

Arabic Translation Work:

Taha Abdurrahman (Author)

The Islamic Application of the Principle of Modern Rationality*

Tarik ElFalih¹ & Layachi El-Habbouch² (Translators)

^{1&2}Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, Tétouan, Morocco

Email1 : tarik.elfalih@etu.uae.ac.ma

Email2 : l.elhabouch@uae.ac.ma

Orcid1  : [0009-0003-7945-9884](https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7945-9884)

Received	Accepted	Published
20/9/2024	31/10/2024	31/10/2024

doi : 10.5281/zenodo.14061950

Cite this article as: Abdurrahman, T. (2024). The Spirit of Modernity: A Prolegomenon to Laying the Foundations of Islamic Modernity (T, ElFalih., & L, El-Habbouch. Trans.). *Arabic Journal for Translation Studies*, 3(9), 307-327.

Abstract

This paper sheds light on the transformative dimensions of translation as conceptualized by the Moroccan philosopher Taha Abdurrahman in his book "*Rouh Al-Lhadata: Al-Madkhal ila Taassis Al-Hadatha Al-Islamiya*" [*The Spirit of Modernity: A Prolegomenon to Laying the Foundations of Islamic Modernity*]. I attempt to translate chapter three from Taha's book in which he theorizes about translation studies. The latter is central to Abdurrahman's intellectual project, which he considers as a call to transcend the pervasive Eurocentrism that characterizes contemporary translation theories. Abdurrahman offers a nuanced critique of the translation methodologies employed during the Abbasid period, particularly the uncontextualized appropriation of Greek philosophy. He contends that this approach led to the marginalization of Islamic philosophy, reducing it to a mode of mere transmission and dependency, initially on ancient Greece and subsequently on the modern West. To address these historical inadequacies, Abdurrahman advocates for an innovative and creative translation strategy termed as Modern Translation and accountable autonomy. This strategy emphasizes a transformative process whereby the source text is integrated into the receiving culture, aligning with its specific epistemic and cultural needs, irrespective of the original context. Abdurrahman posits that this method is essential for fostering an autonomous Arab/Islamic philosophical tradition, one that is not subsumed under external theoretical paradigms, even if this necessitates deviating from conventional criteria of accuracy and faithfulness. This paper critically engages with the theoretical foundations that will be highlighted through the translation of chapter three in Taha's book *The Spirit of Modernity: A Prolegomenon to Laying the Foundations of Islamic Modernity* and it proposes practical applications of Abdurrahman's translation paradigm. It also situates Taha's framework within the broader historical trajectory of translation in the Arabic intellectual tradition and contemporary translation studies.

Keywords: Translation, Islamic philosophy, Faithfulness, Autonomy, Western centrism

© 2024, ElFalih & El-Habbouch, licensee Democratic Arab Center. This Translated Paper is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0), which permits non-commercial use of the material, appropriate credit, and indication if changes in the material were made. You can copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format as well as remix, transform, and build upon the material, provided the original work is properly cited.

* Abdurrahman, T. (2006). *Al-Tatbiq al-Islami li-Mabda' al-Rushd al-Hadathi* [The Islamic Application of the Principle of Modern Rationality]. In *Ruh al-Hadatha: Al-Madkhal ila Ta'asis al-Hadatha al-Islamiyya* [*The Spirit of Modernity: An Introduction to Founding an Islamic Modernity*] (pp. 141–174). Casablanca: Arab Cultural Center.

Earlier in Chapter Two, I discussed how the Islamic concept of accountable autonomy, derived from the principle of Majority, which itself stems from the principles of modernity, represents a form of accountable independence. This concept enables Muslims to free themselves from the guardianship of others, which can constrain their intellectual freedom and limit their creative potential. My aim in this chapter is to demonstrate how accountable autonomy meets the true demands of modern translation, in contrast to the notion of the transmitted independence that has influenced Arabic translation practices in modern times.

We will examine the forms of guardianship from which the translator must liberate themselves and how this can be achieved. I will argue that each text is closely tied to guardianship in two ways: when a translator frees themselves from one form, they often find themselves subject to another. Furthermore, the guardianship they break free from is that of another person over them, while the new guardianship they establish becomes their own authority over someone else. In other words, the more a translator distances themselves from the guardianship of others, the more they assert their own authority over someone else. The ability to reformulate a text hinges not only on the translator's capacity to free themselves from another's guardianship, but also on their skill in exercising this newfound authority. There is no real distinction between these two phases in the practice of guardianship in translation. The original text and the translated text both appear, on the surface, to impose their authority on the translator. However, beneath the surface, the translator exercises their own guardianship over the text, shaping it according to their interpretation. While the original text seems to exert control over the translator, it is in fact, the translator who wields influence over the text, subtly imposing their own perspective and authority within the translation.

As previously mentioned, one of the key avenues for Muslims to engage with modernity is through reconnecting with the other, a process facilitated by the innovative practice of translation, which enables accountable autonomy¹. Given the translator's crucial role in the process of modernization, they must exert even greater effort than others to break free from the clear dependency that can come with translation. This autonomy must be evident in the translated text, ensuring that it is not merely an extension of the original author's work. The translator must go so far as to practice liberation from the guardianship of the original text or any other related texts. However, what the translator perceives as guardianship may differ from what the writer sees as guardianship, and vice versa. In other words, the translator and the writer may have differing views on what constitutes guardianship, leading to varying approaches in their work.

If the translator violates or disregards this condition, they inevitably risk adopting the same approach to independence as the author of the original text. In doing so, they may mistakenly perceive the guardianship imposed on them as identical to that imposed on the author. In such cases, the translator might feel compelled to free themselves from what they believe is the same guardianship the author faced, rather than recognizing the true guardianship represented by the text at hand. This guardianship symbolizes the influence of others on the translator, not the translator's influence over others. Therefore, the

translator must be careful to distinguish between these forms of guardianship to genuinely achieve independence in their translation.

