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Abstract

This thesis examines the biographies and intellectual and cultural works of Elias Haddad, Stephan Stephan and Tawfiq Canaan, Arab writers who lived in Jerusalem in the late Ottoman and British Mandate periods, a time when Palestinian identity was in a state of flux and when Ottoman, British and Zionist interests impacted upon Palestinian Arab society, economy and politics. Informed by ideas about colonial and postcolonial relations, the impacts of context and power on the development of texts, and theories of networks and entanglements, it argues that even in the absence of comprehensive biographical knowledge about individual actors, we can locate them in their intellectual and political environments. It also argues for the importance of using non-elite genres – including language manuals, travel guides and translations – in researching intellectual history, and for understanding debates and discourses within colonial societies. Drawing on my historical research into the lives of Haddad, Stephan and Canaan, and combining it with textual analysis, this thesis makes the argument for more diverse ideas of Palestinian identity than are often discussed for the Mandate period, and for the need to include a wider range of contributors than prominent intellectuals and politicians in our assessment of the discourses in play in this key period of Palestinian history.
Lay summary:

This thesis examines the biographies and intellectual and cultural works of three Arab writers who lived in Jerusalem in the late Ottoman and British Mandate periods, a time when Palestinian identity was in a state of flux and when Ottoman, British and Zionist interests impacted upon Palestinian Arab society, economy and politics. In considering these three men – Elias Haddad, Stephan Stephan and Tawfiq Canaan – this thesis combines historical research with textual analysis to understand the ways in which they thought about and depicted their societies. In their writings we witness them laying out and refining upon their images of Palestine and its people in ways which show how writers in colonised environments can interact with colonial networks and influences whilst still exercising their own agency.

The primary contributions of this thesis to the current literature on Palestine in this period are threefold. Firstly, it uses historical investigation to expand existing knowledge about the intellectuals studied and analyses several hitherto unknown or unexamined works by them. Secondly, it employs a framework of network and entanglement to locate them and their work; their professional lives and written work are thus analysed in ways which acknowledge the impacts and constraints of imperialism and colonialism as well as ongoing relationships with Arabophone intellectual and cultural currents. This allows for wide-ranging influences and individual agency in assessing the nature of their ideas and intellectual output. And thirdly, in focusing on a series of texts (language teaching manuals, tourist guidebooks, and literary and artistic translations) which are usually overlooked in favour of ‘higher’ culture, it shows the diversity of understanding within Palestinian society on issues of identity and territory, whilst not relying on a nationalist/collaborator binary. Drawing on these, I argue for a more entangled image of Palestinian cultural and intellectual life during the late Ottoman and Mandate periods, understood through a lens which acknowledges colonial influence whilst attributing agency to those living under it.
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1 Introduction

This thesis is a study of the intersection of the intellectual world of Arabs in Palestine in the late Ottoman and British Mandate periods with the shifting colonial influences and impacts of this period. It focuses on the cases of three men, Elias Nasrallah Haddad (1878-1959), Stephan Hanna Stephan (1894-1949), and Tawfiq Canaan (1882-1964), all of whom appear (to a greater or lesser extent) in the historical literature of the period as writers of nativist ethnography, and in Canaan’s case also as a medical doctor and advocate of Palestinian nationalism. As ethnographers, the three men are often seen, in rather vague terms, as part of the development of a Palestinian identity and of the Palestinian national movement, although the mechanism for this is rarely explored; other scholars cast doubt on their impact on nationalist thought in the Mandate period.

This dissertation, however, explores in detail the non-ethnographic writings of the three, using the lens of theories of language and translation studies to analyse the contents of works such as Arabic teaching manuals, tourist guidebooks, nationalist pamphlets, and poetic and theatrical translations. The result of this – and the first main argument of this thesis - is that the meaning attached to being Palestinian was much more diverse and flexible a concept than most descriptions of Haddad, Canaan and Stephan’s work implies, and that (like most, if not all, forms of identity) it was malleable and contingent, constantly reshaped under the impacts of unfolding thought and events. A copious literature exists on the appearance of Palestinian identity and nationhood, often directing at establishing the date of its emergence and the extent to which this was a reaction to

1 The transliterated spellings of their names used throughout this thesis are those most frequently used on English-language books and articles by them, rather than those conforming to present conventions of transliteration. Arabic names of other figures from Ottoman and Mandate Palestine who have been discussed in Anglophone academic literatures are also given according to common usage, without diacritic markings except ‘ for ‘ayn and ‘ for hamza. An exception is in quotations from other sources, which have been left as in the original.
3 Salim Tamari, Mountain Against the Sea: Essays on Palestinian Society and Culture, (Berkeley: California University Press, 2009), 109-10.
This thesis, however, takes the emergence of such an identity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as, to some extent, read: instead, it explores diversity and change within the category, and the way that this shifted under pressure from cultural and political factors. The various texts examined for this study are thus read for the clues they offer to their authors’ notions of the origins and nature of the Palestinian people(s), and the boundaries and nomenclature of its land. These readings are located within two levels of context: that of the biographies of their authors, and the wider intellectual and political environments of their creation.

Alongside this, the biographies of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan – which overlap in the social, educational and intellectual fields – are discussed with particular reference to concepts of networks and entanglement as a means of understanding the place of non-elite intellectuals in a colonial setting, and of considering ways in which colonised peoples might exercise agency and strategy within a setting of circumscribed formal power. I see this approach as a means of engaging with Palestinian intellectuals, not as isolated figures, but as nodes in networks extending amongst the imperial and colonial powers in the region (Britain and the Ottoman Empire but also Germany, the USA and others); into Arabophone culture and society; and between intellectual, professional and political circles. This permits a view of intellectual production in the colonial setting, in which the subject’s choice and agency are understood as interacting with structures of power and oppression in historically contingent ways.

The arguments that stem from this are twofold. Firstly, that in studying the ideas and production of Palestinian intellectuals of this period, this thesis needs to look to multiple sources and influences, including biography, Arabic historiography and media,

---

4 The central text on the subject is often seen as Rashid Khalidi’s *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness* (Columbia University Press, 1997). Other significant interventions in the debate include Louis Fishman, “The 1911 Haram al-Sharif Incident: Palestinian Notables Versus the Ottoman Administration”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 34, 3 (2005), 6–22, which highlights the cross-confessional nature of Palestinian opposition to Ottoman-approved Western excavations in Jerusalem, and James Gelvin’s, *The Israel–Palestine Conflict: One Hundred Years of War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), which pushes the coalescence of Palestinian identity back into the nineteenth century.

5 The main exception to this generalisation are discussions over the relationship between pan-Arab, Syrian and more locally Palestinian strands, particularly in relation to the brief rise and fall of ‘southern Syrian’ conceptions of Palestinian identity in 1919-21. This is discussed more fully below.
and colonial and Zionist history and cultural studies, rather than following the “dual society” model of Palestinian history which dominated until the 1990s, perceiving Arab and Jewish societies in Mandatory Palestine as entirely separate. And secondly that, although Jerusalem was marginal to centres such as Cairo and Beirut in the cultural revolutions of the Arabic-speaking work in the nineteenth century (the *nahda*), Palestinian intellectuals were active in some of the key debates of the period, such as the future of the Arabic language, issues of gender and modernity in the Middle East, the role of translated literature in Arabic culture and education, and the relationship between Eastern and colonial knowledge.

The remainder of this introduction offers an overview of the situation in Palestine during the period roughly equal to the working lives of Elias Haddad, Stephan Stephan and Tawfiq Canaan. This is followed by a review of the existing literature on the three men and their works, and two sections considering key questions in how I understand the social, political and intellectual environments in which they worked. The first of these considers the complexity of imperial and colonial relationships in Late Ottoman and Mandate Palestine, and what this means when we think about structural power and individual agency. The second introduces theories of networks and entanglements, as a means of addressing questions of power and agency, seeing personal and professional encounters in ways which do not discount oppression and discrimination, but which also regard people living within colonised settings as makers of decisions and choices.

Finally, I discuss the two main bodies of theory and context through which I will analyse the works of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan. The first of these are questions of language: of the relationship between formal and colloquial Arabic in Arabophone societies, and of the issues of power which permeate discussions of the use of colonial languages by colonised intellectuals. The second are theories of translation, particularly functionalist ideas such as skopos theory, and the ways in which these might illuminate a study of Haddad and Stephan’s work, or conversely how these examples may reveal the shortcomings and underlying assumptions of existing concepts.

---

1.1 The Historical Setting

Elias Haddad, Stephan Stephan and Tawfiq Canaan were all born in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, in regions of modern-day Lebanon and Palestine/Israel which were then administrative districts of the Ottoman Empire. None came from well-off backgrounds, although Canaan at least was unusual in that his parents were literate, but on a broad scale they grew up in a society in which education beyond the most basic level was not the norm.⁷ Only when they were young men did Arabic newspapers become widespread in Palestine, and then primarily in major cities such as Jerusalem, Jaffa, and to a lesser extent Nablus, Hebron and Haifa.⁸ The vast majority of the Palestinian Arab population at this time were peasants, engaged in a mixture of subsistence and cash-crop agriculture; the geological and climatic diversity of the region meant that types of agriculture, of settlement pattern, and of material and aesthetic culture were also wide-ranging.⁹

The region, like the rest of the Ottoman Empire, was undergoing a period of change. The Tanzimat reforms which began in 1839, alongside imperial activity in areas such as local administration, state education, and industrial and transport infrastructure, meant that the conditions of day-to-day life were shifting for many of the Empire’s citizens. Less tangible but equally important were the changes in how the Empire related to the people living in it; the Tanzimat reforms heralded new statuses for Ottoman peoples, moving (in a sometimes erratic and contested fashion) from subjects to citizens and with new meanings attached to identities of religion and ethnicity within the Empire.¹⁰ Starting with cultural and intellectual manifestations, but by the early twentieth

---

⁷ Ami Ayalon, Reading Palestine (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 1,3,16-17 et passim.
century also acquiring political import, ideas of Arab nationhood and later nationalism were also developing, albeit incrementally and mainly at an elite level. Nineteenth-century globalisation, facilitated by major technological changes such as railways and steamships, was also bringing increasing foreign presence and intervention in the Ottoman sphere. From mid-century, European and American missionaries and diplomats established themselves across the region in increasing numbers, whilst over the same period shorter-term tourists and pilgrimage visitors went from being intrepid travellers who arrived in scores or hundreds to a regular spectacle, coming in their thousands on package tours and representing a major economic sector.

Amongst Europeans and Americans, the prevailing image of Palestine at the start of the twentieth century was of a land of peasants and notables, affected by international events but largely dissociated from them, its intellectual life guided mainly by tradition and religion. In intellectual terms, conventional narratives focus on Cairo as the major centre of Arabic culture, learning and thought, with Beirut and to some extent Damascus following behind. But, as Alexander Schölch, Beshara Doumani and Jacob Norris have shown for the economic field, even in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Palestine had connections well beyond the major cities of Ottoman Southern Syria. In the mid-to-late nineteenth century, members of notable families such as the Jerusalem Husseinis were being educated in Istanbul and returning there as political representatives. Jerusalem and Palestine’s other cities may have lacked an intellectual and social life on the scale of a fin de siècle Beirut or Cairo, but figures such as Yusuf Diya’ al-Khalidi (1842-1906), Ruhi al-Khalidi (1864-1913) or Khalil al-Sakakini (1878-1953) demonstrate that as a significant provincial city with a diverse population, Jerusalem had its contributions to

---


make to the late Ottoman and Arabic intellectual sphere.\textsuperscript{15} Less elite migration, and sometimes return, was also common by the late nineteenth century, with large number of young men travelling to the Americas in search of employment and entrepreneurial opportunities.\textsuperscript{16}

The last of these three names – Khalil al-Sakakini – reflects another important, if until recently under-explored, aspect of early twentieth century Palestine; the growing role of what might loosely be termed a bourgeoisie or middle class. Whilst their proportional significance must not be over-stated, at a time when only a tiny proportion of the population could read and write,\textsuperscript{17} Palestinian society was witnessing the growth of a social group which was increasingly educated and professional, often in government employment, working as lawyers and teachers, or establishing businesses.\textsuperscript{18} As Sherene Seikaly highlights in her study of this new class, they often articulated an ideology of modernity, interacting with, if not replicating precisely, ideas popular in the West at the same time around issues such as health, hygiene and domesticity.\textsuperscript{19} Al-Sakakini, by virtue of his intellectual influence and historical profile, is not entirely typical of this class, but might be viewed as an influence or even an inspiration to young men around him, particularly after World War One. Indeed, we can see him in this very role in the diaries of Ihsan Turjman, a merchant’s son from Jerusalem who became a private in the Ottoman army in WWI,\textsuperscript{20} the opening entry of whose diaries reads:

\begin{quote}
This evening I went to visit Khalil Effendi al-Sakakini, in the company of Hasan Khalidi and Omar Salih Barghouti. Khalil Effendi read to us from his diary. It so excited me that I decided to restart my own memoirs.\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

This example highlights two important points: the role of the middle classes, obscured in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[17] Ayalon. \textit{Reading Palestine}, 16.
\item[18] Khalidi, \textit{Palestinian Identity}, 37-41, 47.
\item[21] Ibid, 91.
\end{footnotes}
orientalist views of the Middle East, and the many unknown or unheard people and voices who make up the complex webs of Ottoman and Mandate Palestinian society.

A key punctuation in this world, and in the lives of Haddad, Stephan and Canaan, was the 1908-9 political revolution in the Ottoman capital, Istanbul, led by the tendency often known as the Young Turks. This saw the increasingly autocratic Sultan Abdul Hamid II forced to reinstate the constitutional reforms of 1876 and to accept a greater role in the Empire’s rule for legislative bodies drawn from its regions. Although in many areas it was greeted by ecstatic crowds, over the next few years the Young Turk Revolution turned in a Turkish nationalist direction which increasingly alienated Arab, Jewish, Armenian and other national communities within the Empire, whose rising calls for cultural/linguistic status and perhaps even administrative autonomy were met with repression.  

Whether these dynamics would, in fact, have led to the breakup of the Empire known in European propaganda as the Sick Old Man of Europe was not to be known. The Ottoman entry into WWI on the side of Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire saw its dismemberment by victorious powers including Britain, France and the USA. For several Ottoman administrative units, this meant incorporation into a single entity known as Palestine, which under the terms of the post-WWI peace treaties was placed under British rule.

In theory, this did not signal Palestine’s incorporation into the British Empire; it was supposed to be a Class A Mandatory territory, which meant that its population was deemed within sight of being able to exercise self-rule, after a period of British tutelage. Similar Mandatory territories in Iraq and Syria gained at least notional independence over the next two decades. But the situation in Palestine was subject to a complicating factor: political Zionism. In a bid to attract support from Jews worldwide, and from a US government perceived (in the anti-Semitic stereotypes of upper-class Britain at the time) as beholden to Jewish public opinion, Britain had in 1917 issued the Balfour Declaration,

---


which promised support for a Jewish homeland in Palestine.\textsuperscript{24} Some thousands of European Jews had already settled in the area in two previous waves, the First Aliyah of the 1870s and the Second Aliyah of the early twentieth century, adding to an existing population of Sephardim and other Eastern Jews. But post-WWI, the mainly European Ashkenazi activists of the organised Zionist movement were expecting that, rather than a long period of British Mandatory rule, Palestine would soon be turned over to them.\textsuperscript{25}

Arab Palestinians had similar expectations. In the immediate aftermath of the War, and in the light of promises made by the British to various Arab parties, ranging from the contested McMahon-Hussein letters to popular propaganda and leaflets in the Levant, nationalists in Palestine were looking to Greater Syria or to the Arab world. They saw themselves as future members of a culturally, linguistically and (for some) ‘racially’ Arab/ic unit extending north and east to Syria, Transjordan and even, perhaps, Iraq; a few looked instead towards Egypt. Measures ranging from petitions to the League of Nations to riots at the 1920 Nabi Musa festival in Jerusalem signalled rising Arab discontent as people realised that they were unlikely to receive political independence, and as they became more aware of Zionist political demands and intentions toward the land.\textsuperscript{26}

Instead of handing Palestine over to either Arab or Jewish control, between 1920 and 1922 the British shifted the military administration established with Allenby’s conquest in 1917 to a civilian regime. The nature of that regime, of treatments of Arabs and Jews by it, and of British intentions from 1922 until the bloody and chaotic end of the

\textsuperscript{24} The Declaration, issued in November 1917, stated that “His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country”. The British Government's reasons for making this commitment, the intentions behind its vague wording, the meaning of the phrase “national home,” and the extent to which the British ever envisaged actually implementing this vision, remain contested. Useful perspectives on the various theories can be found in Mark Levene, “The Balfour Declaration: A Case of Mistaken Identity,” \textit{English Historical Review} 107 (1992), 54-77; W.M. Matthew, “War-Time Contingency and the Balfour Declaration of 1917: An Improbable Regression”, \textit{Journal of Palestine Studies}, 40, 2 (Winter 2011), 26-42; and Mayir Vereté, “The Balfour Declaration and its Makers”. In \textit{From Palmerston to Balfour: The Collected Essays of Mayir Vereté} (London, 1992), 1-39.


\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 216-17, 220-23; Roberto Mazza, “Transforming the Holy City: From Communal Clashes to Urban Violence, the Nebi Musa Riots in 1920”. In \textit{Urban Violence in the Middle East: Changing Cityscapes in the Transition from Empire to Nation State}, ed. Freitag et al (New York: Berghahn, 2015), 179-94.
Mandate in 1948, are still the subject of heated debate. Historians of the different camps also see the mode of administration in different ways – as anti-Arab and racially inflected, as anti-Semitic, or as opportunistically imperial. The outcome of British rule is not in itself directly pertinent to this study. Aspects of the Mandate period which do represent relevant background to this study include the following four points.

Firstly, British rule was exercised on a day-to-day basis by an administration headed by a High Commissioner, appointed from and beholden to London. The upper echelons of this administration were occupied by British civil servants, but the middle and lower ranks were increasingly made up of both Jewish and Arab employees. On one hand, this meant that the administration acted as a space in which Jews and Arabs might encounter one another, work together, and in a few cases build long-lasting social relationships. On the other, it was also a situation which at times resulted in conflict and competition, with Christian, Jewish and Muslim communities all claiming at various times that they should be given a higher proportion of the available public-sector jobs.

A second key aspect of policy and practice in Palestine was the underlying British assumption, informed by “inflexible” orientalist and race-based ideas of Arabs and Jews, that religious difference was a defining feature of Middle Eastern society and thus a logical ‘fact’ around which to divide institutions and sectors such as schools, hospitals, enterprise, and the legal system. Whilst, therefore, British public statements often seemed to incline towards a binational state as the desired end-point of its Mandatory

27 Just one example are the many claims and counterclaims made in the controversy over the Israeli ‘New Historians’, such as Ilan Pappe, Avi Shlaim and initially Benny Morris, who from the 1990s have rewritten nationalist Israeli history to take account of accusations of massacres and ethnic cleansing during the 1948 war. See Ephraim Karsh, Fabricating Israeli History: The ‘New Historians’ (London: Frank Cass 1997) for a polemical take on the subject; Joel Beinin’s “ Forgetfulness for Memory: the Limits of the New Israeli History”. Journal of Palestine Studies 34,2 (2005) for a more methodological analysis, and Avi Shlaim, ‘The Debate about 1948’. In The Israel/Palestine Question, ed. Ilan Pappé (London, 1999), pp. 171-192 for a defence.


duties, the actual policies implemented helped to drive society in the opposite direction.

This points overlaps with the third issue which must be borne in mind, that of Jewish immigration. This was not a single monolithic trend throughout the Mandate era; under pressure from international realpolitik and from both Zionist and Arab lobbying, British policies on immigration numbers and visa criteria fluctuated over the thirty-year period.\(^\text{32}\) The type of Jewish immigrants also changed; those coming in the earlier years of the Mandate were often more ideological in their beliefs, hoping to join the Zionist project to establish a new Hebrew state. After British economic policy changes in 1931 and the rise to power of the National Socialists in Germany in 1933 a larger proportion of incomers were Jewish refugees, for whom comparatively poor, unfamiliar, tense Palestine was a last resort, especially after the USA and other Western countries imposed heavy restrictions on Jewish immigration.\(^\text{33}\) As well as shifting the demographic between Arabs and Jews, this immigration changed the composition of the Yishuv itself, which now had a smaller proportion of Eastern Jews comparative to Ashkenazim. This dynamic was coupled with the growing dominance of harder lines of political Zionism which contrasted with the often more complex, open positions towards Arabs taken by many Sephardi or other Eastern Jews at the time.\(^\text{34}\)

Fourth and finally, several incidents of the Mandate period need to be flagged as key points of the historical, ideological and political framework in which the three subjects of this study, Haddad, Stephan and Canaan, lived and worked. The Nabi Musa riots of 1920, in which Arabs hoping for a political future as part of a larger Syrian or pan-Arab entity expressed their displeasure with British rule and the Balfour Declaration, have already been mentioned. After almost a decade of British rule, in 1929 a year of heightened Zionist rhetoric and militancy and increasingly violent Arab responses culminated in the Western Wall or Buraq riots. Over 130 Jews were murdered in Jerusalem, Safad and principally Hebron, and almost as many Arabs killed, mainly by the


Mandate police and military. The subsequent government investigation and 1930 White Paper initially curbed Zionist immigration and saw a brief period of calm, but the rise in Jewish refugees post-1933, mentioned above, renewed tensions. The period 1936-39 saw the Palestinian Uprising, which started with a six-month general strike and reached its peak in late 1937-38 with spells during which the British lost control of much of the country to Arab rebels. But the British government, foreseeing conflict in Europe, added to an already fragmented resistance by imposing enormous levels of military repression and collective punishments, halting the rebellion by the time World War Two began in 1939.

These political trajectories and the unsteady, stop-start descent towards the eventual violence of 1948 form the backdrop, but not necessarily the determinants, for the lives and works on which this study focuses. History is often depicted in terms of great events and broad-brush images. But informed by theories and methods from microhistory and relational history, this thesis argues that examining individuals and exploring the smaller-scale worlds of biography offer the opportunity to add richness and granularity to our images of the past, and that the variation and complexity which can arise from this may even affect aspects of the larger view.

1.2 Literature Review

Most academic writing on Canaan, Haddad and Stephan focuses on their ethnographic work, categorising them as leading members of a small group of nativist anthropologists who wanted to record a dying Palestinian rural culture and whose view was that Palestinian culture was composed of aspects from the many peoples who had lived on the land over the previous millennia. However, in researching their lives it became clear

36 Ted Swedenburg, Memories of Revolt: the 1936-1939 Rebellion and the Palestinian National Past (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 32, 90.
38 Most importantly in the works of Salim Tamari, especially Mountain Against the Sea, and of Khaled Furani and Dan Rabinowitz (“The Ethnographic Arriving of Palestine”. Annual Review of Anthropology
that their non-ethnographic works, which include language textbooks, literary translations and tourist guidebooks, had for the most part been forgotten. A reasonably broad literature exists on the life and works of Tawfiq Canaan, but Elias Haddad and Stephan Stephan generally appear solely as also-rans or footnotes to their better-known colleague. Different interpretations have been put on the men’s anthropological output: Furani and Rabinowitz present them as part of an “Oriental” trend in the ethnography of Palestine, moving away from the tendency to see everything Palestinian as of Biblical interest, with proto-nationalist implications. The latter are described as “strategic” and “challeng[ing] a colonial British version of Palestinian history that saw Arabs in Palestine as transient and ephemeral, offering a narrative that contested the endorsement by the Balfour Declaration of a national Jewish homeland in Palestine.” Furani and Rabinowitz also see this anthropological project as driven by an “urgency to document” a Palestinian culture threatened by modernity and colonialism; this view is reflected in Rowe’s description of the work as “salvage anthropology” linked to “nascent Arab nationalism”. For Emma Aubin-Botanski, Canaan, Haddad and Stephan’s project was one of “Folklore at the service of the nation”, assuming a coherent national identity and intellectual movement behind their work, and further assuming that the vision of ‘Palestinian-ness’ evoked in these works would resonate with the national politics headed by the Husseini, Khalidi and Nashashibi families.

In addition to this broad view of these nativist anthropologists as inspired by some form of nationalist feeling, there arises the question of how we should understand their
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40 Furani and Rabinowitz, for instance, cite Canaan and Granqvist as the two key figures in Palestinian anthropology of their era (“Ethnographic Arriving of Palestine”, 278-79), whilst Tamari describes this intellectual network as “Tawfiq Canaan and his Circle” (Mountain Against the Sea, contents page) and calls Canaan “the most prolific and significant amongst them” (ibid., 97).

41 Khaled Furani and Dan Rabinowitz, “Ethnographic Arriving of Palestine”, 477-78.


relationship to one another. Salim Tamari uses the word ‘circle’ to describe then, albeit
with caveats; Véronique Bontemps does the same. Tamari sees this loose ‘circle’ as
comprising Tawfiq Canaan, Elias Haddad, Stephan H. Stephan, Omar Salih al-Barghuthi
and Khalil Totah. Furani and Rabinowitz list the same names, but also compare their
work with European ethnographers writing at the same time, such as Baldensperger and
Granqvist. I remain unconvinced of the usefulness of the term circle, which implies a
closed-off, separate status for a defined group of people; Tamari admits this, and
acknowledges that it over-states the solidity of the rather fluid relationships, but offers
little in the way of alternative ways of thinking about them. I consider that the notion of
a circle has, indeed, constrained the way in which Canaan and other thinkers are seen, as
it has led to a focus on one figure rather than on the interplay between many. Bourdieu’s
concept of the intellectual field is a next step, with its rejection of the environment for
creating ideas as merely an “aggregation” of people, and the need for a sense of it as an
electrical field, criss-crossed by “power lines”. Although Bourdieu’s notion of the field
is useful in this respect, in that it captures the sense of people struggling to exercise
agency within structural constraints, I want to add in this particular instance a greater
sense of the historical. Here, I see the language of networks and entanglements as useful,
concepts which allow for more mobile encounters, and for a sense of historical change as
people and institutions operate within political and colonial contexts. Such a conception
allows us take account of factors other than the ethnographic output highlighted by the
existing scholarship: the influences of debates in the Arabic-speaking world, of German
and broader Western conceptions of modernity and progress, and of the changing
dynamics of Zionist immigration and British rule in Palestine.

