
- . *Rossiiā — Palestina dialog na rubezhe XIX-XX vekov*. Sankt-Peterburg: Liki Rossii, 2002.
- Naumkin, Vitaliĭ Viacheslavovich. *Neizvestnye Stranytsy Otechestvennogo Vostokovedeniia*. Moscow: Vostochnaia Literatura, 1997.
- Nu’aymah, Mīkhā’īl. *Sab’ūn: Hikāyat ‘amr*. Beirut, Dār al-Ṣadr: 1964.
- . *Ab'ad min Mūsū wa-min Washiṭun*. Beirut: Dār al-Ṣadr, 1966.
- O'Bell, Leslie. "Pushkin's Novel *The Captain's Daughter* as Fictional Family Memoir." *Pushkin Review/Pushkinskiĭ vestnik*. vol. 10 (2007): 47 - 57.  
<<http://www.pushkiniana.org>>.
- Pushkin, Alexander Sergeevich. *Kapitanskaia Dochka*. in *Sovremennik*. vol. 4. November 1836. pp. 42-215.

- Sahni, Kalpana. *Crucifying the Orient: Russian orientalism and the colonization of Caucasus and Central Asia*. Bangkok: White Orchid, 1997.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- . *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- . *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.
- Şālih, Jihād. *Khalīl Baydas : rā'id al-qiṣṣah al-qaṣīrah al-ḥadīthah fī filasṭīn wa-awwal saḡīr lil-adab al-Rūsī fī al-thaqāfah al-'Arabīyah*. Ramallah: al-markaz al-filistīnī li-l-dirāsāt wa-l-nashr. 2005.
- Sāmūk, Sa'dūn Mahmūd. *Al-Istishrāq al-Rūsī: dirāsah tārikhīyyah shāmīlah*. Amman: Dār al-Manāhij, 2003.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." in Lefevre, André. *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Assen, Pays Bas: Van Gorcum, 1977.
- Selim, Samah. *The Novel and the Rural Imaginary in Egypt 1880-1985*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- . "The *Nahda*, Popular Fiction and the Politics of Translation." *MIT Electronic Journal of Middle East Studies*. 4 (Fall 2004): 71-90.
- . "The Narrative Craft: realism and fiction in the Arabic canon." *Edebiyat*. 14:1, 2. New York: Routledge, 2003. pp. 109-128.
- . "The People's Entertainments: Translation, Popular Fiction, and the *Nahdah* in Egypt." in *Other Renaissances: A New Approach to World Literature*. Brenda Deen Schildgen, Gang Zhou, Sandra Gilman, eds. Gordonsville: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. pp. 35-58.

- Smilianskaia, I.M., ed. *Siriia, Livan i Palestina v opisaniiaxh rossiiskikh puteshchestvennikov, konsul'skikh i voennykh obzorakh pervoi poloviny 19ogo veka*. Moscow: Nauka, 1991.
- Soplenkov, S.V. *Doroga v Arzrum: rossiiskaia obshchestvennaia mysl' o vostoce*. Moscow: Vostochnaia Literatura, 2000.
- Spivak, Gayatri. *Death of a Discipline*. 2003. New York: Columbia UP, 2003.
- Tagledin, Shaden. *Seductions of Translation*. Berkeley: U California P, 2011.
- . "One Comparative Literature?: "Birth" of a Discipline in French-Egyptian Translation, 1810-1834." in *Comparative Literature Studies*. 47:4 (2010). pp. 417-445.
- Thompson, Ewa. *Imperial Knowledge: Russian Literature and Colonialism*. London: Greenwood, 2000.
- Todorova, Maria. "Does Russian Orientalism Have a Russian Soul?" *Kritika*. 2001.
- Tolstoy, Aleksey Konstantinovich. *Kniaz' Serebrianyi*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. St. Petersburg, 1880.
- Trivedi, Haresh. "Colonial Influence, Postcolonial Intertextuality: Western Literature and Indian." *Forum for Modern Language Studies*. 43:2. pp. 121-133.
- 'ubayd Allah, Muḥammad. *al-qiṣṣah al-qaṣīrah fī filisṭīn wa-al-urdun*. Amman: Ministry of Culture, 2001.
- Uspenskiĭ, Porfiriĭ. *Kniga Bytiia Moego: dnevniki i avtobiograficheskiia zapiski episkopa Porfiriia Uspenskago*. St. Petersburg: Imperaterskaia Akademiia Nauk, 1896.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: a history of translation*. London: Routledge. 1994.
- . *The Scandals of Translation*. London: Routledge. 1998.

---. "Local Contingencies: Translation and National Identities." *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*. Ed. Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood. Princeton: Princeton UP. 2005. pp. 177-202.

Vorob'eva, Irina Aleksandrovna. *Russkie Missii v Sviatoï Zemle v 1847-1917 godakh*. Moscow: Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, In-t vostokovedeniia, 2001.

Yāghī, Abd al-Raḥmān. *al-juhūd al-riwā'iyyah min Salīm al-Bustānī ilā Najīb Maḥfūz*. Beirut: Dār al-'awdah. 1972.