Once the nature of the guardianship from which the translator must seek liberation is established, it is valuable to consider the principles of free translation into Arabic. These principles are not confined to the credibility or utility of Arabic translations alone but extend to any translation, regardless of the language. Thus, understanding and applying these principles can enhance the practice of translation across different linguistic contexts.

It is well known that the Arabic translation movement began in the modern era at the beginning of the nineteenth century, marking the onset of what is often referred to as "the Modern Arabic Intellectual Renaissance" or the Arabic Enlightenment. This modern movement is considered the second phase of Arabic translation, distinguished from the first phase that took place during the Abbasid era. Egypt led this new phase, spearheaded by the linguistic school founded by Mohamed Ali Pasha, as indicated by Rifai Al-Tahtawi², the pioneer of modern Arabic translation. The works produced during this second phase are clearly connected to modernity. However, they are characterized by what I refer to as "accountable autonomy." This form of independence does not directly implement one of the core principles of modernity but rather mimics an older application from the West that was perceived as contemporary reality. It is as if the spirit of modernity could only sustain a single mode of execution, even though this notion had already been rendered obsolete³.

In this regard, I will consider this modern experience of Arabic translation as a form of realignment; it operates within a framework where its progression toward a second mode of autonomy has established foundations and concepts that, if not fundamentally flawed, do not require re-examination.

1. Critique of Arabic Postulates of Translation

The second phase of Arabic translation is founded on several principles, three of which I will discuss: the first is "the principle of equivalence between ancient and modern translation experiences," the second is "the concept of a single translation per book," and the third is "the idea of one translation per translator." I will elaborate on these principles in the following sections.

1.1 The Postulate of Similarities between the two Arabic Experiences in Translation

The second phase of Arabic translation is comparable to the first in that it is based on the principle of similarities recognized by Arabic linguists⁴ during the Abbasid era⁵. However, this principle has since been rendered obsolete, and its nullification can be explained by the following reasons:

A- The first phase of translation was voluntary and driven by a desire to assert self-identity and realize its vast potential. In contrast, the second phase was a hasty reaction motivated by self-defence, which led to more limited constraints.

B- In the first phase of translation, Arabic scholars operated from a position of strength, using translation to shape their cultural identity and develop their own civilization. In contrast, the second phase was undertaken by latecomers in a position of weakness, profoundly influenced by the backwardness of their societies. This societal decline has contributed to psychological challenges that threaten their identities and well-being.

C- The first phase of translation prioritized selecting writings that would not conflict with Islamic ethics. In contrast, the second phase focused on translating a wide range of texts, regardless of whether they might conflict with Islamic moral standards.

D- The first phase of translation focused on texts from a bygone civilization, even if its relics still existed. In contrast, the second phase translated materials from a developing civilization with the aim of shaping human history in the modern era.

As a result of these factors, the level of independence was more pronounced in the first phase of translation compared to the second. This discrepancy is due to two main factors: First, the first phase was characterized by initiative, where translations were carefully selected and empowered, whereas the second phase was driven by necessity. The guardianship applied to translated texts in the first phase was less effective compared to that in the second phase because the earlier guardianship lacked the support of an emerging civilization. In contrast, the modern guardianship of the second phase is based on the dominant civilization, though it lacks the insightful initiation seen in the earlier phase.

2.1 The Postulate of a Single Translation per Book

The second postulate argues that multiple translations of a single book by different translators is a waste of time. I can address this by providing bibliographical evidence, a network, or data that consolidates all information about translated books and their translators. This argument is unacceptable for the following reasons:

A- Translation does not negate or equate to the original text; regardless of its accuracy, a translation cannot invalidate other translation efforts related to the original text. Even if a translator is dissatisfied with previous translations, they have the right to re-translate the original text, addressing any shortcomings in the initial translation. Moreover, even if the previous translation meets their satisfaction, a translator can still produce a new and distinct translation.

B- Translations vary depending on requirements and contexts; the translator aligns their translation with a specific goal and context. As goals evolve, the approach to translation may also change. Additionally, the language of translation can be improved in structure, substance, and usage. Therefore, translations must be updated in accordance with developments in semiotics, semantics, and usage to ensure that they do not weaken or disrupt the reader's connection with the original work.

C- Although translators are classified into various categories, they each have different perceptions of translation and often follow similar methods. Some prioritize

the source language, while others focus on the target language. Some approach the material from the author's perspective, while others consider the reader's viewpoint. Additionally, most, if not all, translators categorize translation into two main types: "scientific translation," which emphasizes precise terminology, and "literary translation," which focuses on rhetorical figures⁶. There are also additional types: "philosophical translation," which deals with logical meanings, and "religious translation," which addresses spiritual principles. These differing perspectives and styles inevitably lead to variations and divergences in translation works.

The conclusion of these various interpretations is that translators' attitudes toward the rules of the original text vary based on their perspectives. For some, these rules are seen as essential and must be respected to maintain the author's intent and privacy, resulting in a translation that closely follows the original text. Conversely, other translators may view these constraints as limitations that hinder their ability to express themselves, restrict their creative freedom, or misinterpret their understanding of the text. As a result, they may choose to bypass these constraints. Unlike the first category, the second category of translators exhibits flexibility that extends to the level of accountable action.

3.1. The Postulate of One Translator's Translation

In the third principle, it is argued that re-translating the same book is pointless, and that any corrections or edits to an existing translation should not be considered a new translation. Although this perspective is widely held, I must address it with the following objections:

A) The outcome of translation varies based on the segmentation of readers; not every translation aimed at a specific audience will be suitable for others. Since the goal is to influence readers, either through shaping their views or guiding their understanding, the translator must tailor the translation to each reader segment's context and needs to effectively persuade them.