A second problem with the idea of a ‘Canaan circle’ is that this term implies a self-
identified group with, at least to some extent, an articulated position, aim or project. This
mischaracterises the loose relationships between Canaan and other scholars named in the

44 Tamari, Mountain Against the Sea, 2.97,102-11.
45 Véronique Bontemps, Ville et patrimoine en Palestine: une ethnographie des savonneries de Naplouse
46 Salim Tamari, Mountain Against the Sea, 201-2 n14.
48 Tamari, Mountain Against the Sea, 201 n14.
Information 8 (1969), 89.
literature, such as Stephan, Haddad, Totah and al-Barghuthi, but also under-estimates the number of Palestinians and Arabs working in this field. There were other Palestinians who worked on the anthropology and archaeology of the region, and some of them pre-date Canaan and Haddad’s publication. The earliest was Yusif Kana’an, employed by the Palestine Exploration Fund (PEF) as an archaeological site foreman in the 1890s and 1900s and a skilled and in-demand professional who worked on British excavations in Palestine and for German scholars at Baalbek in Lebanon. Kana’an is referred to in PEF papers as a valued professional whose welfare and health were worth protecting and who was paid good wages for the time and place. Notes by Kana’an, held in the PEF archives, show that he conducted his own ethnographic research well before World War One. Some of it was used in publications by European scholars, primarily R.A.S Macalister, but the bulk is as yet unstudied.

Another precursor to Canaan et al is Dschirius (Jiryis) Jusif, a teacher at the Lutheran school in the Muristan, next to the main German Protestant church in the Old City of Jerusalem. Originally from the village of Bir Zeit, near Ramallah, Jusif gathered folktales and dialect phrases for the German ethnolinguists Hans Schmidt and Paul Ernst Kahle, and is credited in the subtitle of *Volkserzählungen aus Palästina* as the source of their material. Prior to this, Jusif also collaborated with the German Orientalist Eberhard Baumann on *Volksweisheit aus Palästina* (‘Folk-Wisdom from Palestine’), in which he is credited with collecting the Arabic material and Baumann with editing and publishing “in conjunction” with him. Given Dschirius Jusif’s involvement with both ethnographic investigation and with the German Lutheran congregation, teaching at the school immediately next to the church attended by Tawfiq Canaan and his wife, it is hard to
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imagine that the two were not acquainted. Jusif’s absence from the history books probably stems from his exclusively German-language output, in the same way that Canaan’s German publications are often ignored.56

The image of a ‘Canaan circle’, therefore, as articulated in the scholarship of Tamari, Bontemps and others, seems partly to rise from a notion of Canaan’s exceptional nature. Taking a more dispersed view, and locating Canaan in a wider context, permits us to see the importance of his contributions to both ethnography and nationalist thought, but also to understand that such ideas rarely arise in isolation, but in dynamic interaction with others.

In some ways, Tawfiq Canaan was different, in that he combined ethnographic scholarship, medical professionalism, and gregariousness and charm to an unusual degree; the other scholars working on similar subjects certainly lacked his famous address book.57 But the focus on Canaan also distorts our understanding of the Palestinian intellectual field in the very late Ottoman and Mandate periods, and underestimates its breadth and diversity. Tawfiq Canaan certainly deserves much of the recognition accorded him for the volume and quality of his work, but he needs to be de-exceptionalised, seen instead, in Samer Akkach’s useful phrase, as part of a “tendency rather than a movement.”58 The net effect of doing so is to give more breathing space to Stephan, Haddad and other Palestinian and Arab writers who also explored, by different ways and means and in languages other than English, their history and cultures. This is my aim in the rest of this study, and the following section (and its four subsections) set out the theoretical and methodological means which underpin it.

Before this, however, given the very limited existing literature on Stephan, Haddad and Canaan themselves, I consider it necessary to look briefly at three other aspects of the historiography on Palestine: biography, microhistory, and relational history.

The first of these includes the important work by scholars such as Salim Tamari, Issam Nassar and Kimberley Katz in recovering, translating and editing the diaries and memoirs of late Ottoman and interwar Palestinians such as Wasif Jawhariyyeh, Sami

56 As noted by Philippe Bourmaud, “Son of the Country”, 110.
ʻAmr, Ihsan Turjman and Anbara Salam Khalidi.59 History done at the micro-level allows a focus on individual actors and their agency which challenge the grand narratives which present complex colonial relations in over-simplified ways.60 There are many more significant memoirs and autobiographies, such as those of ‘Awni ‘Abd al-Hadi, ‘Izzat Darwaza and Omar Salih al-Barghuthi, published in Arabic – in some cases decades ago – but the process of introducing these personal accounts to both Arabic and English readerships is a vital part of asserting Palestinian narratives and agency in the history of the region.61 Many of these Arabic voices also appear through some of the best histories of the period, such as Weldon Matthews’ work on the Istiqlal Party.62 Article-length profiles (often at least partly based on diaries or personal reminiscences) of figures such as Tawfiq Canaan, Khalil Totah and Dimitri Baramki exist,63 peopling the history of Mandate Palestine with living figures – not just ‘big names’ who shaped Palestinian ideas and politics, but the more ordinary men (and sometimes women) who created the environments in which ‘big ideas’ and ‘big politics’ happened.

But where do we go after diaries and memoirs? After all, whilst this thesis does attempt to reconstruct the lives of Stephan Stephan and Elias Haddad, and draws on the existing literature on Tawfiq Canaan, it is also concerned with their broader ideas and intellectual impacts. Those written accounts which have survived war and occupation are few. And, by definition, the authors of such documents are from the educated minority from Palestine in this period: as Philip Khoury has commented of the Syrian context: “Historians […] wanted to examine Syrian society from the bottom up, although their

60 Hauser, German Religious Women, 13.
62 Weldon C. Matthews, Confronting an Empire.
sources often limited them to the middle rungs.” Laila Parsons’ considerations of biography in the historiography of the Arab Middle East (developed during her project on the life of the peripatetic Lebanese soldier and exile Fawzi al-Quwaqji) provide a useful framework for considering the relationship of biography and microhistory. As Parsons points out, micro-narratives are comparatively rare in Mashriq historiography, which has tended towards studies of ‘bigger picture’ issues such as colonialism and the development of the nation. There are valid theoretical and methodological reasons for this, but it also leads to a dearth of histories which give a sense of the everyday, intimate and quotidian in Middle Eastern life. In her own case, Parsons comments that she teaches novels to replace the absent biographies and micro-histories, in order to convey to students something of this more granular texture to their encounters with the Mashriq (a practice itself seen as problematic by postcolonial scholars). Microhistorical writing on this region can also highlight a sense of continuity. The history of this region, and particularly of Palestine, is often presented in terms of radical breaks – between the Ottoman period and the British Mandate, punctuated by World War One, and the establishment of the State of Israel. Studies by Roberto Mazza, Jacob Norris and Abigail Jacobson, which stress continuities between Ottoman and Mandate Palestine, are important. But micro-level writing has a significant role to play too, using single examples to draw out multiple threads of meaning. An intriguing example of this is


Ibid.


In looking at historical works on Palestine, it is common to see titles defined as covering either the Ottoman or Mandate periods (e.g. Nicholas Roberts, Islam Under the Palestine Mandate, or Sandra Sufian’s Healing the Land and the Nation). When this is not the case, the fact of a continuity between periods is often a matter stressed as part of the conceptual underpinnings of the study (e.g. Jacob Norris, Land of Progress: Palestine in the Age of Colonial Development, 1905-1948 or Roberto Mazza, Jerusalem from the Ottomans to the British (London: IB Tauris, 2009). This punctuated view is particularly characteristic of paradigms which privilege political and military history, focusing on the shift from Ottoman to British to Israeli rule. Histories which focus on local people, however, tend to show a greater sense of continuity.
Danna Piroyansky’s ‘biography’ of the home of the Palestinian writer and educator Khalil al-Sakakini in the Jerusalem suburb of Qatamon. The story of the house highlights how continuity over time reveals the discontinuities of life and politics, disrupting the image of al-Sakakini as a purely nationalist figure or revealing over time the tortuous legal fictions of Israeli “absentee custodianship” laws. This case study emphasises the complexities – national, moral, social – of the Mandate Palestinian situation, and its lessons for the way in which the (sometimes idealised) cosmopolitanism of the Ottoman period deteriorated into tension and then hostility have considerable bearing on the examples of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan.

Another issue often discussed in the recent historiography of Mandate Palestine is the extent to which traditional works tend to write about Arabs or Jews as separate communities, viewed in splendid isolation from one another. A major corrective to this was Zachary Lockman’s *Comrades and Enemies*, the foundational text of Anderson’s relational history applied to the Palestinian context. Lockman’s work foregrounds the agency of Arab workers and in doing so highlights the need to understand their relations with both Jewish and Arab institutions. Viewed through the nationalist lens, Palestinian Arab workers’ co-operations and dialogues with the Histadrut and other Zionist organisations have been seen either as collaboration or as the actions of passive dupes. This assumes that the interests of Palestinian Arabs were always unitary, not cross-cut by class, faith, gender, sexuality or regional identity. As Lockman demonstrates, Arab business owners were guilty of exploiting their compatriots, demanding long days under dangerous conditions for poor pay, and Arab workers were entirely capable of seeing beyond implicit or explicit appeals to their national identities and, where it suited them, allying (temporarily and knowingly) with Jewish unions.

A second target of Lockman’s thesis is the problem of the “dual society model”, the sense that Palestinian Arab society in the Mandate era was a “pre-existing, already-
formed entity which was then threatened, encroached upon... and largely destroyed". This view of Arab and Jewish societies posits each as “primordial, self-contained and largely monolithic entities,” implying a pristine Palestinian Arabness which – in the manner of Orientalist visions of the Immutable East – was static and immovable in its nature and form. The result has been a historiography of Palestine and Israel which often fails to question a vision of two entirely separate communities, with no influences upon one another. In some respects, there is an irony to the fact that the work of Tawfiq Canaan, Elias Haddad and Stephan Stephan has been used to construct these images of a pristine, primordial Palestine, whilst a rejection of static authenticity is so important to understanding their lives.

1.3 Alternative Ways of Seeing Canaan, Haddad and Stephan

Having set out the existing literature on Canaan, Haddad and Stephan, and highlighted some of the problems with this, the following four sections set out the ideas, theories and methods which underpin my readings of how we should build on it. In order to do so, I firstly outline ways in which researchers on Middle Eastern and other sites of colonial or imperial domination have used concepts of networks and entanglement to unpick situations in which relations which incorporate inequalities of institutional and political power can nevertheless be bi- or multi-directional. Even the subaltern parties in such environments exercise agency and affect those in statuses of greater formal weight. Secondly, I offer a discussion of literatures on imperialism and colonialism which suggest how I propose to use these multi-directional models whilst also understanding the profound and brutal impacts of these processes on colonised peoples. And thirdly and fourthly, I introduce the two main locations in which I see Stephan, Haddad and Canaan as operating agency and influence within colonial structures, namely language and translation. Drawing on sources from postcolonial studies, translation theory and discussions of language and power, I endeavour to show how my subjects exercised agency within the Late Ottoman and Mandate Palestine environments, whilst also
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acknowledging the constraints these situations imposed on them.

1.3.1 Networks and Entanglements

The focus on individual lives highlighted in the Literature Review sometimes obscures a key fact about the intellectual life of Jerusalem at this time, namely the tightly intertwined social, intellectual and professional relationships which cut across lines of ethnicity, nationalism, religion, profession, and even occasionally class and gender. This section looks at the tangled reality of Jerusalem life, and engages with literatures on other colonial and intellectual settings in order to extract ways in which notions of networks and entanglements have been used to understand such dynamics. Firstly, I highlight two brief examples from primary sources on Palestine to illustrate why I believe that using theories of network and entanglement are useful in this instance. I follow these with three samples from works on other parts of the Islamicate world which demonstrate aspects of the explanatory power of this approach. In the absence of clear articulations from Palestine or Middle Eastern studies, however, I offer more detailed reading of Peter Kalliney’s study of Caribbean writers in 1950s London, which has significant implications for how the cases of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan should be examined.

Salim Tamari’s work on Ihsan Turjman’s diaries offers a useful example of the complex webs of Jerusalem life. Although Turjman’s family were reasonably well-off, they were not of the elite intelligentsia represented by the senior Husseinis or Khalidis. But, via his education and family friendships and despite being a “young and impressionable soldier”, Turjman managed to be an “observer” at political and intellectual discussions which involved not only Khalil al-Sakakini but “Omar Salih al Barghouti, Adel Jaber, Musa Alami,... Isʻaf Nashashibi, and his cousin Hasan Khalidi, who had just received his medical degree from Beirut”. Tawfiq Canaan was also a “family friend”, although the private’s diaries do not record whether his influence on Turjman extended to intellectual issues or whether it was confined to writing him sick notes to get him off his army duties and alleviating his fears about sexually transmitted
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A similar image emerges from the less colourful pages of membership lists and attendance minutes. As discussed in detail in the next chapter, the list of subscribers to, for instance, the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* reveals links to the leaderships of various nationalist factions and of commercial operations in Jerusalem. Minutes of meetings of the British or American archaeological schools in Jerusalem or of the Palestine Oriental Society show them to be part of a web of connections which also includes the Hebrew University and the British administration. Archival fragments help to reveal times and places at which people usually framed as occupying separate spheres of Jerusalemite society coincided: the invitation list for the ceremony at which the foundation stone of the Palestine Archaeological Museum was laid includes the heads of the various international archaeological schools in Jerusalem, senior educators such as “Miss Landau”, the headmistress of a Jewish girls’ school, religious leaders, members of the Archaeological Advisory Board (including the architect Antonio Barluzzi and the Palestinian writer ‘Adel Jabre), along with “Dr & Mrs Canaan” and “Mr & Mrs Stephan”.  

In the study of Palestinian intellectual and political life we therefore see two problems: that individuals tend to be seen as islands, and that Palestinian Arab society tends to be thought of as distinct and separate from other social groups existing in the same place and time. The effects of this are compounded by a disciplinary tendency, influenced by both linguistics and politics, to study Palestinian Arab society and culture, and celebrate its manifestations and resilience, in isolation from Jewish and colonial activities and ideas.

Methodologically speaking, Amal Ghazal captures the essence of this problem when she writes:

The area studies model is an impediment to the historical analysis of linkages not governed by its geographical and conceptual boundaries. Its shortcomings are even more pronounced in the historiography of the modern period, when interactions and exchanges among different communities have changed
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dramatically, in both scale and scope. In the region loosely defined as the Middle East, the problem is further compounded by the collapse of the Ottoman order and the erection of state borders.\(^{80}\)

The ideas of networks and of entanglement can be usefully brought to bear on these problems. This needs to be understood as permitting differential levels of influence, power and knowledge, and dynamic rather than static relations. In Ghazal’s Middle East generally, and Stephan, Haddad and Canaan’s Jerusalem more specifically, the idea of networks and entanglements allows us to consider relations between colonised intellectuals and colonial institutions in ways which acknowledge and incorporate the facts of colonial power inequalities without being entirely prescriptive and deterministic. The notion of power and influence as distributed and multidirectional also, in the case of Palestine and particularly of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan, gives us space to think of colonial impacts not only as coming from the British, but also from entanglements with Germany, the USA and other Western states.

In the absence of personal writings by the three themselves, the networks of social, religious and political contacts, across recently-imposed national borders and colonial divisions, can be reconstructed from other people’s accounts of their contacts with these men, as well as from records which preserve the evidence of more institutional relationships. Through these meshes of relations we can see something of the thoughts and inspirations of men such as Canaan, Haddad and Stephan. Networks have not been widely used as a tool for understanding intellectual and cultural production in Palestine (with the exception of Amara Thornton’s work on Western archaeologists during the Mandate period\(^{81}\) and, less centrally, in Sherene Seikaly’s writings on the Palestinian Arab bourgeoisie\(^{82}\)), but the concept is useful in that it permits us to introduce “concepts such as affiliation, patronage, emulation and competition”\(^{83}\) into how we try to think about such relations, highlighting the role of both institutional and material relations as

---

\(^{80}\) Amal Ghazal, “Transcending Area Studies: Piecing Together the Cross-Regional Networks of Ibadi Islam”. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 34,3 (2014), 582.


\(^{82}\) Sherene Seikaly, *Men of Capital*.

well as ideas, thoughts and knowledge.

Beyond Palestine studies, such ideas have been productively used in other parts of the Islamicate world. Iza Hussin’s research into changes in the nature and status of Islamic law in India, Malaya and Egypt reveals, through its comparative approach, the ways in which even the briefest connections – of people face-to-face, through correspondence or even simply through reading and responding to one another’s work – can weave themselves, across time and space, into shifts of culture and knowledge.84 An important aspect of Hussin’s thesis is also the extent to which it is the mechanics of colonialism which sometimes facilitate these links between colonised peoples,85 highlighting the necessity of understanding terms such as colonialism (or Zionist/Jewish or Palestinian society) not as monolithic, immutable entities, but as being in a constant and interrelated state of flux.86

A second brief example from the Islamicate world is that of Zionist clubs in Ottoman Salonica and the apparent paradoxes in their relations with the Empire’s hierarchy. As Julia Phillips Cohen notes of a soiree in Salonica in 1911, “[t]he coup of the [Salonica] Zionists in gaining the attention of high-ranking state officials also challenges the notion that ideologies and social practices necessarily overlap”. On this occasion Hakki Pasha, the Ottoman Grand Vizier, had accepted an invitation from the Nouveau Club, a Salonican Zionist organisation, to attend its gala as guest-of-honour, despite the fact that only a few months earlier he had referred to their movement as one of “madman” in a speech before parliament.87 Cohen’s analysis of Hakki Pasha’s participation in this social whirl and the lessons she draws from it could equally be applied to George Antonius’ parties or cultural events at the Jerusalem YMCA, at which senior officials of the British colonial administration rubbed shoulders with Arab nationalist writers and politicians or leading members of the Zionist movement (whilst these latter two groups would certainly include many employees of the former).88
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A third brief example is that of Firges, Graf, Roth and Tulasoğlu’s application of the idea of networks and entanglements to the history of the Ottoman Mediterranean. In scaling up the idea of individual networks to the level of cultural interactions, they describe how: “In opposition to the bloc paradigm, another discursive formation has evolved which argues that the boundaries between imagined ethnic, religious and cultural communities have been necessarily unstable and permeable throughout history”.89 Their edited volume speaks of “well-connected domains” and works on a larger level to this study, but their vision of identities as contingent and shifting is key to my own understanding of the lives and works of Canaan, Haddad and Stephan.

Peter Kalliney’s work on Caribbean writers in 1950s London offers a comprehensive illustration of how these notions provide a framework in which to understand intellectual and cultural relations in a colonial and sometimes politically charged situation. As Kalliney describes, this cultural scene saw an encounter between major names of interwar modernist literature such as the poets and critics T.S. Eliot, Stephen Spender and Louis MacNeice, and a new generation of writers in English of Caribbean origin, such as George Lamming, V.S. Naipaul and Derek Walcott. As Kalliney notes, conventional approaches to English literature tend to pigeonhole the latter grouping as “postcolonial” writers, but his analysis of their relationships – both personal and institutional – says much about their place both in British “race” discourse of the period and in the development of English-language literature in Britain.

Employing concepts of “affiliation, patronage, emulation, and competition”, Kalliney traces how, through institutions such as the BBC and the publishing houses in which they wielded power, the (white) cultural elite “not only appreciated but... actively promoted” colonial writers, in terms of both exposure and financial support.90 Relevant to my emphasis on agency amongst colonised writers and intellectuals, Kalliney also stresses that “Just as important, Caribbean writers reciprocated by accepting this patronage and developing modernist techniques in new directions”, engaging in
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relationships of “exchange and reciprocation”. These in turn gave the cultural elite scope to work through major social and political issues such as racism and imperialism. The fact that many of these writers articulated strongly anti-colonial views “could be temporarily defused through appeals to an aesthetic universalism”, with cultural icons and gatekeepers such as T.S. Eliot and the editor Diana Athill emphasising aesthetic quality as the means by which ethnic and political differences could be transcended.

I see Kalliney’s examples as mapping onto the experiences of, in particular, Stephan and Haddad in many ways, with institutions such as the Palestine Oriental Society and the Mandate authorities’ Department of Antiquities playing roles analogous to the BBC and publishers, and the ‘values’ of academic excellence and research replicating those of aesthetics in the London case. Kalliney concludes that relationships with the cultural establishment, and multidirectional influences which spanned several generations of writers, meant that “these West Indian intellectuals can stake a claim to the equivocal legacy of British modernism... Lamming, Walcott, and Naipaul had no qualms about naming themselves the rightful heirs of modernists such as Eliot and Spender”. Likewise, Palestinian writers such as Stephan, Haddad and Canaan, through their reciprocal relationships with the foreign and immigrant scholars of the Palestine Oriental Society, the Department of Antiquities and the Schneller School, carved out for themselves the right – if articulated only implicitly – to claim a similar intellectual inheritance. I suggest that these three Arab scholars – and others like them – drew strategically on the tools and frameworks of Western academic study to appropriate it as a means of engaging with and making public their own visions of Palestine as a territory, society and historical entity.

As Kalliney’s article makes clear, and as I argue also applies to the cases of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan, such dynamics are historically specific and contingent upon wider social conditions. For Kalliney’s Caribbean writers, increasingly restrictive immigration laws passed by the British government, along with rising racism in the 1960s, changed the environment in which they were working and cut off the institutional
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and personal relationships which had enabled this mutually enriching atmosphere. In Palestine, the tensions and conflicts were the problematic relations between Palestinian Arabs and the colonising power of the British Mandate and, even more, the increasing numbers of Jews coming from Europe.

As well as providing insights into how it was possible, for a short and specific time, for mutually enhancing relations to exist between colonial writers and metropolitan cultural elites, Kalliney’s article is also useful in its stress that this was not solely a matter of individual relationships. The general intellectual and aesthetic trend amongst the pre-war modernists as a collectivity was one which encouraged respectful and reciprocal relations with the new generation of Caribbean writers; the fact that there existed intellectual and institutional contacts on both sides allowed for greater overall impacts than the encounter between isolated individuals. This point emphasises how a focus on ‘great men’ and iconic incidents can lead us to over-estimate the strength and influence of a single intellectual strand. Instead, individual interactions need to be placed in the context of broader networks and social/intellectual trends, so that commonalities of theory or practice are not read as ‘false positive’ examples of the simple transfer of ideas. Learning from both examples, I present Stephan, Haddad and Canaan as ‘nodes’ in multidirectional intellectual relations which extend amongst both European/American scholars but also Eastern/Arab/Islamicate ideas and histories.

This vision of Palestinian society as entangled with others, to both East and West, and of Palestinians as points in networks that span time and space allows us to – in Natalie Zemon Davis’ term – decentre history. Rather than thinking solely in terms of high politics and of unidirectional flows of imperial power, they allow us to consider influences and relationships as multidirectional and as fluctuating in terms of power and impact. The idea of entanglement emphasises that all parties have agency, without denying that some have more power to implement it and, in the words of Julia Hauser
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“acknowledg[es] intricate dynamics of appropriation and rejection” in ways which are vital to a nuanced understanding of colonial intellectual histories. At times, of course, such dynamism is blocked; one such example is discussed in Chapter Six, in which I examine Stephan Stephan’s translations and studies of Palestinian folksongs, and their appropriation and clumsy re-Orientalisation at the hands of British literary figures. Given the factor of power and domination imposed by colonialism, such halts and distortions are inevitable. But the idea of relations which are networked and entangled allows us to understand that, even in a society under repressive colonial rule, metropolitan London is not the source of all ideas and power, that even the metropole cannot escape some measure of influence coming back from the colonised, and (crucially) sometimes, there are relations in which the colonial power (as differentiated from more diffuse impacts of cultural, social and psychological imperialism) is actually of little consequence.

Connected to this effort to decentre conceptualisations of Palestinian society and its relationship to the wider world is the point that Palestine, and Jerusalem more specifically, were not isolated places intellectually, ideologically, politically and in many other ways. Although the region went through periods as a “backwater” of the Ottoman Empire, by the end of the imperial period cities such as Jerusalem and Jaffa were entangled in the kinds of networks described above, through the Arabic-language press and the people who informed, wrote, and read it. Two brief examples from other parts of the Arabic-speaking world illustrate the ways in which, even in the nineteenth century, events in far-off locations permeated even areas commonly seen as distant and ignorant. One of these is Sarah Abrevaya Stein’s tracing of the impact of the Dreyfus Affair amongst Mzabite Jews in the Algerian northern Sahara. Excluded by the French colonial authorities from the French citizenship conferred on Jews from the coastal region, and vulnerable to the prejudices of local administrators, the anti-Semitism stirred up by the anti-Dreyfusards in France extended to colonial officers in the Sahara and their treatment of these Arabised ‘Berber’ Jews. A second example concerns a sheikh of the ’Adwan tribe to the east of the Jordan River who, in conversation with the explorer Claude Conder in 1881, was aware in detail of the French invasion of Tunis that year, and of the legal

status of Britain’s acquisition of Cyprus from the Ottoman Empire. Conder himself observes that:

It is not surprising that the Maronites and the Christians of Damascus and Jerusalem should be keenly watching the political horizon—that they should know Lord Beaconsfield and Mr. Gladstone by name [...] but it was somewhat startling to find in the wilds of Moab an old gentleman with a stiff leg, who had certainly not been over Jordan for several years, yet who understood the nature of our tenure of Cyprus, and dimly foresaw the probability of such an event as the occupation of Egypt.