B) The outcome of translation varies depending on the reader's level; not every translation that is effective for a reader at a particular stage of development will necessarily be useful for others. To achieve the goal of influencing the reader, the translator must adapt the translation according to these developmental levels. It is unreasonable to assert that while the author produces only one original text, the translator should only provide one translation. This is because there are multiple methods of translation, even though the original text is singular. Assuming that translation can be accomplished once without considering the need to adapt to the original text's nuances is not accurate.

C) Each translation opens different possibilities. When a translator chooses a specific translation, they inevitably alter the original text to some extent. Thus, each translation process can be characterized by a degree of acceptance, while the original text is subject to various requirements. For example, before selecting the most

appropriate phrase, the translator encounters a range of terms that could convey the intended meaning. Additionally, the translator considers multiple options for each term from the original text and uses each in different contexts, as if integrating various translations with the original text.

In response to the previous objections, a translator's approach to the guardianship of the original text varies depending on the context. The translator may adhere to this oversight to preserve the integrity of the original text and facilitate targeting specific readers, or they may choose to deviate from it to establish a unique perspective in their own translation, independent of existing oversight. Such deviations can occur gradually as the translator moves away from adhering to traditional guardianship or shifts the focus of authenticity based on the reader's understanding.

The conclusion of this issue is that the three principles underlying the second phase of Arabic translation are invalid. Consequently, this experience is not comparable to those of the Abbasid era. The significance of translation independence and alignment with the author is clear. There is only one authenticity that does not require multiple translations by different translators. This is because translators exhibit their independence in various ways: either by closely aligning with the writer's original intent or by establishing their own distinct independence. Additionally, a single original work may require multiple translations by one translator, reflecting different forms of independence, sometimes adhering to the author's perspective and other times creating their own. This results in translations that may evolve through various stages.

2. Critique of Modernization Concept

The phrase "something happened" denotes modernization, or the transformation from an ancient state to a modern one. Thus, I must state that modern Islamic and Arabic intellect involves renewal. Arabic linguists have recently been engaged in modernizing their intellectual frameworks, which is beyond their control, from two perspectives:

One perspective is that modernization is driven by thoughts and ideas, particularly those integrated from Western cultural production. This influence is seen as a primary factor in advancing societies, whether through civilization or modernization.

The second perspective is that the adopted structures of thought and ideas are specific tools that are used wisely to modernize Arabic Islamic thought until it reaches a stage of modernity.

In this regard, it is important to note that this modernization is external, relying on externally adapted tools. This type of external modernization is so different that it can appear as an illusion rather than genuine modernization. I will outline a few of these differences:

1.2 The Vagueness of what ought to be adopted and what ought not to

An Arabic-speaking Muslim may adopt what is not truly new but merely ancient, discarding what should be preserved. This approach involves adopting superfluous elements that should be eliminated, integrating what is local rather than universal, or incorporating what is detrimental to growth or civilization, which should be avoided. Additionally, due to intellectual differences between the origin of this thought and its adaptation, the process may result in changes where initially apparent adaptations become limited, familiar elements turn alien, useful concepts become useless, and nearby ideas become distant. When such changes occur, it is necessary for the adaptor to begin rectifying what has been adopted. Generally, though, they may maintain the status quo, as if unable to distinguish the change or fearful of advancing in the adoption process.

2.2 The Vagueness of poor reasoning and the power of Adoption

The adaptor follows a path that assesses the renaissance of Arabic and Islamic society based on the modernity of non-Islamic societies, regardless of the historical, cultural, and civilizational gaps between them. This complex evaluative approach can be illustrated as follows:

- ** Religious reforms have been implemented in non-Islamic societies, leading to the expectation that Islamic and Arabic societies should similarly follow these reforms.
- ** Furthermore, these societies achieved a comprehensive cultural modernization known as the "renaissance," which Islamic and Arabic societies are also expected to undertake.
- ** Those societies experienced a period of enlightenment that emphasized rationality, and Arabic society is no exception.
- ** These societies have undergone political revolutions, and Arabic society is expected to follow a similar path.

The adopter does not merely stop at making a nonsensical comparison, claiming that non-Islamic societies have improved; it goes further by intruding into aspects of this supposed development. For instance, it suggests that during the Age of Enlightenment, these societies separated religion from politics, a change that, according to the adopter, Islamic societies should also adopt. Furthermore, it argues that these societies prioritized rationality over religion, a shift that our civilization must likewise achieve. Finally, it implies that these societies view religion as a matter of personal intellectual belief, which, by extension, suggests that Arab society should also treat religion as a personal affair.

Upon recognizing the weakness of this comparison, the adopter turns to his Islamic history and heritage, attempting to justify his beliefs by drawing parallels to the reforms in these foreign societies. He deludes himself into thinking that the adoptions he promotes are nothing more than a natural progression in line with these developments.

2.3 The Vagueness of replacing authentic Tradition with adopted one

When this adoption is practiced by Muslim Arabs, who are believed to be the originators of modernity for others, it becomes essential to examine the origins and reasons behind the classification of these intellectual pursuits within the historical context of non-Islamic cultures from which they were adopted. This examination must also consider the outcomes of such adoptions, especially when the true nature of these influences remains misunderstood. Moreover, the precision with which these adoptions are applied within their respective specialties must be scrutinized to ensure they are appropriate for a different cultural heritage.

Consequently, whenever a new element of the desired civilization was established by the adopted heritage, it was often abandoned under the belief that it could not be further developed. This abandonment, without doubt, creates a disconnect between the adopter's past and present. This disconnection may stem from one of two causes: either the adopter becomes entrenched in a parallel world incapable of critical thinking, or he diminishes his intellectual capacity in an effort to protect it.

2.4 The Vagueness of adhering to Adoption

The following three factors contribute to the long-term viability of adoption:

First, the adopter appears to be weak in that he does not establish their own civilization, but rather focuses on protecting their existence from the threat posed by another civilization. This weakness is evident in their lack of confidence in their own civilization's capabilities. Even when plagued by feelings of inferiority, he/she attempts to adopt others' ideas, regardless of whether he/she fully understands their meanings. Moreover, they may feel compelled to reject the adoption of certain ideas if they conflict with their field, despite this mandatory rejection.

Second, these others' ideas are inherently diverse and dynamic, prompting the adopter to exert more effort, often driven by greed, in seeking them out. However, the gap between developing these ideas and merely adopting them remains substantial. As this gap widens, the process of adoption becomes increasingly demanding, perpetuating a cycle of further adoption.

2.5 Identity Crisis

Human identities can be classified into three categories:

A- The Fixed Identity:⁷ This refers to the ability to perceive oneself consistently as oneself while also recognizing others as reflections of oneself.

B- The Soft Identity:⁸ This refers to the ability to see yourself through the eyes of others and, conversely, to view others through your own perspective.

C- The Fluid Identity:⁹ This refers to the experience of seeing yourself entirely through the eyes of others, and likewise, perceiving others only from their own perspective.

It is evident that a person who adopts their thoughts from others and strictly adheres to them possesses only the third type of identity, the melting identity. This approach gradually diminishes their own identity, yet they continue to develop their adoption step by step. They begin by adopting concepts and ideas that seem crucial for modernizing their intellect, and then proceed to adapt the underlying principles of those concepts to fully integrate them. The process involves continuous modification, establishment, and completion until their adoption is finalized, ultimately confined to new, enduring conceptions.

There are several misunderstandings surrounding the notion of adoption, five of which we have highlighted: confusion and lack of implications, replacement of tradition, durable adoption, and dissolution of identity. These issues indicate that modernizing the Islamic and Arabic intellect often involves merely adopting and replicating others' ideas and ways of thinking. Such unreciprocated adoption is essentially imitation, and dependent imitation is superficial. Consequently, the process of modernizing the Arabic Islamic mind remains elusive. Those who cannot differentiate between genuine and counterfeit modernity will likely remain sceptical of this outcome.

Quoting/Adoption from outside Arab Islamic thought offers limited value in modernizing it; translation, as an example of such external adoption, often proves ineffective in this regard.

Despite the seeming strangeness and contradiction of this finding to common sense, reality presents a different picture. It is widely recognized that the second phase of Arabic translation, which began in the nineteenth century, continues to this day, although it has sometimes been weak.

Has this nearly two-century-long experiment produced a new Islamic Arab thought, one that balances giving with receiving, independence with subjugation, and allows an Arabic-speaking Muslim to engage with global issues and contribute alongside other world thinkers?

Some scholars deny the existence of a creative, independent thought among modern Muslim Arab intellectuals, arguing that translation has overshadowed Arabic Islamic production¹⁰ to the extent that it has stifled original thinking. Conversely, others deny the existence of such thinking by asserting that there has been insufficient emphasis on translation¹¹. There are also those who fail to differentiate between the two Arabic translation experiences, the Abbasid and Renaissance periods, seeing them as unfruitful. They argue that while the first experiment produced significant scientific contributions, it failed in the philosophical realm, claiming that "Islamic Philosophy" is merely an impractical attempt to reconcile Islamic and Greek philosophies (as seen in the works of Al Farabi and Avicenna) or an explanation of Greek philosophy with superficial adjustments (as argued by Averroes)¹². In contrast, some scholars distinguish between the two translation periods, contending that the first, despite its brevity, generated a new thought, while the second, despite its extended duration, did not produce substantial results¹³.

Despite their differing opinions, these academics argue that the recent translations have not aided Arab Islamic thought in modernizing to the extent that it can give as much as it receives and remain independent while engaging with others. Some attribute this failure to the stifling effect of translation on Arab Islamic originality, while others blame the lack of completion in the translation process. Examining the differences in these two groups' approaches reveals that both have overlooked a crucial aspect of translation which is the technique that is used.

If this method is flawed, then no amount of thoughtful translation or time spent will enable us to create and contribute effectively, contrary to the belief of those who argue that there is an excess of translation. Conversely, if the method is sound, then even a few translations or a shorter translation period, contrary to the belief that more translation is needed, could still provide us with the capacity to innovate and contribute.

To conclude, if translation fails to modernize Arab intellect, the issue is not with the quantity of translation but with the method used. The current method does not qualify translation to enable us to innovate and create effectively. This inadequacy is evident in the fact that it relies too heavily on the external transfer¹⁴ of ideas without fostering true independence.

We cannot develop this capability unless we elevate translation from mere external transfer to a level of internal creativity. This advancement requires adopting a different form of independence, which I term "accountable autonomy." This leads to the question: How can translation, which is inherently an external process, be transformed into an internally creative force? Specifically, how can Arabic translation achieve independence and responsibility in relation to original texts, thereby allowing Arab Islamic thought to reach a phase of genuine creativity?

To address this question, it is essential to investigate the concept of translation.

3. Critiquing the Concept of Translation

It is important to recognize that translating any text requires a specific objective. Simply stating that "the translator's goal is to fulfil the intent of the author's speech" is insufficient, as this goal is overly simplistic and assumes that the translator will inherently achieve it. Instead, the translator's objective should be comparable and parallel to that of the author. The author's aim is to impact a particular aspect of the recipient who speaks the same language and operates within a similar interactive context. Consequently, the translator should also aim to influence a recipient who speaks the same language and works in a related field¹⁵.