I am not, with these examples, claiming that a majority, or even a significant proportion of, the population of Jerusalem would, before or after WWI, have been exposed to ideas and information from either Eastern or Western scholarship. But I do believe that these cases, and others like them, illustrate that even as early as the 1880s intercultural and international contact and awareness extended beyond the nahda centres of Cairo and Beirut. If Sheikh Diab of the ‘Adwan could converse with Claude Conder about the finer points of European colonial aspirations in the Eastern Mediterranean, or if the Berber Jews of the Mzab were aware that they were experiencing greater oppression because of a court case in Paris, about what might the nascent middle class of Jerusalem have read, talked and thought? An approach which sees Stephan, Haddad and Canaan as nodes in a web of entanglements might not tell us precisely what they read or talked about, but I argue that it provides us with clues as to where their news or ideas came from, by what routes, and what schools of thought might have informed the development of their opinions.

1.3.2 Whose colonialism, which colonisers?

The notion of entangled intellectual relations is, as the previous section shows, an important opportunity to decentre history, shifting our lens away from political and military leaders to the diversity of other ideas and practices in society. A second type of

---

decentring which needs to occur in order to understand the contexts of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan’s life stories is that of how we understand imperialism and colonialism in the Palestinian context. This section, therefore, explores ways in which the common prioritisation of British colonial rule in understanding events and ideas within Palestine can be usefully disrupted: firstly by thinking about who we mean when we talk about imperialism or colonialism in Palestine in the first half of the twentieth century, and secondly by considering how we might understand power and agency as operating in colonised intellectual environments. I begin by considering the place of German imperialism as an influence in the Ottoman Empire, and continue by looking at how various scholars of colonial and postcolonial situations have conceptualised agency and autonomy as exercised by people within the constraints of imperial or colonial rule.

Cyrus Schayegh provides a valuable lesson through his experiment in framing the Middle Eastern Mandates as part of a decolonisation process rather than entirely through the lens of the colonial power. This approach allows us to consider areas often defined even now according to their foreign rulers – the Ottomans, the Mandatory powers – in terms of “societal forces striving for whatever sort and degree of independence” rather than following colonial definitions. I suggest that this approach also allows us a way of viewing the society of Palestine and the other Mandated territories with a sense of continuity across World War One and an understanding (as shown by Jacobson, Norris and Mazza) that many aspects of life did not change that much with the end of the Ottoman Empire and shift to League of Nations Mandates rule. This continuity across the years of WWI, though, highlights one change: that in its final decades, Germany was the most influential imperial power on the Ottoman Empire, at least on the governmental and military levels. It had played a major role in reforming the Ottoman state and armies;
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102 In this thesis, I generally follow Edward Said’s definitions of imperialism and colonialism, in so far as imperialism describes not only a formal, political dominance by one state over another, but may also encompass spheres such as the cultural, linguistic, social, historical and environmental. Colonialism, on the other hand, I understand as having a stricter physical definition, requiring the establishment of colonies on new territories (Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage, 1993), 3-12).


alongside this, German engineers and capital had been involved in many of the large-scale infrastructure developments in the Empire, such as the Hijaz railway.\textsuperscript{105} And informal modes of imperialism – missionaries, education and healthcare – were exercised by German organisations as much as those from Britain and France.

Despite this, British and to some extent French colonialism have been much more thoroughly explored in the Palestinian and Levantine context.\textsuperscript{106} There are logical reasons for this; the near-disappearance of German state influence after its defeat in WWI; the decades of British rule under the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine; the repercussions of this period in terms of Zionist immigration and embeddedness; the debacle of British exit from Palestine; and the impact of British duplicity and colonial aims in its tangled promises to Zionists and Hashemite Arabs and prioritisation over both of secretly-negotiated agreements with France. However, in addressing the practices of informal imperialism in Ottoman and Mandate Palestine – spheres such as the religious, cultural and intellectual – at various points in time and space we should also consider states even less studied than Germany, such as Russia and Italy (particularly in the Ottoman period) and the USA.

This diversity of informal and formal imperial influences foregrounds the second aspect of this topic, which is how we view the impacts of different practices and relationships on the ground, in the everyday encounters between Arab Palestinians and friends, colleagues, bosses, religious and other colonial citizens. To what extent is the cultural impact of imperialism linked to state, political or economic influences? Informal intellectual or aesthetic domination, the threads of which run through religion, writing,


\textsuperscript{106} This is logical enough for the Mandate period, during which the British were the ruling colonial power, although there is still much to learn about, for instance, the impact of Russian Orthodox educational and pilgrimage structures in Palestine and the cultural impact of translations from Russian (as seen in Spencer Scoville's work). For the pre-Mandate period, however, Francis Nicosia and Isaiah Friedman's studies of German intervention in relation to Zionism and Ottoman-level politics are important starting points, but there are few or no in-depth studies of the German role in, for instance, education and missionary work (a situation which can be compared to A.L. Tibawi's major contributions on British schools and religious enterprises and later works such as Nancy Stockdale's research on interactions between British, Arab and Jewish women in Ottoman Palestine). Major studies of the impacts of Orientalist portrayals of Palestine also tend to focus on British and to some extent French cultural production, as seen in the work of Eitan Bar-Yosef.
historical research, translation, art and education in the colonial context, derive unequally from different imperial states, and citizens of colonial states are impacted unequally by their association with these forms of power. How, then, do we read the fraught conceptual connections between Western, colonial values and modernity or modernism (as very different phenomena) in the colonised environment?

These issues are inescapable when considering the personal, professional and intellectual trajectories of Haddad, Stephan and Canaan, and the works they produced in the last years of the Ottoman Empire and under the British Mandate occupation of Palestine. Frantz Fanon wrote in *The Wretched of the Earth* that “every effort is made to bring the colonized person to admit the inferiority of his culture”.\(^\text{107}\) Whilst this statement may hold true for the African contexts which were the focuses of Fanon’s political life and work, what happens if we look at Palestinian writers during the British Mandate in this light? What does it mean for the “colonized person”, the Palestinian colonial subject, educated in a Europeanised environment and on occasion working in the languages of different colonial powers, to write about their own culture and history? Given the post facto incorporation of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan’s writing into the Palestinian nationalist canon,\(^\text{108}\) we might see them as having successfully resisted the “admission of inferiority” which Fanon sees as forced on the colonised. Or, having used colonial languages, methods and paradigms to conduct their scholarship, have they actually fallen victim to colonialism’s intellectual lure? On one hand, working in formal or informal imperial institutions and with European languages, they look like the classic model of the colonised intellectual. But, in that they are seen (at least in retrospect) to have lived, written and worked their refusal of Fanon’s “admission of the inferiority of their culture”, we might see their works as acts of reclamation or ‘writing back’, using the tools of colonial culture in a knowing and deliberate way to assert the value and distinctiveness of their own culture.

A useful insight in this respect comes, again, from Iza Hussin, in her emphasis on the shifting, contingent nature of imperialism. Without ignoring the wide-ranging impacts of imperial power, it is productive to understand colonialism as constantly changing and

\(^{107}\) Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 236.

\(^{108}\) As highlighted in the examples from Tamari and from Furani and Rabinowitz cited above.
developing (in a non-linear and non-ideational sense) in response to conditions in both metropole and periphery. This applies just as much to intellectual and cultural change as it does to more obvious ways in which military and political actions respond to changes in the practices of the colonised and resisting. Imperialism and colonial knowledge are not fixed and monolithic; indeed, one of the most marked colonial abuses of power in the intellectual field is through the appropriation and unrewarded use of knowledge taken from colonised individuals and cultures. As Elias Haddad’s very different relationships with the German-American scholar Hans Henry Spoer and the American archaeologist W.F. Albright show, there is considerable scope for variation. But, as these two cases highlight, how we should interpret such variation is not always clear: does it arise from personality and individual ethics? Or can we understand it also as being shaped by the structures of power overlaying it? The greater equality apparent in Haddad’s partnership with Spoer can, I argue, be seen as shaped by their initial encounter under Ottoman rule, when the balance of power in institutional and international terms was less unequal than during Albright’s presence under the Mandate.

Samar Attar’s contemplation of the impacts of Western friends and colleagues on the lives of the Palestinian poet Fadwa Tuqan and the Egyptian author Taha Hussein offers an entry into this question. Her assessment is that both Arab writers, “Although deeply influenced by the dominant culture to different degrees, [...] emerged as knowing quite well who they were, and where they belonged. Their cultural identity had been enriched”. Attar thus rejects Fanon’s blanket assertion that the colonial encounter is one which by definition crushes and eviscerates the colonised intellectual, and allows for the possibility that some such encounters might transcend the corruption of imperialism. Frustratingly, though, Attar’s blend of the psychological and the postcolonial offers no explanation for the differences between those relations which destroy and those which nurture, or of the mechanics of such encounters, and ultimately her conclusions descend into an essentialist notion that non-Western cultures are inherently more “spiritual” than

109 Hussin, Politics of Islamic Law, 56-9, 216-7.
“perverted” colonisers.\textsuperscript{111}

A useful way of approaching the latter part of the question is found in the notion of strategy and tactics. Chiara De Cesari says of Tawfiq Canaan, Stephan and other Palestinian nativist ethnographers that they “operate... a tactical change” within a “pre-eminent site of colonial knowledge production, where a militant and militarized science met religion” and reshaped orientalist ideas of the Palestinian peasant and history in ways which strengthened national identities.\textsuperscript{112} This suggests a type of agency by which the colonised, aware of both the need for struggle and the limitations of the possible, may choose to pick up the master’s tools to demolish, or at least change, the master’s house. It is this aspect of Canaan, Haddad and Stephan’s work for which they are best known and which is most documented in the secondary literature. Tawfiq Canaan’s ethnographic work – comprising hundreds of articles in English and German and spanning almost sixty years – is most widely studied.\textsuperscript{113} Canaan, along with Haddad, Stephan, Omar Salih al-Barghuthi, Khalil Totah and ‘Arif al-’Arif, is conventionally regarded as representing a trend in Palestinian intellectual life which saw, and depicted, Palestinians and their culture as a “vibrant, cumulative assemblage of modern and ancient civilizations that included Israelites, Egyptians, Syrio-Aramaics and, not least, Arabs”.\textsuperscript{114}

Furani and Rabinowitz join de Cesari in identifying the way that Canaan and his colleagues wrote Palestinian culture as “strategic”.\textsuperscript{115} The descriptions and interpretations of Palestinian culture that Canaan, Haddad, Stephan and others offered in their articles and booklets “challenged a colonial British version of Palestinian history that saw Arabs in Palestine as transient and ephemeral, offering a narrative that contested the Balfour Declaration endorsement of a Jewish national home in Palestine”.\textsuperscript{116} Tamari goes further, identifying in their choice of language a deliberate decision to (like George Antonius) address a European, colonial audience, and in so doing undermine the assumptions of missionaries and administrators who saw in the Palestinians of their day a poor shadow of

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 213.
\textsuperscript{112} Chiara De Cesari, “Cultural Heritage beyond the ‘State’: Palestinian Heritage between Nationalism and Transnationalism”. (PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 2008), 78.
\textsuperscript{113} See, in particular, Tamari’s chapters on nativist ethnography in Mountain Against the Sea.
\textsuperscript{114} Furani and Rabinowitz, “Ethnographic Arriving of Palestine”, 478-479.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 479.
imagined Biblical glories.117 Like Antonius, they also, perhaps, hoped that defying Zionist narratives (from both Jewish and evangelical Protestant sources) would have an impact on colonial policy.

And yet Canaan and other Palestinians who wrote similar work appear rarely, or not at all, in major accounts (such as those by Rashid Khalidi or Ilan Pappe, or in Weldon Matthews’ detailed work on the Istiqlal Party) of the development of a Palestinian national identity or consciousness, or of the Palestinian national movement and the parties, media and intellectual debates which formed it. In contrast to the European ethnographers from whom Canaan and his comrades took their inspiration, Palestinian writers are seen as divorced from political activism and the main currents of the national movement.118

I argue that the picture is more complicated than this, and that examining the biographical details and non-ethnographic writings of Stephan, Haddad, Canaan and others suggests a less clear differentiation between nativist scholars and their nationalist counterparts. Their examples highlight the extent to which the lines between a nationalist and someone not identified with a national movement, or an activist and a more passive citizen/subject, are often drawn in overly simplistic terms. Lauren Banko’s work on British imposition of citizenship versus Arab and Zionist notions of their place in Palestine reveals the contested nature of citizenship and social action in Palestinian society under the Mandate.119 The former has been a clear issue of contention throughout Palestinian historiography, in which the shadow of 1948 lies heavily on names such as the Nashashibi family, often dismissed in the wake of the Nakba as collaborators with the British and even traitors120 but who, in their own eyes, were as much activists for the national cause as the more bellicose Husseinis – but with a different vision of how this should be achieved.121 In relation to more conventional understandings of the Palestinian
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117 Tamari, *Mountain Against the Sea*, 110
118 Ibid.
nationalist movement, the list of subscribers to the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, the main organ through which the ethnographic writings of Canaan, Haddad, Stephan, Barghuthi and other nativist ethnographers were published, shows that key nationalists subscribed to nativist writings, and in some cases were actively involved in the Society.

This is not, however, to claim Stephan Stephan and Elias Haddad, in particular, as nationalist *activists*. Tawfiq Canaan can realistically be given that title, given the nationalist pamphlets he published during the Revolt of 1936-39, his clashes with the British administration and, in a more low-key fashion, his advocacy for the Arab role in ‘modern’ developments in health and agriculture in Palestine. His two counterparts in this study, however, had lower profiles and less clear-cut political positions. This presents a more interesting problem: how to read the works of these ‘quiet men’, working on one hand within colonial institutions, alongside European and even Zionist colleagues, but also producing translations, writings and scholarship which present powerful arguments for the cultural vitality and longevity of Palestine.

The tendency to see Canaan and his contemporaries as a discrete grouping, separate from mainstream political and cultural trends and discussed primarily in relation to trends in European scholars and scholarship also has the effect of distancing them from intellectual currents within Arabic-speaking society. But an incident recounted by Ilana Feldman in her historical anthropology of government in Gaza highlights the fact that writers from this intellectual field had an Arabic hinterland just as broad as their English- and German-speaking intellectual environments, and concerned with similar issues of the nature and production of knowledge. In 1943 ‘Arif al-‘Arif, who was a senior official in the British Mandate administration, published his *Tarikh Ghazza* (History of Gaza). The same year, Hilmi Abu Sha’ban, a local notable, issued his own commentary on al-‘Arif’s history, couching his criticisms in the language of authenticity and representation. Al-‘Arif’s “outsider perspective”, according to Abu Sha’ban, “hindered his ability to
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122 E.g. by Furani and Rabinowitz (previously cited) and even to an extent by Salim Tamari. Similar trends are observable in Philippe Bourmaud “‘A Son of the Country’”, 104-124 and in Mershen and Hübner, “Tawfiq Canaan”, 251-264.

accurately represent” Gaza and its people, and his status as a high-ranking government employee acted as a barrier which could not allow him to “succeed in obtaining the truth”. Only a native of Gaza – such as Abu Sha’ban himself – could fully know Gaza, avoiding the distortions which came from trusting informants whom a civil servant could only ever know as plaintiffs or petitioners. Hilmi Abu Sha’ban was an educated man, with significant status in his own city and engaged in local politics. But it is unlikely that he had encountered European anthropological literature or considered the ability of foreign versus native ethnographers to accurately explore Palestinian culture. His argument with ʽArif al-ʽArif was one founded in local intellectual traditions – within which Canaan, Haddad and Stephan were also embedded.

On one hand, therefore, we must take account of autochthonous Arab knowledge, as highlighted by, for example, Peter Gran’s important, if problematic, study of Egyptian thought and its roots in debates, writings and salons which pre-date European influences in the nahda. A stronger influence on Stephan, Haddad and Canaan, though, is the type of process outlined by Ussama Makdisi in his descriptions of Boutros al-Bustani’s thought or Jonathan Gribetz in his discussions of Ruhi al-Khalidi. The latter scholars’ assertions of the capacity of Levantine writers and thinkers to take European ideas and to shape them into something new and itself ‘indigenous’ provide important ways of thinking about how ‘colonised’ intellectuals are capable of demonstrating both agency and sophistication in their approaches, neither rejecting colonial thought nor swallowing it whole, but consciously reshaping it for the setting. Rather than insisting on a model of indigeneity, which falls into the Orientalist trap of seeing ‘Eastern’ knowledge as static, imposing immovable ideas of authenticity, this way of viewing intellectual production restores a sense of agency, and even resistance, to Palestinian writer and thinkers.

As Makdisi says in relation to al-Bustani, much of his significance stems from “his exemplification of a process of conversion that would take an unanticipated secular route
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124 Ibid., 155-156.
125 Ibid.
which the missionaries could not control and refused to sanction".\textsuperscript{128} It sees Levantine intellectuals as capable of making informed, strategic choices on the subjects they write about, the languages they use and the conclusions they reach, rather than drawing a sharp line which designates them as ‘authentic’ or ‘colonised’. Indeed, to do so rejects the savagely orientalist views expressed by many Europeans against “Westernised” Arabs, who they deemed inauthentic.\textsuperscript{129} Going further, it allows us to think about co-operative methods of creating knowledge and ideas which are not understood through the liberal, individualistic, masculine version of authorship developed by the European Romantics.\textsuperscript{130} This, then, is the understanding of intellectual action in the colonial environment which forms the background to my study. The next two sections provide the theoretical underpinnings for the two specific areas of analysis through which I interpret Stephan, Haddad and Canaan’s works, namely their engagement with issues of language, firstly via their relationships to “foreign” languages and to colloquial and formal Arabic, and secondly through their translations between European and Middle Eastern languages.

\textbf{1.3.3 Language: Writing in English}

As the previous section demonstrates, one of the key issues motivating this study of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan is the question of how we should understand the agency of colonised intellectuals. One of my entry points into this discussion is that of language, in the first instance by looking at what it means for these three men to have chosen to write in English, the language of one of the main imperial powers in the Eastern Mediterranean under the Ottomans, and the direct colonial ruler in the Mandate period.

In this section, I lay out some of the ways in which scholars of colonial and postcolonial settings have debated and theorised the relationship between language and power, and the extent to which the language of an imperial power can be used to undermine or challenge it. The first area I discuss are ideas about the relationship between

\textsuperscript{128} Makdisi, \textit{Artillery of Heaven}, 197.

\textsuperscript{129} Ronald Storrs, for instance, wrote that: “Nothing seems to denationalize an Arab, a Copt or an Armenian like becoming a Protestant, or ‘Brustéstant’ as he more often pronounced himself. I could never see that his almost unctuous respectability, his open contempt for the venerable institutions which he or his father had abandoned, were at all superior to incense and ikons” (\textit{Orientations} (London: Readers Union Ltd, 1939), 426-27.

\textsuperscript{130} Fritz Gutbrodt, \textit{Joint Ventures: Authorship, Translation, Plagiarism} (Bern: Peter Lang, 2003), 41, 50.
bilingualism and colonialism, and whether the introduction of languages from imperial
countries is inherently and irrevocably an oppressive process. Secondly, I discuss debates
about Arabic which occurred in the Arabic-speaking world in the first half of the
twentieth century, highlighting controversies over the role of colloquial versions of
Arabic and their relationship to the formal, written language. This aspect very much
informs my understanding of the thought behind Haddad and Stephan’s authorship of
colloquial language manuals for foreigners and the links between this and a conception of
national identity.

Firstly, then, the majority of the written work left behind by Elias Haddad, Stephan
Stephan and Tawfiq Canaan is in English; second to this are texts in German, with Arabic
a distant third. Each of these three men was at least functionally trilingual, capable of
both social interaction and scholarly work in Arabic, German and English, as well as
other languages (such as Stephan’s translations from Ottoman Turkish). The texts
examined later in this thesis comprise manuals for readers of English wanting to learn
Arabic, written by Haddad and Stephan; nationalist pamphlets published by Canaan at the
beginning of the 1936-39 Palestinian Revolt; and guidebooks written by Stephan during
WWII, when many British and Commonwealth troops stationed in Egypt visited
Palestine. As scholars and activists from across the post/colonial world have stressed, the
choice of what language in which to write, to express oneself and to convey one’s
thoughts, is not a neutral one, and I therefore see the choice of writing in English and
addressing an Anglophone audience as one with underlying meanings. “In... the Arab
world,” according to Niloofer Haeri, “the language question has roots in religion,
nationalism, colonial rule, secularism and interpretations over the heritage of Islam”.131
The use by intellectuals of colonised countries of the language of the coloniser should be
seen as part of a “calculated process of European culture penetration in the non-Western
world”.132

Learning languages has also long been part of the imperial project, used to allow

131 Niloofer Haeri, Sacred Language, Ordinary People: Dilemmas of Culture and Politics in Egypt (New
York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), xi.
132 Shaden M. Tageldin, “The Sword and the Pen: Egyptian Musings on European Penetration, Persuasion
foreign powers to learn more about, and to actively penetrate, other cultures. To what extent does knowing a language also imply a claim to know a people and culture in a more intimate, and invasive, sense? Even further, drawing both on classical Arabic thinkers such as al-Jahiz and on the oppression of colonialism, the Moroccan critic Abdelfattah Kilito rejects the notion of bilingualism, claiming that “when two languages live side by side, one or the other will always appear bestial”. Bilingualism, for Kilito, is a place of violence, in which stronger languages “devour” weaker ones; for another North African theorist, Abdelkebir Khatibi, who at times allows for an erotics of language exchange, bilingualism combines in the Arabic homonym fitna both seduction and strife.

Should we therefore read Stephan, Haddad and Canaan’s multilingualism as a fracturing of their identities, scattering them amongst the various imperial options, or as an act of resistance which asserts the colonised’s ability to know the coloniser, as much as vice versa? This is the possibility raised by Kilito’s translator. He cites the Hebrew literature of Israeli-Palestinian writers for whom using the language of the ‘Jewish state’ offered personal and artistic freedom, but also enabled them “discursively to divorce the Hebrew language from Zionist ideology”, laying claim to the language and decoupling it from its ethno-national ties to assert a wider ownership, and indeed to expose the crimes of the dominant culture. In the context of Mandate Palestine we find the well-known example of George Antonius’ The Arab Awakening, written in English with the specific intent of addressing the coloniser. As has been argued of contemporary Palestinian writers working in Hebrew, to write in “the language of hegemony denies the possibility of evasion” by those in a more powerful position. But does it? For a word to be written is not necessarily for it to be read; texts can be ignored, destroyed, misinterpreted or
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133 Kilito, for instance, states that he “dislike[s] having foreigners speak my language,” because of the sense it brings of both systemic domination and personal infiltration. *Thou Shalt Not Speak My Language*, trans. Wail Hassan (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2008), 87-94.
136 Hassan cites the example of Anton Shammas; one might also mention Sayed Kashua or Atallah Mansour. Wail Hassan, “Translator's Introduction”. In Abdelfattah Kilito, *Thou Shalt Not Speak My Language*, trans. Wail Hassan (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2008), xiv-xv.
rejected – all of which demand at least some kind of reaction, but not necessarily one which engages with their content.

According to these various arguments Haddad, Stephan and Canaan can be thought of as having been destabilised or liberated, as manipulated by the colonial context or as exercising agency within it, depending on the priority we give to dynamics of imperial power versus subaltern agency, and the possibilities of intent and strategy underlying relations with the colonising language.\(^{138}\) My argument in chapters 3 and 4 is that while we cannot necessarily see them as enacting resistance per se, their example blurs lines between categories such as nationalist/collaborator or resistance/colonisation, highlighting the existence of everyday instances of agency, overshadowed, but not eliminated, by an encompassing colonial framework.

In her study of language and translation in nahda Egypt Shaden Tageldin adopts a robust approach to colonial cultural infiltration, seeing translation from European languages to Arabic as a means by which denigratory foreign evaluations of Egyptian culture infiltrated intellectual life. But she does allow for the ability of people under colonial rule to employ “critical assessment and... strategic assimilation of Western ideas and institutions” where they find it useful, alongside the fact that colonised writers and thinkers are able to see the West as Other, as well as to be subjected to Othering by it.\(^ {139}\) Drawing on nineteenth century Egyptian examples, Tageldin highlights how new and innovative thoughts in an imperial setting need not necessarily come from the imperialist, noting how her subjects refuse to identify “the forces of technology and art, utility and creativity, sword and pen” with either France or Egypt.\(^ {140}\) Tageldin argues that, if we overcome our own cultural and disciplinary biases, we can often find non-Western
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\(^{138}\) An illuminating example of debates over imperialism and language is that between Nigerian author Chinua Achebe and Kenyan writer Ngugi wa Thiong'o on the politics and poetics of African writing in English. Achebe defended his use of the coloniser's language on both practical and political grounds, saying: “Let no one be fooled by the fact that we write in English, for we intend to do unheard of things with it”, suggesting that he saw English as a tool, or weapon. Most telling is Achebe's statement that “the price a world language must pay is submission to many different kinds of use”. In employing the term 'submission', Achebe suggests that to use the coloniser's language is not to submit oneself to colonisation, but that the language itself can be conquered and re-shaped to counter colonial domination (Chinua Achebe, Morning Yet on Creation Day (London: Heinemann, 1975), 7, 61).