This influence should be aligned with the needs of the Arabic-speaking recipient, who primarily seeks intellectual liberation. Therefore, the translator must focus on emancipating the mind. This can only be achieved if the translator demonstrates the ability to free themselves from the constraints of the original text. Liberation is signified by the translator producing their own interpretation, rather than merely reproducing the original in another language, as was traditionally done. Instead, the translator should engage in

"exploratory translation," which involves a deeper examination of the original text rather than just reproduction.

Unlike reproduction, which involves the translator transferring the original method or text as-is, exploratory translation requires the translator to assert independence from the original text. The responsibility in exploratory translation is to innovate and provide new insights, whereas reproduction necessitates adhering closely to the original text or earlier versions of it.

3.1. Characteristics of Exploratory Translation

Exploratory Translation is not aimed at simply conveying how the author has developed their text, as was previously thought. Instead, it strives to transfer the methods used by the author in such a way that the recipient can produce a text comparable to the original. This means that the exploratory translator examines the original text primarily from the perspective of the recipient, presenting it in a manner that allows the recipient to grasp the creative essence of the author's work and prepare to recreate it. In short, Exploratory Translation is a form of translation that reveals to the recipient the methods for generating equivalents of the original text.

Since my focus is on the modernization of Arab Islamic thought, it is essential to explore how intellectual translation can function as exploratory translation. Intellectual translation differs from other types because it deals with ideological texts, which are grounded in two main pillars: the problematic aspect and the connotations. Every intellectual text must be problematic, meaning it raises several questions, and connotative, meaning it provides a set of evidence. Upon examining these questions and connotations closely, we find that they operate on at least three levels: the logical level, the semantic level, and the structural level.

The logical level of the problematic aspect involves the ways in which concepts are structured around specific questions. The connotative level pertains to the moral content of these concerns, while the structural level is found within the expressive formulas of these questions.

Similarly, the logical level of the connotative aspect relates to the forms of cases constructed around the evidence that supports a certain fact. The connotative level addresses the moral content of this evidence, and the structural level is present within the expressive formulas of the evidence.

The exploratory translator's responsibility is to thoroughly identify the problematic elements and evidentiary mechanisms in the text they intend to translate. However, this recognition does not necessarily require transferring these elements and mechanisms, along with their judgments, into the target language. This distinction highlights the differences in needs between the recipients of the original text and those of the translation, as well as the various characteristics of their respective languages and interactive contexts.

The properties of the intellectual text outlined above lead to four key outcomes:

First, the translator's exploration takes three primary forms, corresponding to the different problematic and connotative levels: logical, semantic, and structural. The translator's goal is to reveal to the recipient how each of these levels can be constructed. These methods mirror those employed by the author but are now perceived through the recipient's interactive field. This perspective may result in modifications depending on this field. The key criterion for determining the legitimacy and reasonableness of such changes is the ability of the original text to convey its creative power effectively.

Second, the different levels of an intellectual text, logical, semantic, and structural, make it impossible to transfer the text while preserving all three creative powers simultaneously. If one level is preserved, the other two may not be. Even though languages may be equal at the logical level, they are not necessarily equal at the semantic and structural levels. The logical creative power of a language is not always aligned with the semantic and structural aspects, as the imaginative connotative force may differ significantly between languages. Therefore, translation should account for these multiple levels, with each translation highlighting a different aspect of the original text's creative power.

Third, the translation of an intellectual text should ideally be undertaken by a single translator, who must address all three levels, logical, semantic, and structural. This is akin to a person who starts translating or writing a book but does not complete it; it would be incorrect to claim that the text has been translated or written unless all levels are fully addressed. Variations in scientific education and translation methods among translators might lead to differences in handling each level. Nonetheless, to ensure comprehensive translation, only one translator should manage all three levels.

Fourth, the translation of intellectual texts should follow a specific order: logical level first, semantic level second, and structural level last. This order starts from the specific and moves to the general. The logical content is fundamental, as it includes the questions and evidence that define the intellectual text; understanding this is crucial for the recipient. The author's primary aim is to present these questions and evidence. The semantic content, which relies on the logical content for its specification, comes next. Since different semantic contents can correspond to a single logical structure, its translation may need to be deferred. Finally, the structural formation, which lacks its own semantic content, is the last to be translated. Different structural formations can align with the same semantic content, so their translation should also be postponed until the semantic content is fully addressed.

After explaining the exploratory method of intellectual translation and its implications, it is essential to demonstrate how this approach equips the Arab Muslim recipient with the inner modernization capability, which is fundamental to achieving modernization.

3.2. Exploratory Translation is based on three pillars

The Arabic-speaking Muslim recipient needs to engage with the creative mechanisms present in the translations they encounter. When these translations effectively highlight the

creative forces inherent in the original texts, the recipient is more likely to be inspired to practice and apply similar methods. To achieve this, exploratory translation necessitates three distinct translations of a single intellectual text: logical, semantic, and structural. These translations can be considered the pillars of exploratory translation. It is essential to explain how the recipient can acquire and apply these creative practices through the mechanisms provided at each of the three levels of translation.

3.2.1 Logical Translation

Logical translation focuses on conveying the mental structures that constitute the intellectual content of the original text. This structure comprises two main groups: the set of questions addressed by the text and the set of evidence that supports these answers. In an intellectual text, these questions and evidence are of paramount importance. Therefore, the more attentively the translator handles these elements, the more effectively the Arabic-speaking recipient will grasp the mechanisms of thought construction and learn how to apply them.

At the logical level, the translator must focus on accurately conveying the logical structure of the original text. The semantic and structural translations should be aligned with this logical construct as follows: if the semantic and structural aspects are compatible with the logical structure, they should be translated as they are. If they are not compatible, the translator should adapt or replace these aspects with semantic and structural forms that align with the logical construct. By doing so, if the translator opts to modify rather than retain the original aspects, the Arabic-speaking recipient may need to put more effort into understanding the logical constructs, ultimately leading them to achieve a deeper understanding of logical creativity. In essence, at the logical translation level, the translator should adjust the semantic and structural elements of the text to fit the logical structure in accordance with the Arabic Islamic interaction field, taking full responsibility for maintaining independence from the constraints and influences of the original text.

It is well understood that the semantic and structural adjustments made by the translator contribute to the creativity of the translation. By integrating original ideas with creative expressions, this approach enhances the Arabic-speaking recipient's readiness to engage in creative thought, moving beyond mere imitation. The recipient encounters new concepts presented in familiar and clearly articulated structures, which encourages them to rephrase these ideas in their own words, as guided by the translator. This process may even inspire the recipient to develop new ideas on the same level as the author, using similar mechanisms to create a text with different content. Alternatively, this approach helps the recipient expand their mental capacity and strengthen their creative abilities, without necessarily replicating the author's ideas.

Given the translator's creative approach, the Arabic-speaking recipient does not need to understand every element of the intellectual text. Instead, what is essential is grasping the logical structure of the text. Once the recipient comprehends this logical framework, they

can choose to overlook the semantic and structural details if they wish. However, if the logical structure is not understood, knowing the other aspects is of little use.

If the translator uses semantic and structural forms different from the original, the recipient should not fear losing their grasp of the logical structures. This approach can restore the recipient's confidence in their own abilities and in the potential of their language and interaction field, giving them the feeling that they can achieve results like those of the original author.

The primary obstacle to intellectual creativity among Arabs has been the confusion in translation between what the translator needs to convey and what the recipient needs to know. This confusion also involves the distinction between what the translator can modify and what the recipient can disregard. This misunderstanding has led to prolonged struggles with decoding the complexities and ambiguities in translations, hindering intellectual progress.

3.2.2. Semantic Translation

Semantic translation addresses the transfer of moral and logical structures from the original text. These structures consist of two sets of meanings: one related to vocabulary and linguistic connotations, and the other connected to values and ideals. At this second level, the translator aims to convey all these meanings, adhering to what can be termed "semantic artistry." This approach prevents the translator from introducing meanings and content that might seem strange to an Arabic-speaking audience, as they could conflict with the values and components of their cultural context.

The audience is less likely to react negatively to these connotations because the author has already ensured they are appropriate for this cultural sphere. Without this prior awareness and understanding of the logical structure, the recipient might have dramatized these connotations and experienced a decline in self-esteem in trying to replicate them.

At this level, because the translator is focused on transferring the original text's moral structure, the transfer of the text's overall structure follows this moral transfer. If the translator finds that the structural transfer is compatible with the semantic transfer, the structure will remain unchanged. However, if a contradiction arises between the structural and semantic transfers, the translator should remove the conflicting structure and replace it with forms that align with the semantic content.

If the contradictory structure is not removed, it will create obstacles for the Arabic-speaking recipient, making it difficult for them to fully assimilate the semantic content. This, in turn, would prevent them from engaging in the semantic creativity necessary for understanding the text.

In brief, at the level of semantic translation, the translator adjusts the structure of the original text as needed to convey the semantic content in a way that aligns with the interaction field of the Arabic-speaking Muslim recipient. The translator bears full responsibility for making these modifications, ensuring independence from the original structures that might otherwise exert undue influence.

The goal of transferring the semantic structure of the original text is not merely to inform the Arabic-speaking recipient in a way that benefits their intellectual development or enhances their creative abilities¹⁶. Instead, the aim is to convey meanings and values derived from their own interaction field. The purpose is not so much to expand the intellectual potential of the self but to allow the recipient to understand the other's semantic uniqueness.

When the Arabic-speaking recipient recognizes the distinctiveness in the translation, they may seek to free their mind from it, understanding its limitations. They will then replace it with their own semantic uniqueness, thereby fostering a creative interaction that differs from the original author's. The creativity that emerges from the recipient's understanding of the semantic structures serves as evidence of their ability to grasp the properties of another's interaction realm. In contrast, creativity derived from understanding the logical structures indicates growth in their intellectual composition.

3.2.3. Structural Translation

Structural translation focuses on transferring the grammatical structures that support or shape the semantic content of the original text. These structures can be divided into two categories: single words or units and combinations of phrases. At this third level, the translator strives to convey all these forms and phrases, adhering to what might be termed "structural professionalism." However, this approach may sometimes result in the translator producing awkward constructions or unsuitable phrases that do not conform to the rules of the Arabic language.

The purpose of transferring structural formations is not to convey to the Arab recipient the meanings and values drawn from their own cultural context. Instead, it is to acquaint them with the unique morphological forms and grammatical phrases from the other language or to help them understand the other through their structural composition. When the Arabic-speaking Muslim recipient recognizes this element in the translation, they may become eager to free themselves from it, confident in its lack of necessity.

They then replace it with structural features from their own language, fostering a creativity that possesses grammatical qualities different from those of the original author. Just as the creativity that arises from semantic translation differs from their own, so does the creativity that begins with logical translation, based on structure. This structural inventiveness reflects the recipient's grasp of the grammatical characteristics of the other language.

Having defined the structural and functional characteristics of the three types of translations that form the basis of exploratory translation¹⁷, let's now examine some of the key distinctions between them.

3.3. The distinguishing features among the pillars of exploratory translation

A. The three translation methods differ in how they adapt the original text.

Logical translation is the most powerful modifier, as it impacts both the structure and the semantic content of the text. In contrast, semantic translation only affects the structure. Structural translation, however, is unique in that it is not influenced by other structures in the same way as the previous methods¹⁸. This distinction indicates that the translator aims to achieve independence from the constraints of the original text, fully accepting responsibility for their own approach and decisions.