\(^{139}\) Tageldin, “The Sword and the Pen”, 199.

\(^{140}\) Ibid., 214.
sources for ideas assumed to spring from imperial influences. This critique of most postcolonial notions of colonial influence and infiltration, therefore, is that they overstate the power of the coloniser to affect the thought of the colonised. This opens up the possibility of looking at Stephan, Haddad and Canaan’s use of English and German as an act which can be read as intentional and resistant rather than coerced and colonised.

Concerns about the relationship between language and colonialism, power and identity and the sources of knowledge are not merely those of academic theorists; they were very much live debates in the environment in which Haddad, Stephan and Canaan lived and worked. In the Arabic-speaking world language was seen as one of the key factors in national identity, but there were also questions over the type of Arabic which should be promoted – the standard or classical language that was common to all educated Arabs, or the colloquial forms spoken regionally within the wider Arab world. For George Antonius, for instance, a “new classical idiom” had to be created, developing new terms to deal with a rapidly-changing scientific, technological and political environment, but in a way which maintained the pan-Arabic linguistic connection. Within these elite and educated Jerusalemite milieux, other linguistic debates were also current. For Zionists and other Jews, the battles between Hebrew, European colonial tongues, the Yiddish still beloved by many new immigrants, and the colloquial languages of the Eastern Jewish communities were already alight. Many Jewish civil servants and those interacting with the Mandate state experienced the predominance of English, followed to some extent by Arabic, within its structures as a colonial oppression. And at the Evelina de Rothschild School, headmistress Annie Landau faced criticism by Zionists from the early 1900s onwards for her insistence on teaching a bilingual curriculum rather than running a solely Hebrew-language establishment. Tawfiq Canaan, at least, probably knew about Miss Landau’s confrontations over language; the two were close friends.

141 Peter Gran, Islamic Roots of Capitalism, 185.
143 Lockman, Comrades and Enemies, 67.
146 Ibid., 93-4. According to Laura Schor, drawing on Miss Landau's memoirs, their friendship was such
Alongside very local questions of language, the cultural revival of Arabic and grievances against the dominance of Turkish in the Ottoman bureaucracy and education system held centre stage in the emerging Arab nationalism(s) of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. According to Sati al-Husri’s widely-quoted formulation of Arab identity, “A nation has an objective basis, and in the last analysis this is first of all language. The Arab nation consists of all who speak Arabic as their mother-tongue, no more, no less”. For George Antonius, too, language was the most important of the ties which bound Arabs together, superseding any differences between Muslims and Christians or across state boundaries. Some push the centrality of language back even further, arguing that the Arabic language as a mother tongue was key to a kind of Arab ethnic superiority or proto-nationalism to which seventeenth and eighteenth century Arab writers laid claim. Standardising – and maintaining standards – was part of the Arab nationalist project; a unified, Arabic language was seen as both symbolic of and contributing to a united, modern Arab society. To this end, the first regulatory Academy of the Arab Language was established in Damascus in 1919, followed by others in Cairo, Baghdad, Khartoum and elsewhere. It is also worth observing that in Palestine in the first half of the twentieth century some of the best-known intellectuals and nationalist scholars (including Khalil al-Sakakini on Arabic language and literature and

that when he decided that he was sufficiently comfortably off to marry, Canaan elicited Miss Landau's help in finding a bride. She hosted several teas at which prospective wives – some of Arab origin, some European – were presented. None, however, produced a match. Canaan is said to have met his wife, Margot Eilender, at an Esperanto class.


Akram Zu‘aytir on history) wrote schoolbooks, at least partly with an eye to their potential impact on young minds.\textsuperscript{154}

Privileging language in discourses of national identity and nationalist rhetorics is not unique to Arabic; as Benedict Anderson has argued, standardised national languages are central to forming and expressing national identities.\textsuperscript{155} Although the gap between local, colloquial forms of Arabic and the classical language is often stereotyped and exaggerated, what is unusual to the Arabic case is the politicisation of choices around colloquial forms of the language\textsuperscript{156157} – ‘\textit{ammiyya} – against the use of the formal \textit{fusha}. In the case of Arabic, a combination of factors – the religious status of Qur’anic Arabic, \textit{nahda} ideas about the revival of Arabic, the use and sometimes manipulation of local ‘\textit{ammiyyas} by colonial powers – have loaded the issue of writing, reading, learning and teaching \textit{fusha} or ‘\textit{ammiyya} with a whole additional set of meanings. Formal, standardised Arabic is often perceived as part of Arab identity and nationhood, the glorious language of the Qur’an and of great poets, while the colloquial form is seen as politically divided and divisive, a bastardised form rendered impure by words from other languages, causing Arabs to be separated from one another by their mutual incomprehension of one another’s dialects.\textsuperscript{158}

Arabic language reformers were engaging in these debates in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: some argued that incorporating Arabised foreign words into the language had been happening at least since Abbasid Baghdad, and that if done carefully was a valid way to expand the language. Some also argued that in order for Arab nations to be ‘modern’, amendments to the script and the relationship between \textit{fusha} and ‘\textit{ammiyya} were needed, or that to use classical Arabic for mundane purposes such as daily newspapers would corrupt its sacred nature.\textsuperscript{159} In Egypt, debates about linguistic reform

\textsuperscript{154} Danna Piroyansky, “From Island to Archipelago”, 856; Matthews, \textit{Confronting an Empire}, 272
\textsuperscript{156} See e.g. Versteegh, \textit{Arabic Language}, 189-197.
\textsuperscript{157} But not unique: as Niloofer Haeri describes, in Greece, the translation of the New Testament into the popular form of the language was deemed “a grave insult” (Haeri, \textit{Sacred Language, Ordinary People}, 9). Translations of the Bible and of the classical Oresteia sparked fatal rioting in Athens in 1901 and 1903 (Egbert J. Bakker, \textit{A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language} (Oxford: John Wiley, 2010), 566).
\textsuperscript{158} Haeri, \textit{Sacred Language, Ordinary People}, 10-12, 63-4.
\textsuperscript{159} Chejne, \textit{The Arabic Language}, 151-68; Haeri, \textit{Sacred Language, Ordinary People}, 11, 76.
gave rise to publications on the colloquial language by native speakers, as well as Western scholars. But as early as the 1890s, D.W. Fiske’s proposals to replace *fusha* in non-religious contexts with Egyptian Arabic written in Latin characters was condemned in *al-Hilal* and *al-Muqtataf* in language which referred to ‘the nation’ and ‘foreign’ ideas, although the idea was mooted again by Egyptian intellectuals such as Lutfi al-Sayyid and ‘Abd al-‘Aziz Fahmi between the 1910s and 1940s and by the French-language Beirut paper *La Syrie* in 1922. An under-studied aspect of this is also concern about colonial languages infiltrating colloquial Arabic; Halim Dammus’ *Qāmūs al-‘awamm* (*Dictionary for the Masses*, Damascus, 1923), for instance, lists common mistakes and “corruptions” in popular speech, correcting not only general colloquialisms but also rigorously providing Arabic replacements for Arabised French and English words which had entered the Syrian dialect.

A similar disdain for the colloquial language long pertained in much Western scholarship on Arabic; for “most European linguists […] dialects were regarded as faulty speech which had to be eradicated.” Only in the nineteenth century, when linguists discovered that some dialects contained forms which pre-dated standard Arabic, did they start to show an interest in, and seek to record and preserve, rural ‘*‘ammiyyas*. This was also linked to prevailing ideological and philosophical currents; Romantic ideas about rural authenticity affected how colloquial forms were viewed, with a chair in dialects founded in 1820 at the *Ecole des langues orientales* in Paris. However, most Western students learning Arabic at university still studied *fusha* to the exclusion of colloquial.
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160 Socrates Spiro, for example, wrote two major contributions to the study of Egyptian ammiyya, *An Arabic–English Vocabulary of the Colloquial Arabic of Egypt* (1895), and *An English–Arabic Vocabulary of the Modern and Colloquial Arabic of Egypt* (1897). Although Spiro was a native speaker of Arabic, however, he was (like Haddad and Stephan) what might be seen as a marginal figure – an Egyptian of Greek and Syrian origins, educated at the American Mission College and employed for many years by the British administration (Liesbeth Zack, “Key to Mass Literacy or Professor’s Hobby? Fiske’s Project to Write Egyptian Arabic with the Latin Alphabet”. *Al-‘Arabiyya* 47 (2014), 3,10).
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163 Dammus, a well-known Lebanese poet, also wrote a hymn to the Arabic language, offering up his life for her [sic] protection and linking it to mother, father, the arts and the sciences. See Wahab Alansari, *An Anthology of Arabic Poetry* (Seattle: Academy of Languages, 2009), 244.
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Nineteenth-century handbooks and textbooks for English-speakers wanting to learn or teach themselves Arabic focus on the standard version, but even within this variation exists. On the one hand, some manuals are laden with Orientalist assumptions about the unchanging nature of the Arabic language.\footnote{For instance: “I recommend to any one who desires to make himself understood (outside of the kitchen and stables) to begin by reading aloud... with a Moslem who is accustomed to recite the Qur'an in public prayer. A well-educated graduate of al Azhar, the famous Cairo University, can (if expressly ordered) read any book well: but the rest are safe, only with the Qur'an, from lapsing into provincialisms.” Frederic du Pre Thornton, \textit{Elementary Arabic, Part I} (London: W.H. Allen & Co, 1888), iii-v.} By contrast, another insists that “nowhere is the Arabic of the Koran and of poetry spoken. No modern can without pedantry and absurdity speak in the older dialect”, recommending that Europeans should, if they want to learn local dialects, “go to Algiers or to Aleppo”, but otherwise should learn what is now referred to as Educated Standard Arabic.\footnote{Francis W. Newman, \textit{Handbook of Modern Arabic} (Nottingham: Stevenson, Bailey & Smith, 1895), iv-v.}

Outside the ivory tower, however, bureaucratic or military need and market forces gave rise to a new range of rarely-studied beginners’ handbooks for learning colloquial Arabic. Some European tourist guidebooks contained language sections from the 1870s.\footnote{Rachel Mairs and Maya Muratov, \textit{Archaeologists, Tourists, Interpreters: Exploring Egypt and the Near East in the Late 19th-Early 20th Centuries} (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 32-3.} But the popular, rather than scholarly, market presented opportunities for those for whom Arabic was a mother tongue, rather than an academic project. In 1874 the Khedive’s Press published what is probably the first textbook of colloquial (Egyptian) Arabic written by a native speaker and aimed at Western audiences, followed by competitors in the 1880s; handbooks of Syrian or Levantine Arabic first appeared in the 1890s.\footnote{Yacoub Nakhleh’s \textit{New Manual of English and Arabic Conversation} offers to both English-speaking travellers and Arabic speakers wanting to learn English a range of grammatical rules and practical examples in a kind of ‘light’ Egyptian, in a style which Nakhleh refers to as “vulgar conversational Arabic” (Yacoub Nakhleh, \textit{New Manual of English and Arabic Conversation} (Boulack, near Cairo: The Khedive’s Press, 1874), II, VIII). This was followed in 1883 by A. Hassam’s \textit{Arabic Self-Taught: The Dragoman for Travellers in Egypt}, the popularity of which was exploited by European publishers. A version of Hassam’s book, revised for Syrian Arabic, was produced by the Reverend Naser Odeh in 1915. The growing interest in Levantine dialect also prompted Joseph Harfouch’s \textit{Le Drogueman Arabe ou guide pratique de l’Arabe parlé en caractères figures pour la Syrie, la Palestine et l’Egypte} (Beirut: al-Matba’a al-Kathulikiiya, 1894) which, like Hassam, “went through several editions and sold well” (Mairs and Muratov, \textit{Archaeologists, Tourists, Interpreters}, 35-7). Harfouch authored other manuals of Syrian dialect, including the 1904 \textit{Arabe dialectal de Syrie: textes divers}.} Soon after the imposition of British rule on Egypt in 1882, other language manuals appeared, aimed not at scholars or tourists, but at officers and other colonial
officials posted to Egypt. Some contained Arabic script, whilst others were entirely transliterated, and the books vary considerably as to the accuracy of their Arabic and the amount of material lifted from other textbooks. Most of these manuals, however, did not convey colloquial Egyptian Arabic as the Arab troops would have understood it. Anton Tien’s 1882 handbook, for instance, made little distinction between his native Levantine and the very different Egyptian dialect, whilst the European-authored volumes all seem to have been a mixture of simplified fusha and various types of Egyptian ‘ammiyya, often using both Egyptian and North African/Western Egyptian grammars mixed without comment.

Elias Haddad and Henry Spoer’s 1909 Manual of Palestinian Arabic was, therefore, part of a fairly new trend in books aimed at native speakers of European languages who wished to learn colloquial Arabic(s), without being wealthy enough to travel to the Middle East to learn first-hand. It was the first specifically Palestinian Arabic volume (rather than a more general Levantine). A similar book – Leonhard Bauer’s Palästinische Arabisch: Die Dialette des Städters und des Fellachen – was published in Leipzig in 1910. Elias Haddad, therefore, was one of the earliest Arabs to provide written ways for foreigners to learn his colloquial language; the fact that Tien’s 1882 Hand-book is not really in any identifiable colloquial dialect contrasts with Haddad’s stress on accuracy in conveying the spoken language. The latter’s 1909 collaboration with Henry Spoer was followed by a similar manual for German speakers, published in 1927, and other volumes. Haddad’s pioneering role in teaching colloquial Arabic was acknowledged by specialists such as Eric Bishop, lecturer in Arabic at the
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170 Most of these were written by Europeans who had worked in Egypt, although the earliest was written by Reverend Anton Tien in 1882, a Lebanese Maronite convert to Anglicanism who lived in Canterbury. Liesbeth Zack, “Arabic language guides written for the British Army during the British occupation of Egypt, 1882–1922”. In Aspects of (Post)Colonial Linguistics: Current Perspectives and New Approaches, ed. Daniel Schmidt-Brücken, Susanne Schuster and Wienberg, Marina (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 1,3, 23.
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University of Glasgow (and a former missionary in Jerusalem). In the Foreword to Elias Haddad and Jalil Irany’s 1955 *Standard Colloquial Arabic*, Bishop calls Haddad and Irany “pioneers in the promotion of the teaching of colloquial”, having been taught by both men thirty years earlier. In a later article, Bishop also refers to Haddad as the “doyen of Palestinian *mu'allimin*” who had “taught those of the High Commissioners who found time for Arabic”.

Stephan Hanna Stephan came much later to this market. He published his *Arabic Self-Taught: A Primer* and its German twin in 1935 with the Jewish stationery chain and publishing house Steimatzky’s, printed at the Syrian Orphanage. According to the inside front cover of this English-language edition, versions for Hebrew and French readers were in the pipeline; a parallel set of Hebrew manuals (for readers of German, English, French, Russian and Arabic) were also on the way. Judging by the examples of those who used Haddad’s works, such as the future academics Eric Bishop and R.B. Serjeant, the books were taken up by Mandate administration officials. The involvement of the American archaeologist W.F. Albright also suggests that they might have been aimed at students of archaeology or anthropology planning to come to Palestine. Most of the books, though, include very basic information on Arabic script and pronunciation, implying that they were not intended for a scholarly readership. Especially in Stephan’s later version, they look much more like products intended for foreigners needing a grounding in the language of people they were to interact with as officials, students, tourists or businessmen.

In more recent times in Palestine, the issue of prioritising colloquial vs standard Arabic has become particularly politicised. But in the late Ottoman and Mandate periods, in a political and intellectual atmosphere which privileged formal Arabic to the exclusion of the colloquial, writers of Palestinian/Arab origin were composing (either alongside foreign authors, collaboratively with other local writers, or on their own) dictionaries, grammars and manuals of Palestinian Arabic for English-speaking
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readerships. It is tempting to see these through the lens of 1948, to regard them as the precursors to ever-increasing threats to Arabic language and culture in Palestine from colonial domination. But I argue that this should be seen, in tandem with their concerns about recording Palestinian culture, rather as an assertion of identity, delineating a specifically Palestinian form of Arabic and insisting on its value not just as a cultural relic but as the language which should be used by officials and scholars living and working in the country.

1.3.4 Language: Translation

The English and German writings of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan, and the former pair’s promotion of colloquial Palestinian Arabic to foreign learners are all, I argue, the products of sequences of strategic choices, intertwining considerations of readership, desired outcome, and power. In this second language section I present a discussion of theories of linguistic and cultural translation which inform the content of chapters 5 and 6, which explore translations by Haddad and Stephan from Arabic and Ottoman Turkish into English and from German into Arabic. Again, these examinations feed into the overarching themes of this thesis, illustrating how, within the constraints of colonial relations on the individual and systemic levels, and influenced by political issues ranging from debates over the outlines of Palestine and the nature of its people to relations between Arabs and Jews, Haddad and Stephan made strategic decisions which impacted not just on the aesthetic and scholarly aspects of their translations, but larger questions about nation, identity and representation.

Functionalist translation theories arose in the 1970s and 80s and raise pertinent questions about how we should consider Haddad and Stephan’s works. They appeared at the same time as, and related to, the rise of politicised and postcolonialist ideas about writing and representation, which demanded a recognition of the power dynamics in
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They foreground the target (rather than the source) text in the translation process, prioritising the end result rather than the original, and emphasise the role of the translator as a social actor, rather than a conduit for the text, and as a visible agent, not an anonymous processor of words. The aim of the target text – and thus of the decisions made by the translator when undertaking the translation – can be related to the source text’s style or imagery, influenced by factors such as the aesthetic philosophies of the translators. But the aim might also relate to larger social or political purposes, for which translation and representation carry meanings linked to national identity or political and moral values. As such, functionalist theories of translation, such as skopos theory (which focuses on the skopoi – aims/intentions of a translation, rather than its formal content) offer tools for understanding existing works: they can suggest how, and why, Haddad and Stephan translated the texts they chose, and with what purposes in mind.

Ethnographic study of translators highlights the fact that the original author, text and translator are not the only ‘actors’ in the translation process. Many translators consult friends, colleagues, and native speakers of the source and target language during the translation process, utilising wide networks to provide information on language and cultural references. This network-like conception is particularly relevant to my studies of Haddad and Stephan’s work: I argue that their links across the various intellectual, religious and political communities of Mandate era Jerusalem, Palestine and beyond informed both the content and skopoi of their translations. Various points in translation can be sites of “confrontation and negotiation”, a realisation which intersects with issues of power and ideology in the colonial context.

In translation, taking aim is not the same as hitting the target. But not all actions

185 Ibid., 283.
(including those enacted during the translation process) have aims and intentions. Using function-oriented theories as analytical tools, therefore, informs how we read intentionality into a historical act of translation. How much can knowledge of the social, political and cultural environment in which a translation takes place fill this gap, intersecting with a reading of the translated text to unearth the translator’s intent? Functionalist theories, for instance, are often equated with free translation, and with end products which conform to the norms and references of the target culture, but this assumes that the translator or other initiator of the project has such a conformity in mind. The theory’s flexibility suggests that, if it fits the aim, linguistic fidelity to the source text or cultural strangeness – deliberate ‘Othering’, such as Venuti’s concept of ‘foreignising’ a translated text, introducing or leaving in foreign words, concepts or descriptions to highlight difference from the target culture – could instead be a legitimate choice.

Functionalist translation theories may help to consider some of the internal dynamics of Haddad and Stephan’s translations, and the choices they made. But other ways of thinking about language, knowledge and translation are needed to situate their work in the colonial environment in which it was produced. I therefore want also to draw on other literatures which emphasise translation as an activity or a process (rather than a product), and acknowledge the shifting and slippery dynamics of power and representation inherent in translating and interpreting not just language but culture in a colonial environment.

The figure of the dragoman (the translator, guide and interpreter of the pre-WWI Middle East) provides an illustration of such dynamics; this role entailed interaction between dragoman and traveller, with an interplay of power and authority in their relationship and questions of the extent to which the interpreter/dragoman mediated the traveller’s impressions and knowledge, not only of the historical sites they visited but also
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188 Cheung, 68. See Lawrence Venuti’s seminal work *The Translator’s Invisibility: a History of Translation* (London: Routledge, 1995) for a full discussion of his idea of ‘foreignising’ the translated text as a means of disrupting Western cultural assumptions.
of the contemporary culture they witnessed.\(^{189}\) On the other hand, clients’ preconceptions and prejudices often inhibited a dragoman’s ability to put forward their own account of historical, cultural, political or domestic information.\(^{190}\) Although those dragomans who served travellers lost much of their formal status with the rise of mass travel agencies such as Cook’s,\(^{191}\) even as guides and ‘cultural interpreters’ they continued to wield some degree of ‘soft power’. Far into the Mandate period they continued to influence visitors’ image of the Holy Land by choosing tour routes, selectively translating information from speakers of Arabic or Hebrew, and by presenting particular (and often highly political) narratives about the land and its peoples.\(^{192}\)

It is also important to note, in the context of Late Ottoman Palestine, that the word dragoman did not just denote a kind of tourist guide and interpreter who catered to visitors. Foreign consulates also employed dragomans and the role had an official status in communications with the Ottoman authorities,\(^{193}\) indeed, “Diplomats relied on him for the most delicate tasks”.\(^{194}\) Consular dragomans might be sent to represent their institution at official events; the Conde de Ballobar, the Spanish consul in Jerusalem prior to and during WWI, recorded in his diary that when Enver Pasha visited the city the various consuls all sent their dragomans as representatives.\(^{195}\) Contemporary records also note that dragomans often knew more about relations between consulates, local officials and other players than anyone else, and could help Europeans with the daily operations of bureaucratic life.\(^{196}\) But, in the end, they were junior employees who might be cast aside

\(^{189}\) Rachel Mairs and Maya Muratov, *Archaeologists, Tourists, Interpreters*, 4, 29-30. Mairs’ study explores the life and career of Solomon Negima, a dragoman who was, like Haddad and Stephan, an alumnus of the Schneller School in Jerusalem (Mairs 2016, 6).

\(^{190}\) Rachel Mairs, *From Khartoum to Jerusalem: The Dragoman Solomon Negima and his Clients, 1885-1933* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 86.

\(^{191}\) Lonni, “Translating Between Civilisations”, 45-46.


\(^{193}\) As evidenced by the Conde de Ballobar’s diary entry that “A circular from the government to clinch the suppression of the Capitulations said that, from now own, it will not recognise either the functions of the name of dragoman, nor that of cavas. They will be called secretaries and servants respectively” (Conde de Ballobar, *Jerusalem in WWI: the Palestine Diary of a European Diplomat*, edited by Eduardo Manzano Moreno and Roberto Mazza, introduction and notes by Roberto Mazza. London: IB Tauris, 2011, 133-34).


\(^{195}\) Conde de Ballobar, *Jerusalem in WWI*, 90.

\(^{196}\) A pertinent example are the letters and records of the archaeologist R.A.S. Macalister, who worked in
if a consulate closed or a new consul brought his favourites with him. The experiences of Ottoman-era dragomans highlight the fact that to translate language and culture is to be in a position of power, but one constrained by the demands of employers and audiences.

Elias Haddad and Stephan Stephan were not, of course, dragomans *per se*. But there are many aspects of the role which overlap with their experiences, in acts of linguistic translation/interpretation, but also the less tangible aspect of facilitation, negotiation and transaction. In their ethnographic work both men carried out such tasks. They helped Finnish anthropologist Hilma Granqvist with translation and analysis of her material from the village of Artas and Haddad carried out similar functions for the orientalist Hans Henry Spoer and archaeologist W.F. Albright. But the liminal, intermediary role of the dragoman also speaks to Haddad and Stephan’s positions more broadly:

Though attracted to the West, [the dragoman] nevertheless could not be part of this culture: he was not entirely Ottoman, but neither was he English, French, or anything else. Always in the middle, always on the border, he knew the two worlds, East and West, and mediated between them. Some looked down on him; some exalted him as essential; others gave no weight to his presence. He was always in the middle, not here, not there. 197

Like dragomans in the nineteenth century, “usually... Christian, sometimes Jewish or... Druze”, 198 both men were not from the dominant Sunni Islam or even from the main Christian denomination but, as well-educated Protestants, were atypical in the Palestinian society of their day, both privileged and liminal. The apparent dominance of Christians among dragomans seems likely to be a function of this section of the community’s greater access to education and to European languages, through their concentration in urban centres and their targeting by missionary schools. 199 As such, they were well-placed to
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translate languages and cultures, having, more than most, an insight into both. On the other hand, this “not here, not there” position gave rise to as much derision and suspicion as appreciation. “Authenticity” is often seen as key to identity and national tradition, whilst cosmopolitanism or “eclecticism is all too easily associated with superficiality and frivolity”, so that the translator is met with “condescension” and seen as “a traitor to his [sic] original community”. 200

Here, the figure of the historical dragoman meshes with ideas about the politics of translation in post/colonial contexts. Observations drawing on Spivak’s conception of the native informant note that, however “literate, author of written texts” a native might be, in the eyes of the coloniser s/he is still first and foremost a “native”, primitive and “not... (sufficiently) Europeanised”. 201 These conclusions might well be applied to Stephan and Haddad as writers in a colonial context. And yet whilst some of the encounters we witness in this thesis confirm this imbalance – between W.F. Albright and his “young Orientals”, 202 Stephan and the versifier of the folksongs he collected – others disrupt it. As I discuss in chapters 3 and 5, the relationship between Elias Haddad and Hans Henry Spoer raises intriguing questions about the extent to which it is possible for two people in “native”/coloniser positions to exist in some form of equality, and how far this is a function of the type and extent of colonialism or imperialism in which they meet. In this example, this and the previous section combine to emphasise the main themes embodied in these discussions of theories pertaining to language: of the ways in which colonial power is wielded and resisted in the intellectual sphere; of how language can be a site of both oppression and resistance; and the ways in which identities and statuses are flexible and changing throughout these situations.