B. These translation methods differ in terms of clarity and length:

- Logical translation is the shortest and clearest because it conveys familiar and well-constructed ideas.
- Semantic translation is less clear and longer, as it communicates ideas that, while correctly constructed, may seem strange or awkward to the recipient.
- Structural translation is the least clear and longest due to its poor structure and unfamiliar meanings.

C. The influence of these categories on the Arabic-speaking recipient varies.

Logical translation aims to deliver the original text's ideas effectively. It does so by presenting a series of questions and proofs rooted in the Arabic Islamic interaction field. If executed correctly, it achieves its intended impact on the Arabic-speaking recipient.

Semantic translation also seeks to convey ideas and connotations based on deeply rooted reasons within the Arabic Islamic interaction field. However, some connotative aspects may not be fully integrated, which can reduce its impact compared to logical translation.

Structural translation is tasked with delivering the ideas, connotations, and structures of the original text within the same interaction field. Yet, if some connotative or structural elements are missing, this can weaken its effect on the recipient and potentially have a negative impact.

D. These categories differ based on the Arabic reader's ability to engage creatively.

- Logical translation prepares the Arabic-speaking recipient to be creative with both structure and connotations, if they understand the logical content of the translation.
- Semantic translation encourages creativity in structural thinking, though this creativity may wane over time. This occurs because the recipient may become constrained by the connotative professionalism if they fail to recognize its presence during the translation.
- Structural translation reduces the recipient's readiness to develop their understanding. This is due to its emphasis on vocabulary and structural professionalism. If the recipient does not notice these elements during the

transition, their ability to engage with the content may be hindered or even obstructed.

E. These categories differ in terms of understanding the other.

- Logical translation conveys the intellectual structures of the original text, highlighting the common ground between the author and the recipient, irrespective of their separate interaction fields. This form of translation enables understanding the self through understanding the general human intellectual energy.
- Semantic translation reveals the connotative structure of the original text, offering insight into the author's perspective shaped by various interaction fields. Knowing the other through semantic translation involves understanding the author's connotative energy.
- Structural translation focuses on the grammatical structures of the original text, exposing another aspect of the author influenced by different interaction fields. Understanding the other through structural translation involves grasping the author's structural formats.

To address two potential objections to this categorization of translations by a single translator:

The First Objection: If the translator exercises a degree of autonomy in their work, they might lose some of this autonomy in semantic and structural translations, resulting in a form of imitated autonomy.

Response: The translator's sense of responsibility and independence is achieved consciously and willingly. By transitioning the recipient from acquiring general ideas to understanding specific differences between the author and their context, and between the author and their language, the translator provides the recipient with the choice to either engage with or disregard these insights. The perceived loss of autonomy in semantic and structural translations is not a genuine loss but a deliberate choice made to broaden the recipient's understanding. While logical translation alone suffices for general comprehension, maintaining structural translation allows the translator to preserve their accountable autonomy and serve as a foundation from which other translations can evolve. Thus, structural translation remains integral, serving as a basis that informs and enhances the other forms of translation.

The Second Objection

If the translator is allowed to be free from the semantic and structural constraints of the original text, they are still bound by the logical structure, provided that it is fully conveyed. Otherwise, their independence could be considered superficial. I address this concern by stating that the logical structure, unlike the semantic and structural aspects, does not impose constraints on the translator. This is because the logical structure is not tied to the author's specific context, field, or language; rather, it pertains to general principles that

transcend individual contexts, even if expressions vary between languages. Since general principles do not impose guardianship, the translator's work based on the original text's logical structure remains genuinely independent.

Finally, I will summarize the results of my examination of the Islamic application of the autonomy pillar of modernity. As previously mentioned, one pathway through which the Arabic-speaking Muslim can engage with Modernity is by reconnecting with others through translation. However, this practice should not entail mere subordination to imitated origins, even if it involves engaging with and communicating with its proponents. Instead, it should involve maintaining responsibility for its independence, recognizing what it offers both to the translator and the recipient of the translation.

It is evident that the translations associated with the Arab modern renaissance were largely unsuccessful. Additionally, it is inappropriate to base this experience solely on the Abbasid era's practices. Whether performed by multiple translators or one, these translations show that modernization, involving external quoting, is fraught with errors. These include conflating what should be quoted with what should not, resulting in weak quotation, altering the original heritage, adhering only to the form of quotation, and losing one's own identity. Consequently, these translations often followed a path of imitation rather than facilitating genuine modernization of Muslim Arabic thought.

To achieve true modernization, translation must adopt a different approach, which we term the "exploratory path." This approach aims to guide the Arabic-speaking Muslim recipient toward the same level of creativity as the original text and allows for an internal updating of Arab Muslim thought. This new path requires the translator to undertake three types of translations, each with varying degrees of modification, and to take responsibility for this independence in the following order:

Logical Translation: Reveals the intellectual structure.

Semantic Translation: Reveals the connotative structure.

Structural Translation: Reveals the grammatical structure.

This exploratory translation requires a reversal of the imitated perspective. In imitated translation, the structure of the original text is prioritized first, followed by meaning, and then evidence, such that the structure affects the meaning, and the meaning affects the evidence. In contrast, exploratory translation reverses this order: it begins with the evidence, followed by the meaning, and then the structure. This approach ensures that the evidence influences the meaning and measurability. True intellectual creation begins with obtaining the evidence in the translated texts, and Islamic Arabic modernity of thought relies on the existence and continuity of this creativity.

Having discussed the Islamic application of the first pillar of majority principle, which manifests in accountable autonomy, and how this application can refresh the link with the other through translation, I will now turn to the Islamic application of the second pillar: Creativity. I will explain how the practice of reading the Quran based on this application can lead to self-discovery and update personal understanding.

Notes:

1. The reader will recall that the second entry is self-discovery, which emphasizes the importance of rereading the Coran. This rereading is seen as essential for achieving the original creativity described in Chapter IV.
2. See History of Translation and Cultural Movement In The Era Of Muhammad Ali by Jamal Al Din Al Shayal.
3. See the Theoretical entry from this book.
4. We alert the reader that wherever the term appears in this book, especially in this chapter, it carries no connotation whatsoever; its precise meaning refers to the language in which the Coran was revealed. Our focus here is on discussing the Islamic application of the spirit of modernity.
5. Kamal Quha, Translation in Modern times, History and Issues in a conference on Translation at the Faculty of Arts, Tunis.
6. See Jean-René LADMIRAL : « Pour une philosophie de la traduction » dans Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale, 94 année / n° 1, 1989.
7. A fixed identity may manifest as a closed identity, a dominant (or bossy) identity, or a self-centered identity.
8. A soft identity or a moist identity may represent an open identity, an unauthorized identity, or even the absence of identity altogether.
9. A fluid identity (or liquid identity) may manifest as an expatriate identity, a concerned identity, or a lost identity.
10. See Hassan Hanafi.1997. Humum Alfikr wal watan.
11. See Atif al-Iraki. Al akl wa tanwir.
12. See Taha Abdurrahman .1996. Fiqh al-Falsafa-1- falsafa wa tarjama.
13. See Hassan Hanafi.1997. Humum Alfikr wal watan.
14. It is meant the original texts to be translated as opposed to the adopted texts.
15. This fact necessitates the invalidation of the principle of restricted translation in the author's language, often referred to as source-oriented translation, in favor of restricted translation in the recipient's language, or destination-oriented translation. Restricted translation in the author's language serves as a translation for the author rather than for the recipient, which contradicts the primary purpose of translation; the essence of translation is to serve the recipient, even if special attention is given to the author's language. Recognizing that every translation must be aimed at the recipient, an element within the translator's deliberative domain, requires the convergence of two actions in translation practice: the external transport of meaning and the internal engagement with the author. This means that the translation process should be guided by an understanding

that stems from within the translator's deliberative domain while also bringing in external elements. We have already noted that this convergence is the condition under which translation can effectively stimulate the recipient's engagement and renewal.

16. It is known that the word "meaning" can be used in two different ways. The first is moral, where "meaning" is equivalent to "value," as in the phrase "spiritual meanings." The second is linguistic, where "meaning" refers to "benefit" or "connotation," as in the phrase.
17. It is not surprising that a reader might wonder about the relationship between this new classification of translations "logical translation," "semantic translation," and "structural translation" and the classification we previously established in our book, *The Philosophy, Part One: Philosophy and Translation*, which includes "academic translation," "connective translation," and "authentic translation." The truth is that these two classifications are closely related and even overlap. The current classification pertains to the field of thought in general and was developed with consideration for the degree of responsible independence afforded to the translator. In contrast, the previous classification is specific to the philosophical field and was developed with an emphasis on the degree of philosophical creativity it offers the recipient. We can draw parallels between the two classifications: logical translation corresponds to authentic translation, semantic translation aligns with connective translation, and synthetic translation parallels academic translation. The benefit of this comparison is that it reveals how the elements of logical translation are encompassed within authentic translation. This is because these elements are universal intelligible that can be accepted by every culture and nation. Therefore, it becomes clear that rooting, contrary to common perception, is not confined to incorporating particularities but rather extends to all elements that should be considered universal.
18. We include morphological structures within syntactic structures because the intention here is to encompass everything within the structure, whether it be a word, a letter, or a sentence.

The bibliographic reference to the original source that was translated

Abdurrahman, T. (2006). *Al-Tatbiq al-Islami li-Mabda' al-Rushd al-Hadathi* [The Islamic Application of the Principle of Modern Rationality]. In *Ruh al-Hadatha: Al-Madkhal ila Ta'sis al-Hadatha al-Islamiyya* [The Spirit of Modernity: An Introduction to Founding an Islamic Modernity] (pp. 141–174). Casablanca : Arab Cultural Center.

List of Bibliography

- Abdurrahman, T. (2006). *Rūḥ al-Ḥadātha: al-Madkhal ilā Ta'sīs al-Ḥadātha al-Islāmiyya [The Spirit of Modernity: An Introduction to Establishing Islamic Modernity]*. Casablanca: Arab Cultural Center.
- Hanafi, H. (1997). Humūm al-Fikr wa al-Waṭan [Concerns of Thought and the Homeland]. *Al-Mustaqbal al-'Arabī [The Arab Future]*, 20(222), 147.
- Al-Iraqi, A. (1998). *Al-'Aql al-Tanwīrī fī al-Fikr al-'Arabī al-Mu'āṣir [The Enlightenment Mind in Contemporary Arab Thought]*. Beirut: University Institution for Studies and Publishing.
- Achayal, J. (2014). *Tārīkh al-Tarjama wa al-Ḥaraka al-Thaqāfiyya fī 'Aṣr Muḥammad 'Alī [The History of Translation and the Cultural Movement in the Era of Muhammad Ali]*. Cairo: Arab Thought House.
- Qaḥḥa, K. (1989). *Al-Tarjama fī al-'Aṣr al-Ḥadīth: Tārīkhuhā wa Qaḍāyāhā [Translation in the Modern Era: Its History and Issues]*. In *Al-Tarjama wa Naẓariyyātuhā [Translation and Its Theories]*. Tunis: Publications of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- Ladmiral, J. R. (1989). Pour une philosophie de la traduction. *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, 94(1), 5-22.
- Abdurrahman, T. (1996). *Fiqh al-Falsafa: al-Falsafa wa-l-Tarjama [The Essence of Philosophy: Philosophy and Translation]*. Casablanca & Beirut: Arab Cultural Center.