1.3.5 The Following Chapters

I discovered Julia Hauser’s work on the Kaiserwerth Deaconesses of Beirut late on in my

\[\text{Communalism and Nationalism, 1917-1948} \text{ (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), 78, 80, 90;} \]
\[\text{Khalidi, \textit{Palestinian Identity}, 81-2.}\]


Staten, “Tracking the Native Informant”, 115.

research, whilst searching for information on the environment from which Tawfiq Canaan’s mother, herself a Kaiserwerth member, had come. Hauser’s articulation of her own theoretical understanding clarified my own, particularly in terms of the relationship between micro-histories and ideas of entanglements and networks as a means of conceptualising wider cultural and social relations. Entanglement, as a way of looking at social relations in an imperial setting, enables agency on both sides to be acknowledged, seeing the movement and transfer of culture and knowledge as bi- or multi-directional. “Intricate dynamics of appropriation and rejection” are credited, and micro-histories complicate grand narratives about cultures and “civilisations.”

The work that follows combines these approaches to present a picture of the lives of Stephan Stephan, Elias Haddad and Tawfiq Canaan which allows for a sense of agency; simultaneously it locates them in personal and professional networks and cultural, social and political entanglements which help us to understand how they accumulated the tools and tactics employed through that agency, and how they brought influence and knowledge to bear along the threads of their local, national and international connections.

A justification, though, is required for why this study is confined to, or centred upon, the lives of these three particular men. I argue that the similarities between their biographies make them a useful exercise in comparison. They were educated at the same school, were all Christian Arabs whose adult, professional lives extended from the late Ottoman across the British Mandate periods. They all wrote nativist ethnography, each publishing in the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* as well as other locations, and all worked for or with European institutions in Palestine. For all of them, encounters with Jewish immigrants, colonial officials and other non-indigenous inhabitants of Palestine were daily occurrences, but their writings show an ongoing awareness of their Arab, Palestinian and Jerusalemite identities and a changing engagement with them over the course of their lives. I believe that the convergences between their lives make the divergences all the more meaningful and open up points at which these ideas and identities can be explored.

These examples also demand that we look beyond Arab-Jewish relations, to the
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three-cornered nature of their situation as it incorporates also German, American, or British influences under conditions of direct or indirect imperialism before and after WWI. Similarly, although Parsons’ discussions of microhistory are significant additions to the methodological literature on Middle Eastern history, Stephan, Haddad and to some extent Canaan present new and different challenges. Of far less historical consequence, none of them left memoirs or diaries, and no archives have systematically collected their works. With the partial exception of Tawfiq Canaan and of a few book reviews, comment pieces and listings, none appear in other memoirs or in newspapers and journals of their day. As such, in this study I explore other methodological possibilities. I have assembled, from the fragmentary evidence available, as much as is possible of Haddad and Stephan’s lives, whilst Canaan’s is already more fully recorded. But going beyond that I employ more literary methods, such as close reading, and ideas drawn from postcolonial theories of language and translation, to try to construct portraits which draw together historical evidence and textual analysis as intertwined twin routes to understanding these men’s intellectual existences.

The following chapter, therefore, narrates the lives of Elias Nasrallah Haddad and Stephan Hanna Stephan, and synthesises from the more substantial body of work already in existence a narrative of Tawfiq Canaan’s history. Intertwined with these are the institutional ‘life stories’ of two of the key organisations in the lives of these three men: the Syrische Waisenhaus (Syrian Orphanage), known to many in Jerusalem as the Schneller School (where all three men were educated and where Haddad worked for his entire career); and the Palestine Oriental Society, the scholarly group in the journal of which all three men published at least some of their ethnographic writings. These individual and institutional biographies are intended to provide a background to the analyses which follow, but also to highlight the different networks in which the three men were embedded, ranging from the German Lutheran congregation of Jerusalem to scholarly circles associated with the Hebrew University, or the social worlds of prominent Arab nationalist thinkers such as the writer George Antonius (whose social contacts are perhaps the example par excellence of these kinds of broad and catholic personal networks), or the educationalist Khalil al-Sakakini.

Chapters three to six are grouped into two thematic pairs: one pair on the subject of
colonised subjects writing in the languages of colonial powers, and what this means in different contexts; and one on translation to and from a range of different languages, including Arabic, German, English and Ottoman Turkish. The theoretical discussions from this Introduction are applied to a selection of writings by Haddad, Stephan and Canaan: in the case of writings in English, the Arabic textbooks Haddad and Stephan wrote for English- and German-speaking students, the nationalist pamphlets of Tawfiq Canaan, and Stephan’s guidebooks for visitors to Palestine. The chapters on translation then examine Haddad’s work with the German-American Orientalist Hans Henry Spoer on the poems of Nimr ibn ʽAdwan; Stephan’s translation of the ‘Palestine’ section of the Travels of Ottoman writer Evliya Çelebi; his academic study of “Palestinian Parallels to the Song of Songs” and the poetic English version of Stephan’s functional translations made by the Orientalist ‘versifier’ E. Powys Mathers; and finally Haddad’s Arabic edition of Gotthold Lessing’s play Nathan der Weise.

Each of these texts is subjected to close readings and discussed in relation to the conditions of its production – both the individual circumstances of Haddad, Stephan and Canaan, their possible motivations, the collaborations and relations which informed their work, but also the wider political, intellectual and cultural currents of the time. Their choices of subjects or texts, the ideas they expressed, promoted and sought to project of Palestine and its society, and the people with whom they collaborated or to whom they turned for help and advice in the course of their projects are the ‘remains’ we have left to interpret and analyse. This study is an attempt to find out how, by piecing together information from all of these sources, and by interpreting writings and texts, we might reach a richer understanding of the intellectual life of Late Ottoman and Mandate Jerusalem. This study adds to a new strand in historiography on Palestine, focusing not on British policies, nationalist conflict or the activities of notables, but on the middle classes and their agency in creating a world-view that synthesised elements of “modern” science, technology, economics and rationalism with their own narratives and values.204 My textual analyses offer a new angle on the issue of collective and individual identity in
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204 As seen in (e.g.) Seikaly, Men of Capital, 37-39, 62-75, 100-6, and Norris, Land of Progress, 18-23 et passim.
Palestine: they highlight how a particular fragment of this developing middle class picked their way through influences from the Arab world, Lutheran Christianity, contested modernities and orientalist scholarship to forge their own model of Palestinian-ness which has impacted on national discourse to this day.
2 Entangled Lives

As the Introduction set out, Stephan Stephan, Elias Haddad and Tawfiq Canaan spent their adult lives in a Palestine affected firstly by informal imperialism and later by British Mandatory rule, deeply changed by World War I and the fall of the Ottoman Empire, and impacted by the rise of political Zionism and increasing Jewish immigration. Taking an approach which emphasises the role of networks and entanglement in the intellectual and social lives of my subjects and in understanding their intellectual production, I outlined how this way of seeing the three men allows for a sense of their agency, taking account of the influences of imperialism but not viewing it as entirely deterministic. In this chapter, I argue that, in the context of Late Ottoman and Mandate Palestine, their educational histories and intellectual entanglements allow us to see ways in which the three were embedded in networks which comprised individuals from many different communities, social classes, political opinions, and positions in the colonial system. However, in contrast to historiography which tends to place educated Christian Palestinian Arabs in a specific category vis-a-vis the society in which they lived, especially as regards the growing nationalist movement, I see a networks approach as allowing for greater scope to comprehend their intellectual and ideological encounters with colonialism, nationalism, Palestinian identity and Islam.

In order to support and illustrate this argument, this chapter firstly delivers brief ‘institutional biographies’ of two of the key organisations with which all three men were involved, namely the Syrische Waisenhaus (the Syrian Orphanage or Schneller School), where they were educated, and the Palestine Oriental Society, which issued the journal in which their best-known work was published. These institutions can be seen as the source of much of the breadth in their cultural references and intellectual skills, as well as the main sites from which their networks and entanglements emerge and expand. Secondly, I offer brief narratives of the lives of the three men, focusing in particular on the breadth of their scholarship and
intellectual contacts, and on the diversity of their links amongst (Christian and Muslim) Arabs, Jews of both Middle Eastern and European origin, and Westerners from Europe and America. Finally, I discuss the implications of these life stories and institutional environments in terms of how I then interpret the writings and translations explored in subsequent chapters.

2.1 The Institutions

2.1.1 The Syrische Waisenhaus

Stephan Stephan, Elias Haddad and Tawfiq Canaan were all educated at the Syrische Waisenhaus (Syrian Orphanage), also known as the Schneller School after its founder, Johann Ludwig Schneller. Attending the school in the 1890s and the early years of the twentieth century situated them in a major German Lutheran institution, giving them contacts throughout the networks of the Levantine Protestant community, as well as access to what were probably some of the best educational and vocational opportunities in Jerusalem at the time. It also meant that they grew up in an environment informed by German ideas of the nation but also by comparatively liberal social attitudes: although Canaan and Haddad were Lutherans, Stephan was not; the Orphanage accepted Muslim children as well as Christians, and both boys and girls.¹ On the other hand, as this section also examines, the history of the Schneller School must be considered in the light of the literature on missionaries in the Middle East, and their close links to imperialism.

Established in 1860 by a German Lutheran pastor to house children orphaned in the unrest in Lebanon, the Schneller School became one of the largest educational establishments in Jerusalem, providing vocational opportunities in its ceramic workshops, printing operations, brick factory and teacher training activities. Its regime included work in the kitchens and gardens, and trips to the countryside where the children could swim and sleep in the trees or in “holes in the sand”,² perhaps

² Yousef Mourad testimony on the Johann Ludwig Schneller School (Lebanon) website, http://www.schneller-school.org/yousef_mourad_memoirs_part_i.aspx, accessed 1⁴ February
influenced by Western ideas about exercise and physical fitness. Amongst the
thousands of alumni of the school’s operations between 1860 and WWII, some
became leaders in many fields, from high culture to the Jordanian military,\textsuperscript{3} and it
played a significant role in religious debates in late nineteenth and early twentieth
century Jerusalem, especially the development of a distinct Arab identity amongst
the Lutheran congregation and discussions around the use of Arabic for church
services and sacred texts.\textsuperscript{4} Importantly for the subjects of this thesis, pupils at the
Schneller School also learned a range of languages: a contemporary account records
that the main language of instruction was Arabic, but that German, French, Turkish
and Armenian were also taught.\textsuperscript{5} However, as a German institution, it also came
under suspicion both in 1917, when the British conquered Jerusalem from the
Ottomans, and as relations between Germany and Britain declined in the 1930s. Its
buildings were requisitioned for military use during WWII and sections of the school
closed down and scattered to Nazareth and Bethlehem, later to be re-established in
Lebanon and Jordan.\textsuperscript{6} Members of Elias Haddad’s family remain amongst the

\textsuperscript{3} Ruth Kark, Dietrich Denecke and Haim Goren, “The Impact of Early German Missionary
Enterprise in Palestine on Modernisation and Environmental and Technological Change 1820-
1914”, in: Martin Tamcke and Michael Marten (eds) Christian Witness Between Continuity and
New Beginnings: Modern Historical Missions in the Middle East (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2006), 151.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{4} Roland Löffler, “Aggravating circumstances: On the processes of national and religious identity
within the Arab Lutheran and Anglican congregations of Palestine during the Mandate years”. In
Martin Tamcke and Michael Marten (eds) Christian Witness Between Continuity and New
Beginnings: Modern Historical Missions in the Middle East (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2006), 102, 107-
116.\textsuperscript{5}

(January 1909), 921.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{6} Ludwig Johann Schneller, The Life and Work of Father Johann Ludwig Schneller, Founding
Father of the Syrian Orphanage, Schneller Institute in 19th-century Jerusalem, Palestine, trans.
(from the Arabic by Elias Nasrallah Haddad) by Ramsay Fawzie Bisharah (London: Melisende
2009), 112-113; Nehmeh testimony; Strategic Plan of the Johann Ludwig Schneller School,
school’s leadership to this day.⁷

Many of the individuals who lived, worked and taught at the Syrische Waisenhaus may have come with the best of intentions, but we also need to consider the institution as a facet of the German imperial project in the Middle East. Just as A.L. Tibawi analysed schools and social welfare programmes run by British organisations as a kind of ‘soft’ imperialism in the nineteenth century,⁸ and Beth Baron focused on the general role of orphanages and boarding schools as extensions of imperialism in Egypt,⁹ so we must consider the Syrian Orphanage’s role in Palestine, inculcating German cultural values, spreading use of the German language, building contacts and loyalties between Germany and an emerging Palestinian professional class, and placing German nationals ‘on the ground’ in the Holy Land.

In the three decades before WWI, Germany saw its international role (stretching from the Middle East to Samoa) as countering older British and French imperialism, for strategic reasons and to gain access to the vast natural resources needed to feed its rapidly-growing industrial sector.¹⁰ Education was identified as a key means of doing this, and “drawing local indigenous elites into German cultural, scientific and economic achievements […] by] instrumentalising educational institutions to create formal hubs of an Empire which defined itself in global terms” was a preferred method, including the establishment of targeted Propagandaschulen in the Ottoman Empire and Persia between 1900 and 1914.¹¹ As highlighted by Kaiser Wilhelm’s visit to the Middle East in 1898, in this period the German state and Germany capital had considerable influence in other sectors of the Ottoman polity and economy, advising on the army and military education, and providing finance and expertise on railways to Baghdad and the Hijaz.¹²
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¹¹ Ibid., 240-41.
¹² Ozyuksel, Hejaz Railway, 5,23-31,105; Todd Samuel Presner, Mobile Modernity: Germans, Jews
Nevertheless, we must also acknowledge the variation amongst colonial institutions and behaviours. On a non-state level, the two main German presences in Ottoman Palestine were the Templer and Lutheran communities. The Templers, a millenarian Protestant sect, largely kept themselves separate from the local Arab population, from immigrant Jewish settlements, and from most other Europeans.\footnote{Mahmoud Yazbak, “Templers as Proto-Zionists? The "German Colony" in Late Ottoman Haifa”. \textit{Journal of Palestine Studies}, 28, 4 (1999), 40-41.} They have been justly described as “proto-Zionist” in their attitudes towards the inhabitants of land they intended to settle, and antagonistically racist in their relations with Palestinian Arabs.\footnote{Ibid., et passim.} It is perhaps consistent with this that, in the 1930s, the earliest and later the bulk of recruits to National Socialism from amongst the \textit{Palästinadeutsche} came from amongst the Templers (commonly-cited figures say a total of 17% of the Germans in Palestine joined up).\footnote{Heidemarie Wawrzyn. \textit{Nazis in the Holy Land, 1933-1948} (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013), 4, 74; Francis Nicosia, “National Socialism and the Demise of the German-Christian Communities in Palestine during the Nineteen Thirties”. \textit{Canadian Journal of History/Annales Canadiennes d'Histoire} 2 (1979), 243; Ran Shapira and Nurit Wurgaft, “A Life-Saving Swap”. \textit{Ha'aretz} 23 April 2009, http://www.haaretz.com/a-life-saving-swap-1.274701, accessed 16 February 2015.}

The Lutheran community, and the Syrische Waisenhaus as part of it, certainly played a role in German imperial ambitions towards the Holy Land, but its day-to-day attitudes, whilst paternalistic and missionary in tone and intent, also incorporated genuine instincts for outreach and service. The Waisenhaus “became a leading nucleus of modern development, of education and training, of production and technical innovation, all based on Christian belief and humanity, to ‘serve the Lord’ and help those of the Arab population who were helpless and in need of human aid”.\footnote{Kark, Denecke & Goren, “German Missionary Enterprise”.} A series of expansions ending in the late 1920s saw the Orphanage grow into a major complex, incorporating a brickworks, bakery, printing press and other industrial/training workshops, as well as accommodation for hundreds of pupils and teachers. Philippe Bourmaud attributes Canaan’s espousal of early-twentieth-century

modernising, scientistic ideas about medicine, hygiene and sexuality to his roots in this German-speaking Lutheran community, with its rejection (compared to Catholic or Orthodox Christianity) of superstition and popular ritual, and adoption of rationalist ideas about both faith and more corporeal aspects of life.\textsuperscript{17}

If the Schneller School is viewed in the light of ideas about networks and entanglements, it is worth considering that the orphanage’s funding came not just from German Protestant sources, but from closer to home. According to Nasser Eddin Nashashibi’s biography of his uncle Ragheb, a major political figure in Mandate Palestine, several senior members of the Muslim Nashashibi family helped to fund the School and supported its initiatives to help orphans “stand on their feet and live useful lives with self-respect”.\textsuperscript{18} Given that the Nashashibis are often painted (with hindsight and sometimes over-simplification\textsuperscript{19}) as collaborators with British and even Zionist forces we could see this as the absorption of the family into the colonial mindset, choosing to fund a German school rather than one run by Arab Palestinians. On the other hand, we could view it as a window into a more complex vision of the social relations of Mandate Jerusalem, in which money (and the influence it often brings) flowed in both directions. This is highlighted by the fact that the Schneller School needs to be seen as part of wider educational provision in Jerusalem – both mission schools and those founded and run by Arab Palestinians with their own vision of the country’s future. This is visible in the examples of the musician Wasif Jawhariyyeh and his brother. They were sent to Schneller’s, according to Jawhariyyeh’s memoirs, but left after ill-treatment by a teacher, and went to Khalil al-Sakakini’s Dusturiyya college instead. The Dusturiyya is widely cited as a key moment in the development of a Palestinian modernity.\textsuperscript{20}

On a more conceptual, indeed ideological, level, German ideas of race and nation were also important in shaping discourse in and about Palestine in the late

\textsuperscript{17} Bourmaud, “Son of the Country”, 105.
\textsuperscript{18} Nasser Eddin Nashashibi, \textit{Jerusalem’s Other Voice}, 10.
\textsuperscript{19} Arnon Degani, for instance, notes that members of the Nashashibi family were involved in both assertively nationalist organisations as well as in groups with positions which favoured British rule. “They Were Prepared: The Palestinian Arab Scout Movement 1920–1948”. \textit{British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies} 41,2 (2014), 208.
nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A key example is the way in which the ideas of early Zionists such as Theodor Herzl were shaped not only by trends of general nineteenth-century romantic nationalism, but quite specifically by a German brand of this which intersected with notions of and anxieties about racial purity, national unification, and Jewish presence and assimilation.\footnote{Todd Samuel Presner, \textit{Mobile Modernity: Germans, Jews and Trains} (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 157-58, 174-94.} From 1890 onwards, German state interests in the Middle East intersected with the growth of the Zionist movement, so that the two must be seen as intertwined in the thought not only of German Jews looking towards Palestine, but also of a Middle Eastern elite exposed to German ideas. Another set of ideas which found particularly stark expression in German notions of \textit{Volk} centred around race identity and racial purity. Such ideas had a measure of influence in the Zionist movement (for example in Moses Hess’ 1862 \textit{Rom und Jerusalem}\footnote{Nicosia, \textit{Third Reich and Palestine}, 16.} ), but they also made their way into Arab nationalist thought and conceptions of race, nation and identity.\footnote{Israel Gershoni, “Rethinking the formation of Arab Nationalism”, 8; Reeva Simon, “The Teaching of History in Iraq before the Rashid Ali Coup of 1941”. \textit{Middle Eastern Studies}, 22.1 (1986), 43-4.}

In addition to the political, educational and religious aspects of German influence in Palestine, a study of Canaan, Haddad and Stephan’s working lives and scholarship must also consider the differences between the German and Anglophone intellectual traditions in relation to the Holy Land. Whilst German scholars – archaeologists, anthropologists, historians and theologians – were undoubtedly absorbed by Palestine’s Biblical associations, fewer of them were motivated by the zeal to \textit{prove} the Bible’s ‘truth’ that is seen amongst, for instance, British scholars of the Palestine Exploration Fund or the famed American proponent of ‘Biblical archaeology’, W.F. Albright. Examples of German ethnography from the late nineteenth century are not dominated by the concern to compare the contemporary inhabitants of the land with Biblical figures, as Anglophone texts often are. Influenced by the German intellectual tradition of higher Bible criticism, German Old Testament scholars such as Martin Noth disputed the historicity of the Bible and the possibility, therefore, of ‘Biblical archaeology’.\footnote{Thomas Davis, \textit{Shifting Sands: The Rise and Fall of Biblical Archaeology} (Oxford: Oxford}
who shared his scepticism, was head of the German School of Archaeology in Jerusalem in the early 1920s when Albright arrived, and the two clashed on this very subject. German archaeology may have been no less colonialist and grasping in its attitudes than that of other Western countries, “carting off carvings and mouldings by the boatload to Berlin”, but it came with a different – and perhaps, from the local perspective, less weighty – selection of ideological baggage than the Anglophone school.

This tension between bucolic images of life at the Schneller School, the wider role of missionary schools in Western imperial extension into the Middle East, and the vision of modernity promoted by a German Protestant education, is a theme which permeates the future lives of Haddad, Stephan and Canaan. Much has been written of the imperialism implicit in the acts and attitudes of British missionaries and diplomats in Palestine in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; Britain, as the colonial power in Palestine from 1917-48, is justifiably subject to the majority of scrutiny and criticism for imperialist behaviour in the Holy Land. But this is to forget that, in the last decades of the Ottoman Empire, Germany’s relationship with the Porte was the closest of any European power. German investment and involvement in infrastructure and education was hugely significant and German cultural influence was also strong, via Christian missions as well as through the impacts of German thought on political Zionism. The idea that both the nature and style of German Protestant colonisation in Palestine form a model for Second Aliyah and later Zionist immigration has also been mooted, resisting Zionist historiographic portrayals of both as examples of progress. The descriptions former pupils give of the environment in which they grew up are not so far from visions promulgated in Theodor Herzl’s *Altneuland*, his novel of Zionist settlement in Palestine, inspired in part by Herzl’s visit to Palestine in order to meet Kaiser Wilhelm in 1898, which
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imagined a process of “cleansing, resettling and cultivating”. The German presence in Palestine, therefore, went far beyond the benefits the Syrian Orphanage brought to individual pupils.

2.1.2 The Palestine Oriental Society

Like the Syrian Orphanage, the Palestine Oriental Society (hereafter POS) is emblematic of two of the main themes of this study: the existence of broad, overlapping social and intellectual networks in Jerusalem society, and the way in which the intelligentsia of a colonised environment might be seen as picking their way carefully through colonial institutions, finding in them opportunities for re-making knowledge for anti-colonial ends. In this section I argue that there is an implicit political aspect to the nativist ethnographies of Tawfiq Canaan and other Palestinian Arab writers in the Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society (JPOS). I add to the assessment of other scholars by suggesting that we should search for the roots of their understanding of the place of folklore in nation-building in their German-inflected upbringings. I also argue that the membership and subscription records of the POS suggest that its role in informing ideas of the Palestinian nation during the Mandate period was not as marginal as assumed by Salim Tamari and other scholars.

The Palestine Oriental Society was formally established in Jerusalem on January 9th, 1920. Palestine was still officially under British military administration following the end of World War One; the British Mandate over the territory was yet to be imposed by the League of Nations. Although imperial nations – Britain, France, Germany, Russia and America – and private groups within them all had existing institutes, schools, funds and other organisations for studying archaeology, history and anthropology in Palestine (often dubbed the ‘Holy Land’ in this context), the Palestine Oriental Society is notable for the involvement, from early in its existence, of local scholars. Many of these institutions employed translators, dragomans and excavation overseers whose role in and impact on their work is usually

29 Presner, Mobile Modernity, 197.
underestimated, but the Palestine Oriental Society was unique in that Arabic names – mainly, but not exclusively, Christian – feature not only amongst the subscribers to its journal, but also on the list of directors and publication editors who shaped policy and day-to-day operations.

The Society was the brainchild of the American archaeological contingent in Jerusalem; it was probably initiated by A.T. Clay, professor at the American School of Archaeological Research and a veteran of attempts to forge co-operation between international scholars in Jerusalem. The credit is sometimes given to the more flamboyant newcomer to Jerusalem, William Foxwell Albright, but this seems to be a myth. But it does highlight that in post-war Jerusalem, “fairly humming with archaeological interest”, the Americans were most active at forging links and collaborations, although “English [sic], French, German, Italian [and] Jewish... Schools and Societies” were also springing up, emphasising the diversity of international influences and networks in the city’s research community. Another theory, that the POS was a “venture devised by the British authorities to bring together representatives of the Arab and Jewish communities in the humanities”, seems improbable. Most other British policies divided, rather than united, Arabs and Jews, and both communities were outnumbered by Europeans and Americans in all aspects of the Society’s activities. The ‘public’ version of the Society’s foundation is also evidence against it being a British attempt at cross-community communication. If the Mandate administration had any strong interest in the POS, it was probably as a source of intelligence about the peoples it was endeavouring to rule. The Society’s membership included many political and district officers and, given the many well-documented cases of anthropological knowledge being used by colonial regimes to subjugate colonised peoples, ethnography in this region cannot be seen as politically

34 Shepherd, *Ploughing Sand*, 70.
neutral, but as contributing to British colonial control of the land and its inhabitants.

The Society’s ‘Introductory Notice’ lays out its Constitution, designating its object as “the cultivation and publication of researches on the ancient Orient”, with the latter term defined broadly (occasional papers over the years addressed locations as far off as Iran) but with the focus primarily on Levantine subjects. The official languages of the Palestine Oriental Society were to be French and English, reflecting its roots in European and American scholarship and the colonial powers of the Middle East. The 1920 edition of the Journal of the American Oriental Society reported that the inaugural meeting of the Palestine Oriental Society was “participated in by about thirty officials and scholars,” a mixture of scholars, British military administration officials, consular officials and churchmen. Attendees such as Storrs underline the Society’s links to the British Mandate authorities, whilst senior scholars from across Europe suggest that it was taken seriously as a place to discuss and publish research. Founding members also included several significant figures from the Jewish community of the time; Eliezer Ben Yehuda, the ‘father of modern Hebrew’, who had migrated to Palestine in 1881 from what is now Belarus, and David Yellin, a prominent Jerusalem educationalist whose mother came from the famous Sassoon family of Baghdad Jews. There is a notable absence of any Arab names amongst the founder members of the Society, underscoring its essentially colonial character.

David Yellin is a useful example of the complex intellectual and political picture of Palestine at the time. On one hand, he was President of the Va’ad Leumi (the Jewish National Council) from 1920-29 and was criticised in the Palin Commission report as an example of the “autocratic method of dealing with the Administration” shown by Zionists. On the other, he has been described as the
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35 JPOS Introductory Notice, 3-4.
39 'Report of the Court of Inquiry Convened by Order of HE the High Commissioner and Commander-in-Chief’, 12th April 1920 (‘Palin Report’),
“first scholar who devoted himself to the systematic comparison of Arabic and Hebrew poetry […] and] familiar with both poetries on a first-hand basis […] also the first to coin Hebrew terms for rhetorical concepts in Arabic.\textsuperscript{40} Yellin’s positions underscore the necessity of seeing the intellectual in early Mandate Palestine as shot through with political meaning. His insistence on what he framed as academic, linguistic – and therefore depoliticised – accuracy enabled him to make claims that were intrinsically political: he was one of those who, in 1920, urged the British administration to include Aleph-Yod – the initial letters for Eretz Israel – on its postage stamps. He claimed not to be interested in “the relation of Jews to the country” but merely with a “linguistic point” and “linguistic fact”. The political aims behind the choice of fact are, however, clear: as a Palestinian lawyer arguing against the usage on government stamps in 1937 pointed out, it would have been equally accurate, in some historical respects, to use “‘The Land of Canaan’ or the ‘Holy Land’” instead of or alongside that of Israel.\textsuperscript{41}

But Yellin’s insistence on the notion of scientific factual accuracy was far from neutral, and was never intended to be. The example of Yellin and the postage stamps underscores the role of the POS and similar institutions in promoting a particular kind of knowledge, one that, in laying claim to academic purity and rationalism, was itself used to exercise intellectually colonialist forms of power in determining what constituted scholarly ‘truth’.\textsuperscript{42}

The composition of the POS’ founding group highlights both the breadth of its appeal and the challenge of unpicking, across the impediments of time and distance, the motives, desires and power im/balances governing relationships within it. As a grouping which would eventually bring together Palestinian and other Arab scholars with British Mandate officials, Jewish historians and archaeologists, visiting American and European archaeologists, and long-resident religious scholars of the


region, the interests and aims of the Society’s members replicate the clashing and converging imperatives of different and overlapping sections of Jerusalem society and their ideologies. This diversity also included a substantial constituency of non-specialists; as letters and diaries from the Mandate era show, lectures and exhibitions by learned societies, including the POS,\(^\text{43}\) were one of the main spheres for upper-class and expat socialising in Jerusalem,\(^\text{44}\) which also meant that the scholars involved had a wider scope to spread their views. How much of the scholarship actually sank in is a moot point; more likely, these were opportunities to drink tea and catch up with the colony’s chat. But for this class of Jerusalemites, archaeology and history were a constant presence. This was the era of discoveries such as Tutankhamun in Egypt and archaeology could make front-page news; meanwhile, archaeologists and antiquities dealers came and went from Palestine and mixed in social and professional circles.\(^\text{45}\)

What was unique about the Palestine Oriental Society, though, was that it admitted Arabs and local Jews (as opposed to those recently immigrated from Europe). This was almost completely unknown amongst the Club society of Mandate Jerusalem,\(^\text{46}\) where even those societies which were “meant to draw different sections of the community together, [became] increasingly British and exclusive” over time.\(^\text{47}\) What did this mean in terms of Palestinian Arab representation in the POS? Although Arabic or Palestinian names are absent from the 1920 lists of founders, the situation changed quickly. Arab contributors are a constant from the first volume of the Society’s journal, most commonly Tawfiq Canaan and Stephan Stephan, followed by Haddad and others such as Omar Salih al-Barghuthi (a nationalist lawyer, journalist, and the scion of an aristocratic family from the village


\(^{45}\) The overlaps sometimes enter the documentary record; the Cook’s Travel agency, for instance, provided financial services for the Palestine Exploration Fund, and in 1912 a “Mr Salameh” (probably the same Dimitri Salameh who subscribed to JPOS for many years) visited the PEF’s excavations at Ain Shems to discuss financial matters. Letter from Duncan Mackenzie to Crace of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 15 July 1912. PEF/DA/Mack 250.

\(^{46}\) Sherman, Mandate Days, 59.

\(^{47}\) Glynn, Tidings from Zion, 72-73.
of Deir Ghassana); the Quaker educator Khalil Totah; Joseph Nasrallah; Nabih Amin Faris; and Asad Jibrail Rustum. Although a number of these, including Canaan, had already published in European and American scholarly journals, and these might be viewed as especially important in cementing their reputations as serious researchers, JPOS offered additional advantages. Its journal was read not only by distant academics but, judging by the subscription lists, persons from their own social circles; their articles in the Journal offered the prospect of their work being recognised and admired amongst both European and Arab society.

Just as importantly, Arabs also started to appear on the managing committees of the Society, with Canaan, Stephan and to a lesser extent al-Barghuthi all serving time as chair, treasurer, journal editor or on the board. The Arab nationalist bureaucrat, diplomat and networker par excellence, George Antonius, also spent several years on the Society’s central committee, as did the Jerusalemite Jew, David Yellin. Tawfiq Canaan was by far the most committed of this list: he remained a member of the board (secretary and occasionally treasurer) until the Society closed in 1948 (contra assertions that he dropped out after the hostile reception to his nationalist pamphlets in 1936; he did, however, start to publish his articles elsewhere, not contributing to JPOS after 1937). If the ‘Note to Members’ in the final
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48 Nasrallah contributed pieces in 1934 and 1936 on Palestinian and Transjordanian archaeology; he was at the time of these publications a student for the Melkite priesthood in Jerusalem, later becoming a major scholar on the history of the Melkite church and, as a clergyman, exarch of Paris. Pierre Canivet and Jean-Paul Rey-Coquais (eds), Memorial Monseigneur Joseph Nasrallah. (Damascus: Institut Francais du Proche-Orient, 2006), xvii-xviii, 5.

49 Nabih Amin Faris is listed as co-author (with Harold Glidden) of a 1939 article entitled ‘The development of the meaning of Koranic Hanif’. N.A. Faris (1906-68), born in Nazareth, later became professor of history at the American University of Beirut, was a close collaborator with eminent Lebanese historian Philip K. Hitti, and translator of significant texts by al-Ghazali and Ibn al-Kalbi. “Obituary: Professor Nabih Amin Faris”, The Muslim World LVIII, 3 (1968), 193.


issue of the *Journal* is to be believed, Canaan resigned from the position of treasurer only due to ill-health; in theory he remained on the board, although the Society could not have continued beyond the 1948-49 Armistice lines.

The fact that the POS offered the opportunity for Palestinians (Arabs and Jews) to participate sets it apart from other archaeological organisations in Jerusalem. The British School of Archaeology, the American School of Oriental Research, and their various continental European counterparts were all in the firm grip of management committees in their home countries. All meeting notes of the British School, for instance, were taken in London or Oxford, and decisions about funding, recruitment and other key issues were taken there, not in Palestine. Indeed, this was sometimes a source of tension within these bodies, as well as a reflection of their colonial nature.

But to what extent did Canaan, Stephan and Haddad see their involvement in the Palestine Oriental Society and its journal as a political act? Bourmaud stresses his belief that Tawfiq Canaan “politicised neither his ‘nativist ethnography nor its objects of study... His writing was focused on beliefs and the practices translating such beliefs and did not touch upon the possibly political use of pilgrimages”, and sees any political message or content in Canaan’s work as later extrapolation. This runs counter to Furani and Rabinowitz’s assertion that Canaan and his ilk were “strategic” in their depictions of Palestinian peasant life, and Nashef’s suggestion that Canaan’s interest in the *fellaḥin* and their way of life was rooted, from the earliest days of his ethnographic research, in a concern for the country’s future. De Cesari frames the matter slightly differently, but concurs; she argues that despite the POS’ nature as a “pre-eminent site of colonial knowledge production, where a militant and militarized science met religion”, Canaan, Stephan and their compatriots found (or created) space in which, “[w]hile reiterating a long-standing discourse
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about the Palestinian peasantry, they operated a tactical change within it, or rather brought it to its logical consequences in the spirit of a nascent Palestinian-nationalism”. I broadly agree with the positions taken by Furani and Rabinowitz, Nashef and De Cesari but, given their upbringing and education, with its German influences, and the strength of folkloric themes in German ideas of the nation and national identity, I argue that we can see another strand to the logic of Palestinian nativist ethnography as published in the pages of JPOS.

In addition to those who wrote for and helped to run the POS, the Society’s membership lists show a hitherto uncredited level of interest from other figures in Mandate Palestinian society. Salim Tamari, for example, writes that the nationalist writers of the day, “such as Muhammad Izzat Darwazeh, Awni Abdul Hadi, Musa Alami, Ajaj Nweihid, and many others, were rather oblivious to the writings of Canaan’s circle and their nativist ideology.” In Tamari’s view, these figures saw “Palestinian claims to the land [as] based on self-evident assumptions of historic patrimony and did not need any nativist justifications.” But the membership lists of the Palestine Oriental Society show that the ‘obliviousness’ of major nationalist writers to the work of Canaan and his colleagues was not comprehensive. Notable amongst the names is “Auni Bey Abdel Hadi” (ʻAwni ‘Abd al-Hadi), a subscriber from 1925-1930 – some of the years in which Palestinian contributions to the journal were at their richest. We also find the Arab nationalist George Antonius (subscriber 1923-38 and briefly a member of the Society’s board), and “Faidi al-Alami”, father or brother of Musa, was one of the initial subscribers when the journal was launched in 1920. Alongside them is “Adil Effendi Jabre”, proprietor of the Jerusalem-based Arab nationalist newspaper Al-Hayat al-Maqdisiya (subscriber 1920-24); Boulos Shehadeh, the editor of the newspaper Mirat al-Sharq (in which nationalist author Akram Zu‘aytir was also involved; Shehadeh subscribed 1922-26);
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Jerusalem notable and intellectual “Isaaf Nashashibi;” and historian and journalist “Abdullah Mukhlis,” a close associate of Najib Nassar, the fiery anti-Zionist editor of al-Karmil.  

In 1930, alongside Antonius, al-Barghuthi, Canaan and Stephan, we also find:

- Mr A.A. Faris, Land Dept, Jerusalem
- Mr Dimitri Farraj, The Governorate, Ramallah
- Mr M. Hannush, Department of Education, Jerusalem
- Mr Anis Jamal, Jerusalem
- Mr Shukry Muhtady, Rashidiyeh School, Jerusalem
- Mr Dimitri Salameh, Cook’s Tourist Agency, Jerusalem

In 1931, this list is joined by ‘Mr S.A.S Husseini, Dept of Antiquities, Jerusalem’, but in 1932 Shukry Muhtady drops off it and in 1933 so do Messrs Faris and Farraj, followed by Anis Jamal in 1934. The numbers involved are tiny, but there is a definite increase in names of Arab origin in the late 1920s and very early 1930s, at the same time as the high points of Arab and Palestinian contributions to JPOS and involvement in running the Society. Was this a matter of successful networking by Palestinian and other Society members? Of institutions picking up on the Journal and then losing interest? Of economic ups and downs? Or of a brief, small spark of interest by Palestinians outside of academic and religious circles in Western influenced studies of the region? The second half of the 1920s are understood by historians as one of the less conflictual periods of Mandate rule (albeit because of heavy-handed rule by High Commissioner Plumer between 1925–28). On a day-to-day basis, this might have created an environment in which diverse notions of Palestinian culture and identity had time to raise their heads.


62 “M. Hannush,” for example, is Manasseh Melki Hannush, b. Diyarbekir 1895, studied and taught at A.U.B. 1913–15, served in the Ottoman army 1915 and as a medical officer until 1918. He then joined the British Mandate Department of Education in 1918, remaining there until 1948, rising from chief clerk to senior education officer. In 1948 he left for Beirut, becoming head of the education section of UNRWA (*A.U.B Directory of Alumni* (Beirut: 1952), 96; *Report of the Director-General on the Education of Arab Refugees in the Middle East* (Paris: UNRWA, 26 May 1952), 6.

In the early-mid 1930s, though, Palestinian Arab interest in the Palestine Oriental Society and the *Journal* declines, in terms both of written contributions and membership subscriptions, leaving only a hard core by the end of the decade. Alfred Glock argues in his survey of writing by and employment of Palestinians in Mandate-era archaeology that the contents of JPOS show that:

Jewish immigration had a significant impact on the growing weight in numbers of Jewish scholars in archaeology, while the number of Palestinians remained relatively stable and then declined [...] reflecting the increasing Judaization of scholarship.\(^{64}\)

Glock’s study undoubtedly charts a shift in who was writing and studying the history of Palestine, and the general picture he paints is reminiscent of earlier patterns in Egyptian archaeology: Western scholars dominated the excavation, recording and interpretation of Palestinian remains, while Palestinians were largely relegated to junior roles.\(^{65}\) But Palestinian involvement and interest in the POS decline absolutely (rather than merely in comparison with Jewish engagement), as reflected both in Glock’s employment and publication figures and in reduced Arab readership of *JPOS*, suggesting that something more is going on.

I argue instead that the declines come partly from within Palestinian discourses, an internal trend as well as the effect of external pressure from colonial and Zionist trends. I see the trend of decline as linked to the increased polarisation of Mandate politics after the 1929 riots and the impacts of rising Jewish immigration in response to the Nazi threat in Europe. As I argue of Stephan Stephan’s translation of Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyahatnâme* in chapter 5, the political tensions and pressures simply became too much for all but the most committed to see a purpose in projects such as the Palestine Oriental Society.

---


2.2 The Biographies

2.2.1 Tawfiq Canaan

Tawfiq Canaan is undoubtedly the best-known and most thoroughly documented of the Canaan-Haddad-Stephan trio, with aspects of his life studied and analysed by Salim Tamari, Furani and Rabinowitz, and Mershen and Hübner (ethnography), Sandra Sufian and Melania Borgo (medicine), and Philippe Bourmaud (biography and nationalism)\(^66\). This summary of his life focuses, however, on two aspects which relate most closely to the themes of the study: the meaning we should attribute to his cosmopolitan life story, and the extent to which we should understand a nationalist sensibility as running through his work.

Canaan was the most high-profile and widely-networked of the three men within Jerusalem society in the Mandate period; Bourmaud comments that one of the most distinctive things about him was his address book\(^67\). In this, he embodies the contradictions and complexities of colonial societies. On the one hand he worked and socialised with Anglophone and Germanophone inhabitants of Jerusalem, married a woman of German extraction, wrote both his academic and polemical works in English and German, and espoused models of knowledge and science which are commonly identified with Europe and America. But of the three men studied here, he also took the most active and political nationalist positions, for which he was briefly interned by the British.

Canaan was born in Beit Jala, on the Jerusalem side of the town of Bethlehem, on 24 September, 1882. His father was Bishara Canaan (or Kana‘an), one of the earliest Arab Lutheran Pastors in Palestine\(^68\). Bishara was also one of the original charges of the Syrian Orphanage, either brought there by Johann Schneller’s 1860

---


\(^67\) Bourmaud, “‘Son of the Country’”, 114.

\(^68\) Ibid., 105; Nashef, “Tawfiq Canaan: a New Evaluation”, 70.
rescue expedition to Lebanon, or sent by his father from their home at the age of 12, along with his brother Antun. Bishara Canaan remained close to Johann Schneller, teaching at the Orphanage, acting as a liaison with the local community, accompanying him on an 1875 trip around Palestine, and delivering one of the eulogies at his funeral. The link, combined with the quality of the education, led his father to send Tawfiq Canaan to the Syrian Orphanage for his high-school years. Tawfiq’s mother was Katarina Khairallah, also of Lebanese origin. She had worked as a nurse under the Lutheran Kaiserwerth deaconesses in Beirut and later in Jerusalem.

These roots in the Levant-wide networks of the Protestant church served Tawfiq well; his father died soon after he finished school, but regional contacts allocated him a half-rate scholarship to the Syrian Protestant College. He was able to make up the difference and, along with the oldest of the six, Lydia, already a teacher, to help support his mother and siblings by tutoring private students. He earned a BA, in order to improve his English, and then embarked on a medical degree, winning a number of class prizes. Chosen to deliver a speech at his graduation ceremony in 1905, a few days later Canaan found himself printed (in Arabic translation) in the journal al-Muqtatf, under the heading ‘Modern Therapeutics’. The speech and article, in common with statements he was to make over the next four decades, argued for the uptake of what he considered to be modern, scientific forms of medicine in the interests of strengthening the Arab peoples.

The star student of the SPC degree programme made rapid progress in the medical profession. In pre-WWI Jerusalem, medical institutions were arrayed along national lines. Here, Canaan’s German Protestant networks again came into play, and

69 Schneller, Life and Work, 74.
71 Schneller, Life and Work, 74.
72 Ibid., 74, 82, 94.
75 Ibid., 71.
77 Ibid.
in 1905 he was appointed as a deputy physician at the Kaiserwerth hospital, run by an order of Lutheran deaconesses. His growing experience in treating patients, but more significantly in laboratory work and epidemiological research and publishing, led to further jobs and responsibilities, and to international professional contacts. Canaan was not the first Arab Palestinian to run a hospital in Palestine – French hospitals in Bethlehem, Jaffa and Nazareth had had local directors since the 1890s – but he was the first in Jerusalem. In 1913 he also became the first local physician to open his own clinic, based from his new family home in Musrara, just beyond the Old City’s Damascus Gate. Canaan’s private practice was both a continuous part of his professional life and of his social networks; he was not only physician to many foreigners in Jerusalem, including a large number of scholars at the various ‘Oriental Schools’, but also to middle-class Palestinians, as the young Ihsan Turjman recorded in his diary.

The Musrara house was home to Canaan and his new wife, Margot Eilender, the Palestine-born daughter of a German merchant; the land was a wedding gift to the couple. The two met at an Esperanto language class, but Tawfiq appears to have been seeking a bride to complete his successful life and career, going so far as to approach Annie Landau, the English Orthodox Jewish headmistress of a school for Jewish girls, for advice in a “delicate personal matter.” According to Canaan’s daughter,

He said: “look, Miss Landau, you are a good friend. I want a wife.” Landau, who knew all the educated women in Jerusalem, made a list of eight suitable young women, four Europeans and four Arabs. She invited each one with her parents to meet Dr Canaan in her home. Although Canaan did not marry any
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of the candidates, he and Landau remained close friends.86 Canaan’s marriage to Eilender gave him an unusual social status in Jerusalem, including admission to the German-speaking congregation at the Church of the Redeemer, membership of which was usually limited “to native German speakers or to nationals of countries whose language was of German origin”.87 Other members of Canaan’s social circle included the Arab nationalist George Antonius, and the moderate Zionist Judah Magnes and his wife Beatrice, highlighting the overlap between Arab, Jewish and Western social milieux in pre- and immediate post-WWI Jerusalem. To these can be added major figures of Arab nationalist history who mention Canaan in memoirs of time spent in Damascus with the Ottoman army, including Khalil al-Sakakini and ‘Izzat Tannous.88 Alongside Tawfiq and Margot, the Canaan household in Musrara also included Tawfiq’s mother, his sister Badra, an activist women’s rights and nationalist activist during the Mandate period,89 and his sister-in-law Nora, along with Tawfiq and Margot’s daughters Yesma, Nada and Leila and their son Theo. They were to remain there – barring periods of internment by the British authorities – until 1948, when the family evacuated the house after it suffered a direct hit from a shell.90

During the immediate pre-WWI period Tawfiq Canaan’s career continued apace, including a spell of research in Hamburg.91 The eminent nahda writer Jurji Zaydan noted in al-Hilal in 1914 that Jerusalem was prominent on the world stage in epidemiological studies and health sciences more generally, and Canaan must be seen as part of this trend.92 The city saw a boom in writing and publishing after the Young Turk revolution of 1908/9, and this also supported Canaan’s career, as he contributed pamphlets and articles which reached beyond the intellectual world of Ottoman Palestine. As well as medical works, these included ethnographic writings. But the small size of the region’s intellectual community did impact on Canaan’s
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work, as noted by Carl Heinrich Becker, the German Colonial Institute professor who read one of Canaan’s pamphlets and observed the lacunae in his knowledge of key works. Although Canaan undertook field research on his medical rounds, read Goldziher, and met the German theologian and Orientalist Gustaf Dalman, there were limits on the literature that reached Jerusalem. Canaan’s medical and ethnographic output from this period has, however, been largely ignored by researchers, since it is written in German rather than English or Arabic. This results in a gap in our understanding both of Tawfiq Canaan and of intellectual developments in Palestine more broadly. Canaan is often considered solely in the light of his post-WWI writings and achievements, but he was very much a product of Ottoman Jerusalem, and of his German Protestant education.

Socially, Canaan was involved with British and other foreign circles in post-WWI Jerusalem through invitations to the High Commissioner’s residence, and involvement in the YMCA (the “Zenith of Jerusalem society life”, accessible via his AUB alumni network and of which he was three times president) and Palestine Oriental Society. Internal documents and newspaper clippings in the Israeli National Archives show that he attended openings and ceremonies at the Palestine Archaeological Museum and Hebrew University. But on a day-to-day basis, British identitarian policies meant that he no longer worked with Jewish doctors in the same way, although he occupied senior positions in German medical institutions.

Although Tawfiq Canaan was fascinated by ‘folk’ medicine, his views on medical care were determinedly modernist, vehemently opposed to “superstition”
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and what he saw as unhygienic practices. This he saw not only as imperative for individual health, but for that of the nation: his 1923 graduation speech at AUB was entitled “Health, Foundation of National Life”. Arab mothers were, he believed, key to the strength of the nation and in using popular cures on their children they endangered not only their own offspring, but the country’s future. Early, arranged and intra-familial marriage, and male promiscuity, were all condemned as dangerous to individual and national health and moral fibre, and Canaan sympathised with calls for state control of personal behaviour, for instance requiring certification that both parties were free of syphilis before a wedding could go ahead. The modernist cult of health, the body and cleanliness was a key part of Zionist and Palestinian national iconography both during and after the Mandate period, and Canaan is a clear example of this. His ethnographic interest in health did not translate into seeing popular practices as part of a national culture to be preserved or protected; they were part of a past which might be recorded but in daily life had to be eradicated.

For many years Tawfiq Canaan enacted his political beliefs in his medical and ethnographic writings. There are signs from his medical work that he was growing increasingly frustrated with the direction in which Palestine was being taken by the British authorities, and in 1936 he supported the General Strike petition and ensuing uprising. Oral testimony claims that he voiced support for arming the rebels, and he may have offered clandestine medical care to wanted men, judging from a report that he removed a bullet from the thigh of notorious bandit/rebel Abu Jilda. Certainly he and his sister Badra were deeply engaged in the politics of the 1936-39 revolt. His daughter Leila also recalled “winding bandages and filling first aid boxes” for “anti-British protestors”.

Canaan’s most visible contributions were two pamphlets; he also signed public statements urging a strong position on national sovereignty. In these, as well as in
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Arabic-language articles in the Palestinian press, he advocated a binational state;\textsuperscript{107} in doing so, he relied upon a language of facts, statistics and quotations from British and Jewish figures, a rational form of argumentation which he seemed to believe would be effective on the English-speaking public. Despite this politically ‘moderate’ position, Canaan was linked to the Arab Higher Committee, Haj Amin al-Husseini’s faction in the uprising.\textsuperscript{108} The two apparently stayed in touch even after Husseini fled Palestine in 1937, and it is unlikely to be a coincidence that Canaan’s daughter Jesma (or Yasma) ran a cafe, the Scheherazade, in the same building as the AHC offices in Jerusalem’s German Colony neighbourhood.\textsuperscript{109}

If Tawfiq Canaan’s pamphlets betray a faith in the appeal of rationalism to the British, any such hopes were dashed on 3 September 1939, when Canaan was arrested and taken to the prison at Akka (Acre), a significant lieu de memoire in both Palestinian and Israeli nationalism because of its use by the Mandate authorities as a site of incarceration and execution.\textsuperscript{110} He was held for nine weeks without being charged, appearing twice before courts which ordered him to be released, which orders were countermanded by the investigatory authorities.\textsuperscript{111} Margot, still a German citizen, was interned as an enemy alien, whilst Badra, the most politically active of the family, was imprisoned. Both were held at Bethlehem for their nine-month prison periods and then interned at the Templer colony of Wilhelma until 1943. The women had been founder members in 1934 of the Arab Women’s Committee, a charitable organisation which, during the 1936 uprising, took on a more militant role; Badra had also represented the Committee at an international women’s conference, in Cairo in 1938.\textsuperscript{112}

Bourmaud’s interpretation of Canaan’s reaction to his arrest is that he “was
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very much disappointed by being jailed and stopped expressing himself on directly political issues. He moved for good from direct political involvement to professional activism with a political agenda”.\textsuperscript{113} As Canaan had only embarked on direct political expression through his two 1936 pamphlets, this was more of a return to form than a change of tactic. Canaan focused his remaining energies in the period to 1948 on the Palestine Arab Medical Association, which published a journal featuring articles on diseases and medical practice, but was also concerned with refuting Zionist claims about the Jewish revolution in Palestinian health. He also remained involved in running the Palestine Oriental Society, although he ceased writing regularly for the \textit{Journal}. With the outbreak of final hostilities in 1947-8, Canaan, as an experienced director of medical institutions, was involved in transferring hospitals and other facilities on the ‘Arab’ side.\textsuperscript{114} After 1948 he was director of the (German) Augusta Victoria Hospital until his retirement in 1955, and helped to transfer the operations of the Talbiya leprosarium to new quarters near Ramallah.

Canaan’s ethnographic career is also important for its recognition of the multi-directional influences in the Jerusalem anthropological community/ies. As well as being “facilitated” by his relationship with his fellow Arab scholars, Canaan was probably influenced by contact with the Finnish ethnographer Hilma Granqvist, so that “from the 1920s onwards his ethnography tended to move away from the systematic form of description of \textit{Aberglaube und Volksmedizin} and toward more interpretive writing”.\textsuperscript{115} This observation confirms that Granqvist was linked to all three of the subjects of this study, whether through her influences on them (Canaan) or their provision of translation, interpretation and other support to her (Haddad and Stephan). Although Bourmaud detects a shift in Canaan’s style of writing and interpretation of his material, Nashef stresses that Canaan’s originality – his detailed study of Palestinian material and oral culture and his ability to draw on Arabic, German, English and other scholarly sources to inform his understanding of his observations – begins well before his encounter with Granqvist.\textsuperscript{116} Indeed, I would
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argue that they represent a synthesis of his awareness of the need to defend Palestinian Arab culture and a German-influenced idea of national identity as rooted in folk culture.

2.2.2 Elias Nasrallah Haddad (1878-1959) and Stephan Hanna Stephan (1894-1949)

Tawfiq Canaan’s life is reasonably well-documented, but the same cannot be said of his colleagues. The lives of Elias Haddad and Stephan Stephan, though, raise similar issues: of varying imperial influences in their upbringing and education; of colonial institutions in their working lives and how we should understand the level of agency they could exercise in these situations; and the way in which personal and professional networks that extended into both the Arab and Western worlds affected these. In addition, I argue that the examples of Haddad and Stephan show that there remain individuals from the intellectual world of Late Ottoman and Mandate Palestine still to be unearthed, and thus strands of thought and argument which are not fully acknowledged in current understandings of debates and positions in Jerusalem.

Elias Haddad was, in Salim Tamari’s portrait of the ‘Canaan circle’, a marginal figure, “virtually unknown and unacknowledged” during the second half of the twentieth century. Understanding Elias Haddad’s life and works thus entails piecing together an image of this multi-faceted scholar from the ground up. Haddad’s ideas, although mildly or tangentially expressed, often address the sharpest end of debates about the relations between coloniser and colonised: he translated European literature into Arabic, he worked in a European institution, he wrote in Western languages and – unlike Canaan and for the most part Stephan – many of his writings were co-authored with Westerners. Salim Tamari notes Haddad’s varied contributions to the anthropology of Palestine, and Furani and Rabinowitz place him firmly amongst their “circle of mostly Christian contemporary Palestinian
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intellectuals” with an explicit agenda of “offering a narrative that contested the endorsement by the Balfour Declaration of a national Jewish homeland in Palestine”. But Haddad’s anthropological output was comparatively small in comparison with Canaan and Stephan; his publications in other genres are at least as significant.

Elias Nasrallah Haddad was born in 1878 or 1879 in Khirbet Qanafar, a village in the Beqaa Mountains of what is now Lebanon and was then Ottoman Greater Syria. He entered the Syrian Orphanage as a child; unlike Canaan, he appears to have been a full resident. Elias’ father, Girius, had died in 1889, leaving his wife Haje to care for their four youngest children. Five older girls had already married, but three boys (including Elias) and a girl were still dependent on their parents. It was at this time that Elias, already showing signs of being a bright young man, was sent to the Schneller School.

Elias Haddad remained part of the Schneller institution for most of his life, becoming a senior teacher, head of Arabic, and finally head of the entire school. In 1907, by which time he would have been respectably established in his career, he
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married a woman called Astrasia, and had children, including a son called
Theophil. According to Gabi Haddad, his grandfather started teaching at the Syrian
Orphanage in 1899 but briefly returned to Lebanon at the end of WWI to teach at a
school in the town of Suq al-Gharb; he also suggests that Elias studied for a BA at
the American University of Beirut at this time, although his name does not appear on
the student rolls. Whatever the details of his time in Lebanon, Haddad certainly
returned to the Schneller School as an experienced teacher of Arabic. His interests in
(especially colloquial) Arabic also took him beyond the confines of the Orphanage.
Before WWI he co-authored the *Manual of Palestinian [sic] Arabic* with the
German-American scholar Hans Henry Spoer, and provided language lessons and
translation help for at least one other German researcher in Palestine, the Orientalist
and theologian Friedrich Ulmer.

Other than his publications, we know little of Elias Haddad’s life during the
Mandate period. His books and translations indicate that he spent much of his time in
the world of the Syrian Orphanage, teaching his pupils, developing his ideas on
Arabic language and pedagogy (which gave rise to several textbooks used in the
Palestinian educational system), and playing music – he taught some of his pupils
the flute and played the organ in church. Beyond the Schneller School, however,
Haddad’s language-teaching skills and interest in colloquial Arabic and village
dialects brought him a broad network amongst foreign scholars and officials. He
helped foreign ethnographers such as Hilma Granqvist and archaeologists such as
W.F. Albright trans literate and interpret the rural sayings and folk tales they
collected; the sheer volume of Haddad’s notes in the Granqvist files held at the
Palestine Exploration Fund show that this must have occupied a significant amount
of time. As a high-ranking teacher of Arabic in Jerusalem during the Mandate era he
also helped senior members of the British administration with their Arabic, and
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family history records that he also taught the language to the future Israeli politician and diplomat Abba Eban.  

Between 1944 and 1948, Elias Haddad worked for the Middle East Centre for Arab Studies, the Arabic language institute established in Jerusalem by the British Army during WWII and later moved to Lebanon. Eban was an instructor there from 1944 onwards, training Jewish recruits, whilst Haddad taught colloquial Arabic, which offers a possible time-frame for the family story. Employment at the Centre may also have been a means for him to move to Lebanon at the end of WWII and to help to move the Syrian Orphanage’s work there. According to Sir James Craig’s history of the institute, Haddad was one of the instructors who “took the chance to escape” to the Centre’s new base at Shemlan, although he “did not stay”, presumably because he went to Khirbet Qanafar to head the re-established Schneller School. The missionary and Arabist Eric Bishop describes Haddad as one of the Arab teaching staff who had been “requisitioned” during the War, implying that his role at the Centre was not entirely of his own volition and suggesting a nuance to his willingness to work for colonial institutions. It might be argued that this case suggests Haddad was happy to work in a German organisation, the Schneller School, which offered education to children of all faiths and backgrounds, but less eager to serve an institution directly connected to British colonial rule.

As is the case for Elias Haddad, no secondary literature exists on the life of Stephan Stephan. He appears as a brief also-ran in studies of Tawfiq Canaan and ethnographic production in Mandate Palestine. But, like Haddad, he offers an illuminating example of a Palestinian Arab whose thought and politics leaned
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towards an interest in national identity and history, but who saw little or no contradiction between this and their jobs in colonial organisations. Indeed, in Stephan’s case the contrast is even sharper, as he worked for the British Mandate administration directly. I also argue that an examination of Stephan’s hitherto unstudied writings highlight even further the gaps in our knowledge of debates about issues such as gender, identity and nation in this period, and that the diversity of partners with whom he worked on publications ranging from scholarly translations to pocket guidebooks signals the importance of professional networks which encompassed Arabs, Jews and Europeans.

Stephan Hanna Stephan’s date of birth is disputed (not unusual for this period); Nabil Khalid Agha reports that he was born in 1899, and a website with information on his place of birth, Beit Jala (where Tawfiq Canaan was also born), repeats this. Bibliographic information on his books, however, suggests a date in or around 1894, and this is supported by a letter from Stephan to the Finnish anthropologist Hilma Granqvist in which he writes:

> About 40 days ago, the old director, Herr Schneller, passed away – Allah may welcome him in his grace. He was a gentleman in every respect. Today, on 24th May 1908 he confirmed me. Back then, I was still a brat of barely fourteen.

W.F. Albright notes that “like Canaan and Haddad”, Stephan “received his inspiration in the Syrisches Waisenhaus”, adding to Stephan’s memory to place him at the Orphanage itself. Stephan married and had children; one of these was a son called Arthur, of whom we know thanks to a 1934 letter from Stephan to Granqvist, in which Arthur’s bout of rheumatic fever and subsequent bed-rest is mentioned. A 1935 letter mentions two sons and also Stephan’s wife, although no
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names are given. A chance email from Stephan’s grand-daughter, Cristina, cleared up a few of these questions: Stephan’s wife, Arasky Keshishian, was Armenian, and their two sons were Arthur and Angelo. The whole family fled to Lebanon in 1948, having been forced to abandon their home in Jerusalem, and Arasky and her sons then left for Brazil in the mid-1950s.

The question of Stephan’s religious affiliation is intriguing. Closely linked to the Syrische Waisenhaus throughout his life, Elias Haddad seems to have been Lutheran from start to finish: it seems likely that, if his branch followed the same trajectory as his cousins, the entire family had converted from the Orthodox church sometime in the nineteenth century. Tawfiq Canaan was also a born-and-bred Lutheran. But several accounts of the convoluted events surrounding the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls name Stephan as a member of the Syrian Orthodox church. The claim can be traced back to an article by the Syrian Orthodox Metropolitan, Mar Athanasius Y. Samuel (1909-1995), whose recollections of his role in the discoveries were published in the journal *Biblical Archaeologist* in May 1949. He stated that “I called one of our community who was employed by the Department of Antiquities, Stephan Hanna Stephan, who came to my office to look at them”. The wording used by Mar Athanasius in the rest of the article makes it clear that by “our community” he meant the Syrian Orthodox.

This highlights the fact that the Syrische Waisenhaus housed a range of religious beliefs within its walls, taking its missionary role as secondary to that of education. It also provides an explanation for the overall sense that Stephan never stayed connected to the Waisenhaus and other Lutheran institutions in the same way as Haddad and Canaan. Ussama Makdisi claims that “a Protestant minister often cajoled his congregation into more sincere piety”, whilst “a Protestant missionary essentially dictated to his Indian converts the forms of Christian behaviour”. In the
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case of the Schneller School, though, we seem to see missionaries behaving like pastors and teachers, perhaps influenced by the Schneller family’s long residence in an Ottoman-Islamic world that simply assumed co-existence amongst multiple faiths under an Islamic ruler.\(^\text{143}\)

Between his confirmation in 1908 and his first two publications we know little of Stephan’s whereabouts or activities. We can, however, make some informed guesses, based on secondary literature and on the memoirs of other Palestinians. Aged nineteen or twenty at the outbreak of World War One, Stephan may well have been conscripted into the Ottoman army.\(^\text{144}\) As a Christian, however, he was unlikely to have fought, as most were used in construction or logistics battalions, rather than being armed.\(^\text{145}\) A brief aside in a 1922 article by Stephan provides a tantalising clue: he describes having heard a “Kurdish ditty” from the “Kedkân Kurds between Jerâblus (the ancient Carchemish on the Euphrates) and Mîmbij (the ancient Bambyce)...”.\(^\text{146}\) Given his age and regional events, military service seems like the most likely explanation for his presence in northern Syria.

Despite what Salim Tamari calls his “significant contributions on peasant notions of time and the periodization of the agricultural cycle”\(^\text{147}\) and the “bold... meticulous... [and] important” scholarship in his work on the Biblical Song of Songs and on madness in Palestinian folklore,\(^\text{148}\) Stephan’s work remains “virtually unknown and unacknowledged.”\(^\text{149}\) In 1922 Stephan made his first known appearances in print, two articles in the Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society (including one of his most widely-cited works, “Modern Palestinian Parallels to the Song of Songs”), and a short article entitled simply “Al-Marāa” in the January 1922 issue of the monthly cultural magazine Sarkis, published in Egypt by Salim Ibn
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Shahin of the Lebanese Sarkis family between 1905 and 1924.  

The latter is a fairly early example of a Palestinian intervention in regional debates about the place of women in Arab society. Stephan argued that women should be educated and social rights conferred upon them in order to build a stronger nation and to improve perceptions of Palestine. This is very much in the vein of conversations which had been taking place in such journals since Qasim Amin’s famous statements in *The Liberation of Woman* (1899) and *The New Woman* (1900). Women were seen in this discourse as biologically different from, but equal to, men; their position having been debased by male authority, to the detriment of all humanity. Women needed to be restored to their full role, and where this happened a society was seen as having reached “the highest peaks of civil life, prosperity, civilisation and urbanity”. Sarkis was very much part of the *nahda* intellectual environment, and was particularly linked to the Lebanese writer Ameen Rihani, debating questions of religion and politics with him in print. The fact that Stephan, in his mid-twenties, had sent his article to Sarkis in the hope of publication suggests both a tentative confidence in his views and abilities, and an awareness of the debates on gender happening in the Syrian-Egyptian press.

In addition to this publication, Stephan’s later works include more co-operation with fellow Arabs than is apparent for Canaan and Haddad. At the Department of Antiquities of the Mandate Administration he co-authored papers with another employee, the archaeologist Dimitri Baramki, and worked alongside a number of
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Palestinian Arab inspectors of antiquities and specialists in practical archaeology. Stephan also co-produced his tourist guides to Palestine with the photographer ‘Afif Boulos, discussed in detail in chapter four. But he also co-operated more obviously with Jewish newcomers to Palestine than either Canaan or Haddad, issuing Arabic phrasebooks and at least one travel guide through recently-founded Jewish publishing houses Steimatzky’s and Ahva, and publishing a number of translations from Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyahatnâme* in concert with the Galician orientalist L.A. Mayer. These examples are all covered in detail in ensuing chapters.

Of the three subjects of this study, Stephan is probably the one who can most accurately be linked to Arabic-speaking networks and audiences, from the early Sarkis article to the end of his career. His scholarly articles, however highly rated by his academic contemporaries, probably had only a tiny readership. But he was also a practised voice on Palestine’s government-run radio station, which started broadcasting in March 1936. The topics of his radio lectures include his amateur, ethnographic studies as well as his archaeological and manuscript work at the Museum. According to programme listings in the *Palestine Post*, on 13th December 1936 he spoke on “Wit and Wisdom in Arabic Folksongs”, on 29th January 1937 on “Forgotten Trades of Palestine”, and on subsequent dates over the next two years on Turkish monuments in Palestine, libraries of the Umayyads, the festival of Nabi Rubin. He also broadcast a series on Palestine in the Stone Age, the ‘Nomadic’ age and under the rule of the Pharaohs, Assyrians, and Greeks. The ‘Listener’s Corner’ column on 19th April 1938 described Stephan’s talk of the preceding day, noting that:

In the Arab Hour yesterday, Mr. Stephan Hanna Stephan gave a talk on ‘Punch and Judy,’ which was not what you might think, but rather a form of entertainment common in Arabic-speaking countries for a long time, which in all modesty might be described as a precursor of the ‘talkie’. It consists of a shadow-play, accompanied by spoken dialogue; to this day, one can see it performed in some parts of the Nablus district, to say nothing of Byron’s
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mention of it in one of his travel poems.\textsuperscript{158} 

Stephan’s radio broadcasts probably gave him a wider reach than any of his colleagues, particularly to Arabic-speaking audiences who were largely unlikely to have encountered the English and German articles of Stephan and Canaan. They formed part of the 70-80\% of the Arabic programmes that were “musical, theatrical, ethical, children’s and women’s” interests, with the content reflecting wider trends of thought and opinion in the Arab world.\textsuperscript{159} Although the Palestine Broadcasting Service was the creation of High Commissioner Wauchope and often criticised for the racial and cultural assumptions it made about its listeners (classical music for ‘cultured’ European Jews; agricultural advice for Arab farmers in need of ‘modernisation’), it did gain credibility with Arab audiences because of its willingness to hire cultural figures with nationalist backgrounds as heads of the Arabic section, such as Ibrahim Tuqan and ‘Ajaj Nuwayhid.\textsuperscript{160}

Although owning a radio was a luxury confined to a tiny percentage of the population, radios were often played in cafes and in social situations, so up to a third of the population may have been listening by the end of the Mandate period (far more than read newspapers, despite the greater attention this medium receives).\textsuperscript{161} Talks by “learned men” such as Stephan were part of the radio’s appeal, judging by their large allocation of airtime and references to them in advertisements for radio sets.\textsuperscript{162} This was the only popular forum in which Stephan (or his colleagues) had an opportunity to talk about their ideas of Palestinian history and culture in Arabic, to a wide and cross-class Arabic-speaking audience extending across the whole Mandate region. Stephan’s programmes told rural Palestinians, often dismissed by the British administration and Zionist colonisers as primitive and illiterate, that their culture, with its music and folk-tales, was worthy of preservation and study, and that it had a long and honourable history.

A final sphere of Mandate Palestinian society into which Stephan reached was
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the illustrious Khalidi family. He worked at the Khalidiyya, or Khalidi Library, in the Old City of Jerusalem, for a period in the 1940s. According to Walid Khalidi, Stephan helped his father, Ahmad Samih al-Khalidi, head of the Arab College, and Sheikh Amin al-Ansari to look after the famous library from the death of Sheikh Khalil al-Khalidi in 1941 until Stephan and Ahmad al-Khalidi were both forced to flee in 1948.\textsuperscript{163} This situates Stephan in another of Jerusalem’s important intellectual and political networks: Ahmad Samih al-Khalidi had been one of nationalist and educator Khalil al-Sakakini’s ‘Vagabonds’ circle, along with Tawfiq Canaan and Musa ‘Alami,\textsuperscript{164} and was also a member of the rather more solemn Royal Society for Asian Affairs, along with ‘Awni Bey ‘Abd al-Hadi.\textsuperscript{165} He was also husband of the notable Lebanese feminist Anbara Salem Khalidi. A seven-year stint at the Khalidiyya, therefore, entangles Stephan still further with people who were key in considering issues of modernity, identity and nation in Arab Jerusalem.

As mentioned above, Stephan’s day-to-day life took place inside the British colonial administration in Mandate Palestine, with colleagues from all communities. Although he started out in the Mandate Treasury, he soon moved to the Department of Antiquities, which oversaw archaeological explorations in Palestine, dealt with new finds, and judged applications to alter non-religious buildings of historical importance. The way in which the British in general, and the Department in particular, understood the antiquities of Palestine was deeply colonial in nature. It viewed the archaeological remains of Palestine’s many cultures as static objects, to be protected from a local population perceived as primitive and ignorant, liable to quarry ancient remains for building-stone and sell valuable finds to unscrupulous antiquities dealers. Indigenous ownership of Palestinian archaeology was certainly not on the cards.\textsuperscript{166}

Whilst we may perceive Stephan’s long career at the Department of
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Antiquities, and his many publications for its *Quarterly*, as indicating a level of agency within its imperialist confines, the atmosphere must have been constraining. Biblical ideas about Palestine’s past permeated British framing and treatment of the material heritage. A number of clergymen, including W.J Phythian-Adams and Herbert Danby, occupied significant positions in the British archaeological establishment in Jerusalem. This circumstance must be understood against the background of British Protestant notions about the Holy Land, its place in the British Christian patrimony, and contemporary Palestinians as degraded relics of the Biblical past. Danby was also a fervent Zionist, as was P.L.O. Guy, whose opinions of Arabs were “harsh” and who paid little attention to buildings of Arabic-Islamic origins while in post. It is clear that some divisions of the Department were not hospitable environments for Palestinian Arab employees, and that the ideological bent of some staff might have influenced how they treated Arab colleagues, interpreted excavation data, or applied antiquities law to the remains over which they had jurisdiction.

The Department has also been accused of making “no serious effort to encourage Palestinian archaeologists to become professionals,” an allegation which to some extent holds water; certainly Stephan’s career never seems to have made the progress his publications deserved. More far-reaching effects stemmed
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173 During the Mandate period, the DAP did train several Palestinians as 'student inspectors', all of whom went on to long-term employment in the Department, in some cases in senior roles (Donald Whitcomb, “Dimitri Baramki: Discovering Qasr Hisham”. *Jerusalem Quarterly* 55 (2013), 79-80). But the total number of Arab Palestinians employed in non-menial roles (cleaners, site guards) by the Department was small compared with British and Jewish staff. On the other hand, senior Jewish staff such as Leo Mayer came to Palestine with doctorates and academic experience in
from the Mandate administration’s Antiquities Ordinance, which protected artefacts and buildings from the year 1700 or earlier (religious buildings were handled separately). This cut-off date rendered many Ottoman-era remains unprotected under Mandate and subsequent policy frameworks. Its underpinnings were ideological forces which both detached the ordinary Palestinian population from their heritage and reinforced archaeology, as a source of supposedly objective, scientific knowledge, as an important tool in the creation of Israeli identity and claims to the land. Antiquities were thus distanced from the everyday, not part of ordinary life or the legitimate possessions or heritage of average people. Instead, under a logic employed by European and American collectors in cases across the Middle East, they became the property of those who could engage with them on the scholarly, scientific level. Given the racism and cultural superiority endemic to the archaeological literature, it is worth wondering whether Stephan’s own choice of signature was deliberate; his English-language work was almost always signed ‘St. H. Stephan’, a European-looking name.

This was the supposedly objective and scientific, but actually politically entangled and riven, environment in which Stephan spent much of his working life. He is mentioned in connection with the Department in various accounts, usually as an ethnographer or because of his brief involvement with the Dead Sea Scrolls, but appears nowhere on the lists of staff published in the ‘Blue Books’, the annual lists of data compiled by each British colony and sent to the Foreign & Commonwealth hand, unlike their indigenous counterparts, amongst whom the highest level of formal education was a BA: Baramki from London, Hussein from Beirut (Albert Glock, Lois Glock and Nancy Lapp, “Archaeology”. In Encyclopedia of the Palestinians, ed. Philip Mattar (New York: Facts on File, 2005), 74-5). Arguments about whether European Jewish immigrants were given unfair access to Mandate jobs, or were simply better qualified, affected other departments in the administration; see Seikaly, Men of Capital, 114.
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Office in London. This suggests that he entered the civil service as a member of the general administrative staff and was never appointed to a professional-ranked position in the department or the Palestine Museum. A 1936 bibliographic pamphlet edited by Stephan, published by the American University of Beirut, names him as ‘Assistant Librarian, Palestine Archaeological Museum Library’. 179 The conjecture that he came to the Museum via the lower ranks of the Palestinian civil service is supported by the inclusion, in the first subscription list for the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, of Stephan’s address in 1920/21 as the Treasury, not the Department of Antiquities.180

Stephan’s case also highlights the way in which reliance on official evidence such as the Blue Books skews our impression of the Mandate administration’s workforce. The entire civil service for the administrative division of Gaza, for example, comprised 2,775 staff, of whom 162 were British. Over 2,600, therefore, were Palestinian Arabs. These numbers were particularly high because of police (the majority of the employees), recruited during World War II,181 but they are mirrored in figures for the Department of Antiquities in 1947: 73 out of the 94 staff on the payroll were Arabs (22 Christians and 51 Muslims), with six Armenians, nine Jews and six British; the vast majority of the Palestinians were “guardians at sites around the country, museum guards and attendants, messengers, and cleaners.”182 These illustrate the huge numbers of Arab employees in the Mandate civil service and corrects the image of a primarily Anglicised bureaucracy (although in Jerusalem, where the higher echelons were based, this would have been less true).

Civil service conditions also need to be borne in mind when considering the politics of Stephan’s writings. Administration employees were barred from political involvement. Many felt frustrated by this restriction, especially in the later years of the Mandate and the national movement, but – despite calls during the Revolt for strikes and for punishment of Mandate employees as traitors – did not necessarily see

182 Albert Glock, “Archaeology as Cultural Survival,” 75.
a contradiction in, or feel compromised by, working for the British administration whilst supporting Palestinian autonomy. Civil servants distinguished between their own work, serving their compatriots, and the government as an institution or as an instrument of British policy. Stephan may have seen his role in uncovering the history and complexity of Palestinian culture as worth the charge of collaboration.

Although Stephan was undervalued by his employers at the Department of Antiquities, he received more credit in less formal intellectual circles. W.F. Albright referred to him in the early days of *JPOS* as a “young man of promise” and his publications quickly attracted attention. “Modern Palestinian Parallels to the Song of Songs” was called the “chief feature” of its issue. The following year, Stephan’s article on “Lunacy in Palestinian Folklore” was picked out for lengthy description in another major journal in the field, and the editors of the *American Journal of Archaeology* called Stephan’s notes to his translation of a legal document linked to Suleiman the Magnificent’s favourite, Khasseki Sultan, “a valuable supplement to the article *waqf* in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.”

As his experience and confidence grew, the tone of Stephan’s personal writings suggests familiar and relaxed relations with the European scholarly community in Jerusalem. In an exchange of letters with the Finnish anthropologist Hilma Granqvist, he offers friendly critiques of the Arabic transliteration and translation in one of her books, which was at the time being reviewed by Tawfiq Canaan for *JPOS*. In the same letter he mentions, in a tone which combines respect for an elder with social familiarity, that: “I saw Sitt Louisa [the Artas resident and anthropological writer and botanist Louise Baldensperger, 1862-1938] recently: she is robust. The state of her mental vigour [literally: freshness] is astonishing. She

---

183 Feldman, *Governing Gaza*, 82-84.
gives her best wishes.\textsuperscript{189}

Elsewhere, Stephan writes that he is reviewing the collection of 5,000 Arabic proverbs published in 1933 by Bethlehem pastor Sa’id ‘Abbud and notes that “I will then talk about them to Herr Dr Kampf[m]eyer. We both have the same “hobby”, namely folklore, as it is expressed in spoken language”.\textsuperscript{190} The tone places Stephan on the same social and intellectual level as Kampfmeyer (a German Orientalist and Arabic philologist\textsuperscript{191}), as well as categorising their interest in folklore in the same way. This does not look like the words of a man who necessarily sees the European scholar as more expert than himself. In an earlier letter, Stephan sent Granqvist his best wishes for her “important work on Palestine”,\textsuperscript{192} highlighting his concern for Palestine as an issue, and suggesting that he saw ethnographic work such as Granqvist’s as significant for Palestine itself.

Stephan’s long career at the Department of Antiquities closed with a major error of judgement, although he may never have known it. The archaeologist Millar Burrows recounts how Stephan, who he describes as a “well-known Orientalist”, was one of the first people to be shown the Dead Sea Scrolls by the head of the Syrian Orthodox church. Stephan apparently pronounced the scrolls worthless, which Burrows suggests was because “his special competence was in the field of Arab history rather than in Hebrew archaeology or paleography”.\textsuperscript{193} By late 1947, though, Stephan was working regularly in Cyprus, analysing early Islamic inscriptions from excavations by the British-led Cypriot Department of Antiquities.\textsuperscript{194} In 1948 he and his family became refugees in Lebanon, along with hundreds of thousands of other Palestinians, but the Cypriot job, presumably obtained via British archaeological networks from the Mandate administration, at least meant that his career looked set
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to continue. But personal and professional sources confirm that Stephan died soon after, in 1949, and his widow and sons left for Brazil.195

2.3 Conclusion

This chapter has narrated the hitherto unresearched life stories of Stephan Stephan and Elias Haddad, presented alongside and as entangled with the better-known biography of Tawfiq Canaan. As such, it shows how Canaan, whilst an important intellectual figure in Late Ottoman and Mandate Palestine, should not be seen as such a lone and exceptional figure. Rather, we can understand both him and his environment better by acknowledging that he, along with Stephan and Haddad, should be understood as part of an intellectual field, in which ideas operated in a dynamic way and under influences ranging from the colonial to the nationalist.

By coupling these individual biographies with accounts of two of the institutions in which all three men were involved, this chapter also highlights the grander, structural levels which feed into an analysis of these processes of knowledge and cultural production. As the examples of the Schneller School and Palestine Oriental Society illustrate, the social and intellectual spheres of Late Ottoman and Mandate Palestine constantly overlapped, sometimes in ways which disrupt current historical understandings, such as the membership of Arab nationalist figures like ‘Awni ‘Abd al-Hadi in the Palestine Oriental Society. Noting the many personal and institutional interactions and overlaps in lives such as those of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan is also suggestive of the fact that there is no unilinear, deterministic course by which influence, be it colonial, resistant or other, shapes ideas. Rather, we see in these networks of complexity the space in which at least some level of choice may operate.

This understanding of the biographical frameworks which created the scholars

and writers Stephan Stephan, Elias Haddad and Tawfiq Canaan forms, therefore, the background to the following sections of this thesis. In the next chapter, I look at the first selection of texts by Haddad and Stephan, their Arabic language textbooks, and begin the process of analysing and interpreting their intellectual productions against the backdrop of their life stories and historical contexts.
3 Teaching Colloquial Arabic

The two main sections of the previous chapter outlined the life stories of Elias Haddad, Stephan Stephan and Tawfiq Canaan, and the main institutions which linked them. While Canaan’s history has been to some extent charted, viewing him not as a solo figure or centre of a “circle,” but as one of many nodes in networks extending across and beyond Jerusalem, allows us to understand his ideas and those of fellow scholars such as Stephan and Haddad as part of a dynamic interaction with Arabic-, English- and German-speaking intellectual fields, professional institutions, and cultural currents. The next two chapters start my exploration of their written works, situating them within the conditions of their creation, and allowing a deeper understanding of the texts and of the men whose ideas they carry into the world.

In the first of these chapters, I look at a sequence of textbooks for learners of colloquial Arabic, written by Elias Haddad and Stephan Stephan over the course of a quarter of a century, sometimes in collaboration with other scholars and sometimes alone. Although several of these manuals are recognised as sources for colloquial Arabic of the region, they have never been studied as examples of knowledge production by Palestinian scholars. Indeed, I am not aware of any systematic study of language textbooks or other teaching materials from Palestine in the pre-1948 period, although history textbooks are sometimes mentioned in the context of the development of Palestinian identities; Reeva Simon has studied those used for teaching history in Iraq prior to 1941.1 The examples in this chapter, as well as providing discursive material for questions of how Haddad, Stephan and Canaan functioned as scholars in the Late Ottoman and Mandate context, therefore represent comparatively rare non-Western cases in studies of educational materials, the conditions under which they are produced, and their role in articulating wider social messages. As researchers working on this field have emphasised, textbooks, while widely despised as a literary form and type of knowledge production, have much to

offer as historical sources, and as such this discussion of Haddad and Stephan’s language manuals makes a novel contribution to these aspects of Palestinian history.

Drawing on the background discussed in my Introduction and the biographical information of chapter two, I see Haddad and Stephan’s works as situated in the contexts of discourses on the nature and desirability of change in the Arabic language, and of earlier examples by native speakers of language writing manuals for foreigners to learn their tongue. As outlined earlier, the use and status of colloquial Arabic(s) was a controversial subject in late nineteenth and early twentieth century *nahda* debates, and in particular I argue that Haddad’s decision to write a colloquial language manual with Henry Spoer was an act embedded in this larger question. This pre-WWI textbook also contains significant expressions of Palestinian and Ottoman identity; this strand, however, shifts in tone and meaning in the later books of both Haddad and Stephan, written in the very different environment of Mandate Palestine and the increasing politicisation and urgency of assertions of Palestinian selfhood. Haddad and Stephan articulated strong but temporally shifting ideas about what constituted Palestine and Palestinian culture, thus acting as mediators between their own Arab society and colonial learners and, in doing so, highlighting the extent to which such national identities are flexible and contingent.

Looking at the people and organisations with whom Haddad and Stephan worked and wrote, I also consider what these examples have to say about dynamics between intellectuals and their collaborators in a colonial environment. These writings raise the question of what it means for the coloniser to learn the language of the colonised, rather than the other way around. But they have other kinds of social significance. On one hand, Haddad’s early work, in particular, is representative of the scholarly production being carried out in Palestine in the early twentieth century, with examples ranging from Khalil Baydas’ literary translations from Russian to Ruhi al-Khalidi’s diverse writings on history and culture in both the Arabic-speaking and European spheres. Works by Jonathan Gribetz, Salim Tamari and Spencer Scoville provide an important corrective to the traditional concentration on Cairo and
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Beirut as the seats of Arab learning in this period. But on the other, Haddad is a figure from outwith the elite; he was not a Khalidi or a Husseini, or even a flamboyant, comfortably-off Khalil al-Sakakini; he was also not engaged in the national movement, like ‘Izzat Darwaza. Coming from a low-status genre such as manuals and textbooks, the volumes considered in this chapter show us not the articulations of nation, modernity and identity as understood by notables, the cultural elite, or the spokespeople of political movements, but those of middle-class, working men whose lives were complex intersections of the national and colonial.

This chapter is organised into four sections. The first three are arranged chronologically, addressing the three main textbooks which Elias Haddad authored or co-authored, and using the histories of each individual book as the pivot around which a discussion of the themes set out above circulates. The fourth section looks at Stephan Stephan’s intervention in this market, taking place a quarter-century after Haddad’s first language manual and under very different social and political conditions; as such, it offers a contrast to the nuanced shifts of tone and content which characterise Haddad’s forty-five year career in this field.

3.1 The Manual of Palestinian Arabic for Self-Instruction

The first of Haddad’s handbooks for learners of colloquial Arabic was the Manual of Palestinian [sic] Arabic for Self-Instruction, written with Hans Henry Spoer (Krefeld, Germany 1873 – USA 1951), a clergyman and orientalist scholar with whom Haddad also worked on ethnographic articles. The Manual was published at the Syrian Orphanage in 1909 and in Germany by the Reichsdruckerei in 1910. Spoer’s introduction features the following tribute – fulsome, but on the one hand establishing Haddad as the junior partner in the enterprise, whilst also acknowledging his centrality to its success:

4 The Introduction to the Manual also reveals its place in the technological changes happening in Palestine at the time, when Spoer writes: “I and my collaborator have to thank Director Pastor Schneller and the Printing-master of the Syrisches Waisenhaus for undertaking the printing of this work under considerable mechanical difficulty, as well as that of the fact that the young printers know nothing of the English language”. Manual of Palestinian Arabic for Self-Instruction, V.
Though it has been my privilege to associate freely with Arabs of all classes in town and country, I should have felt less hope as to the usefulness of the result, without the final assistance of my friend Elias Nasrallah Haddad, teacher of Arabic in the Teachers’ Seminary of the Syrisches Waisenhaus, Jerusalem, whose knowledge of the classical language has enabled him to appreciate changes and distinctions which might have escaped even an Arab whose scholarship was less, while his intimacy with Palestinian and Libanese [sic] Arabic, in various dialects, has given him an insight into his own language, practically unattainable by a European however long his residence, or however profound his observation.5

In the context in which Haddad and Spoer were writing and publishing, their choice of subject and title is suggestive. The use of the word ‘Palestinean’ indicates that they considered an identifiable Palestinian Arabic to exist. It also suggests that they understood there to be an entity called Palestine, with a specific group of people (speaking a particular dialect) inhabiting it; this agrees with those who see a distinct Palestinian identity as having existed prior to WWI.6

It also fits with the interest in variation amongst dialects which developed amongst orientalists in the nineteenth century, as they tried to trace the evolution of Arabic and understand the diversity within it.7 But Haddad and Spoer saw Palestinean as the appropriate word, over other choices such as ‘South Syrian’ or ‘Levantine’. Also noteworthy in this respect is a section, alongside the folktales, songs8 and proverbs at the end of the book, entitled ‘National Dishes’ – again, implying a distinct unit of ‘Palestine’ which could be designated as national (but,
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8 One of the songs given in translation in the Manual is entitled 'Barhoom', a diminutive of the name Ibrahim. The same song – with differences in translation – appears in Stephan Stephan's 1922 article “Modern Palestinian Parallels to the Song of Songs,” 227-228. It is also one of the songs transformed into a poem in The Smell of Lebanon, a bilingual collection of lyrics from Stephan's article reworked by the British poet E. Powys Mathers (Talybont, Wales: Francis Walterson, 1928, 2-3). See Chapter 5 for a fuller discussion of this volume.
apparently, with a hybrid culture, such that these ‘national’ dishes include several marked as ‘Turkish’ in style or origins). The accumulation of linguistic and folkloric information under the heading of ‘Palestinian’ implies a set of behaviours and characteristics which can together be seen as demarcating an authentic Palestinian identity, as enacted by the true *ibn* (or *bint*) *al-balad.* But in debates about Arabic language reform – very much in play at the time at which Haddad and Spoer were writing – ‘*ammiyya* was sometimes associated not with the traditional and folkloric but with modernity and a necessary simplification of complex classical *fusha.* So in presenting an image of Palestinian ‘*ammiyya* which is at times linked to apparently ‘pre-modern’ rural culture, I regard Haddad and Spoer as plugging into debates about how Arabic should be modernised, for use amongst natives speakers and for presentation to the wider world.

Spoer and Haddad also thought as early as 1909 that there was an interest in and a market for a textbook focusing on such a specific regional form of Arabic, and that this was different enough from other dialects spoken in *Bilad al-Sham* to be worthy of a separate text. The Arabic(s) spoken in Palestine can be divided further, down to the level of village variations; Haddad and Spoer’s choice of what they deemed to be an educated Jerusalemite dialect can be partly explained by the fact that both men lived there, but also by the prestige attached to it because of the city’s religious and historical significance and attractiveness to visitors. In addition, the Jerusalem dialect occupied a rough mid-point between Palestine’s north and south – both geographically and linguistically. We might even speculate that by identifying Jerusalem as the source of an ‘*ammiyya* which could be used across all Palestine, the latter is deliberately associated with the former, taking on its elevated status.

As was common at the time, the frontispiece to the Manual establishes the authors’ credentials, naming Spoer as “MA, PhD (NY Univ), BD (Rutgers College), Sometime Fellow of The American School of Archaeology and Oriental Research in Jerusalem” and Haddad as “Teacher of Arabic at the Teachers’ Seminary of the

10 The links between *ammiyya* and authenticity (and the role of class and anti-elite feeling) are discussed by Niloofer Haeri. *Sacred Language, Ordinary People*, 37-42.
11 Ibid., 11-12, 46.
Syrisches Waisenhaus in Jerusalem”. Spoer thus positions himself as an Oriental scholar, associated with Western study of the East and with an intellectual pedigree rooted in Occidental academia – although not, it might be noted, European academia, with its more obviously colonial relations to the Levant. Indeed, by this time Spoer had published articles on subjects such as thirteenth-century Syriac manuscripts.12

His spell at the ASOR was also his opportunity to mix with Western and Arab scholars based in Palestine, and to learn Arabic from native speakers of the language. Spoer may have been one of the three students at the American School of Oriental Research who undertook Arabic study with Farhud Kurban,13 an ordained Lutheran cleric who served at the German Church of the Redeemer alongside Theodor Schneller.14 The way in which Spoer chose to identify himself in the Manual, however, also suggests that he wishes his credibility to derive from his Middle Eastern and academic links, not the religious ones to which he could equally have laid claim. His spell at the American School in Jerusalem, for instance, was taken during a longer studentship at the Meadville Theological College,15 but he chose to highlight his work on Orientalist themes rather than on divinity.

Spoer’s introduction identifies “a need – which I have abundant reason to suppose that others as well as myself have experienced” for a specific textbook for the Jerusalem/Palestinian dialect, differing from the manuals which offer only Egyptian or “Libanese” spoken forms and which contain too much, in his view of “modern, literary Arabic... not belonging to the vernacular and not understood by the populace”. Spoer sees the Manual’s readership as comprising students of Arabic interested in dialect, but also the “passing traveller” who wishes to navigate the “multiplication of railways, hotels and other conveniences of travel” and to be independent of the “often obtrusive dragoman”. Recent scholars have followed Spoer’s lead in understanding travellers as the primary market for the Manual.16

15 Ibid., 179.
16 Mairs and Muratov, Archaeologists, Tourists, Interpreters, 42.
Other possible audiences mentioned include English-speaking residents of Palestine, amongst whom he numbers clergy, missionaries and teachers. Evidence for the idea that Spoer and Haddad see Palestinian Arabic as part of a cultural whole lies in the selection of “idioms, stories, rhymes and proverbs [and the] lists of animals and plant belonging to the country”, locating the colloquial language in an holistic view of a culture which combines land, language and artistic production.

The text of the *Manual of Palestinean Arabic* contains no Arabic characters, but is entirely transliterated. Colloquial grammatical usages typical of the region are given, such as “hōom” or “hōon” (human plurals in standard Arabic) for non-human plural nouns. That both of these endings are given seems to indicate that the authors view Palestinian Arabic as falling at a fairly central point between users of -m as an ending (found in southern Palestine) and -n (a remnant of Aramaic, found in the Galilee, Lebanon and Syria). Another characteristic of colloquial Levantine, the assimilation of the letter jeem into the definite article, is given in the transliterated phrases – such as *j-jmāl* for camels and *j-jabr* for algebra. Some loanwords from European languages are apparent, such as the use of “lokanda” for hotel instead of the Arabic *funduq*, an acquisition better known in Egypt.

The majority of the example phrases given by Spoer and Haddad are the anodyne norm for language handbooks: information for travellers and shoppers, how to order food or book rooms. But some include content notable for the light it sheds on the Palestine of the time, the intended audience for the book, and the possible political sentiments of the authors. Perhaps surprisingly, for a book published under Ottoman rule in Jerusalem, the potentially controversial statement that “Conditions would change if the Pasha would go from here!” is given, juxtaposed with “The liberty which the Sultan gave to the people is a blessing”. Other statements, such as “This is the second time a Constitution has been granted to the people of Turkey”
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18 Ibid., v, 164-187.
19 Ibid., 5, 143.
20 I am greatly indebted to Uri Horesh and Jona Fras for their enlightening discussion of Palestinian and broader Levantine dialects.
22 Ibid., 134-137.
23 Ibid., 80.
and “The newspapers have announced the Osmanli Constitution,” take a less obvious position but also address major political events.24

This range of comments on the contemporary political environment suggests that Haddad and Spoer were finalising their manuscript just after the Young Turk Revolution in 1908, which forced Sultan Abdul Hamid II to reinstitute the constitution of 1876-78. The constitutional changes of 1908 were initially greeted with widespread public joy in Palestine and other Arab parts of the Ottoman Empire and the new freedoms saw a burst of newspaper and other publications. The euphoria was, however, fairly short-lived, with an attempted counter-revolution and Turkish nationalist sentiments at the centre of power heralding a phase of repression in the run-up to WWI.25 Spoer and Haddad thought it appropriate to educate their European readers on the political context of Palestine, and to espouse publicly the hoped-for freedoms of the new regime.

The sample sentence “He bribed him, but the officials discovered it”26 also suggests, less directly, the idea that Western travellers can expect to find the rule of law at work, in contrast to stereotypes of the lawless ‘mysterious East’. The idea that a textbook might be used to educate its users about social and political issues is not unusual for the time; the contents of Egyptian Arabic language books for use in schools (with which Haddad may have been acquainted) often featured “lessons of social and national importance”.27 However, they project a positive image of the new government which highlights the brief moment in which the book appeared, before the 1909 counter-coup, Abdul Hamid’s deposition, and the Young Turks’ turn to Turkish chauvinism. As such, we might identify this position as one which asserts a Palestinian cultural nationhood and identity, within the broader state structures of the Ottoman Empire, which was not an unusual political stance at the time.28

In contrast to orientalist ideas of the Middle East as defined first and foremost by its religions, comparatively little mention is made of faith in the 226 pages of the
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24 Ibid., 104, 111, 122.
28 Khalidi, Palestinian Identity, 63-87; Gribtez, Defining Neighbors, 35, 92.
Manual. Amongst the sample sentences a few are to be found, including that “The pilgrims who departed for Mekka are mostly from this country” and the statement that “It was the same year in which Muhammed fled to Medina”.\(^{29}\) Despite the Protestant Christian background of both authors, therefore, the examples given in the Manual are as primarily Islamic. However, the folktales added at the end of the book have a different tone, featuring a story entitled ‘Saint Anthony and the son of the King’,\(^{30}\) with a clear Christian point of reference.

The content chosen by Spoer and Haddad also presents Palestine as a mixture of social and technological styles. In contrast to Western accounts focusing on ‘traditional’ ways of life and technologies, and contemporary stereotypes of Palestine as a relic of a Biblical way of life,\(^{31}\) the Manual features railways, cars and other markers of ‘modernity’ as part of normal existence in late-Ottoman southern Syria. Indeed, one of the folktales presented at the end of the book is entitled ‘The King and the Photographer’.\(^{32}\) A list of human attributes used to demonstrate possession uses the teacher, judge, professor, inventor and physician as examples, rather than the peasant or sheikh.\(^{33}\) Spoer and Haddad clearly wanted to put forward a ‘modern’ image of Palestine, combining the technological and social reality around them with other aspects of life in this period, including camels, peasants and locusts. Their portrait of Palestine is thus distinctive, compared with much Western writing, and represents an at least partly conscious decision to portray life as they – two young men living in one of Palestine’s urban centres – saw, or wanted to see, it.

3.1.1 The Manual’s Reception

That there was a space to be filled in the market for Arabic textbooks is borne out by the anonymous contributor to the ‘Notes’ section of The Nation (the long-standing American left-liberal publication founded in 1865 and still running in

\(^{29}\) Spoer and Haddad, Manual of Palestinian Arabic, 104, 106.
\(^{30}\) Ibid., 166.
\(^{32}\) Spoer and Haddad, Manual of Palestinian Arabic, 109, 129-134, 166.
\(^{33}\) Ibid., 92.
2017). In a short review of the *Manual, The Nation* declares that:

> It is singular how long the modern dialects of Palestine, and especially of Jerusalem, were neglected while those round them found diligent students. But of late, under the pressure of practical necessities rather than through academic studies, that gap is being rapidly filled.  

The difficulty of producing meaningful descriptions of local Arabic dialects is, however, highlighted by the poor review the *Manual* received from the German Bible scholar and Orientalist Max Löhr (1864-1931) in the respected journal *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*. Haddad and Spoer introduce their work by claiming that the Jerusalem dialect is used with only “slight variations” throughout Palestine. Löhr, by contrast, emphasises the diversity of dialects in Palestine, not just between regions but even “between individual neighbourhoods in a place like Bethlehem”. Indeed, Löhr seeks to reinforce the authenticity of his expertise by the minute detail he deploys, claiming that: “During a single ride on the road from Jerusalem to Hebron, one can make extensive dialectal observations when talking to the charcoal burners coming up from the southwest”. He lists examples in which he considers that the pronunciations in the *Manual* are not representative of those to be found amongst the dialects of the south and centre of Palestine, including Jerusalem itself. He concludes, on the basis of these, that the Arabic of the *Manual* is “more Syrian than Palestinian” and that its use in Palestine would be greeted with “astonished and bewildered faces”.  

Whilst Löhr’s emphasis on dialectical diversity undermines his own argument about the possibility of pinning down the contents of Haddad and Spoer’s *Manual* as definitively right or wrong, of more pertinence here are the techniques he uses to establish his authority and the way in which he deploys proofs of his own  
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34 *The Nation* 91, 235 (July 21, 1910), 61. Whilst *The Nation’s* fortunes may in 1910 have been on the downturn – with circulation down to around 8,000 from a height of 12,000 – it was still a respected publication, and one which had established itself amongst the most important publishers of book reviews in the American marketplace. See D.D. Guttenplan, *The Nation: A Biography (The First 150 Years)*, (New York: The Nation Company LLC, 2015), 75-77, 80, 99.  
37 Ibid.  
38 Ibid., 55.
acquaintance with ‘real’ Palestinians and their patterns of speech. His nameless Bethlehemites and charcoal-burners, their voices appropriated by a foreign scholar, stand as evidence to assert the superiority of Western academic knowledge over that of the “indigene” Haddad. Löhr’s attitude is diametrically opposite to that of Spoer, whose emphasis is on the blend of scholarship and authenticity which Elias Haddad brings to the project, and on Spoer’s complete faith in it.

Missing from this survey of reviews of The Manual of Palestinian Arabic are reactions from Arabic-speaking sources, whether in Palestine or the wider Arab world; a search of a number of Arabic periodicals and newspapers from Palestine and beyond yielded no results. But we can consider where the book, and by implication Elias Haddad, falls in relation to debates in the Arabic-speaking world about the respective merits of colloquial versus classical or formal Arabic. Haddad’s work places him firmly on the side of those who, rather than viewing colloquial Arabic as something which debased the language and drew lines between Arabs from different regions, saw regional variations as valid. The inclusion of folkloric material in the language textbooks on which Haddad worked between 1909 and 1955 suggests that he very much saw colloquial Arabic as an integral part of regional and local cultures, and both language and folklore as something worthy not just of preserving but of passing on to foreigners (whether out of pride in his own culture, or as an act of defiance in the face of colonial aspirations and Zionist immigration).

Haddad’s view of colloquial language as part and parcel of a local culture is also suggested by his role in the detailed transliteration of village Arabic for publications by Western ethnographers such as Hilma Granqvist, Louise Baldensperger and Grace Crowfoot.39 His annotations and corrections on notes and manuscripts by Hilma Granqvist held in the Palestine Exploration Fund archives illustrate the attention Haddad paid to the details of dialect pronunciation (and the significance of the place he should be accorded in the history of Palestinian linguistics).40 The Nation’s reviewer may or may not have absorbed such a message

39 See e.g. Grace M. Crowfoot and Louise Baldensperger, From Cedar to Hyssop: a study in the folklore of plants in Palestine (London: Sheldon Press, 1932), vi.
40 See e.g. PEF archives, Granqvist files – notes to books Birth and Childhood and Child Problems. I am indebted to Rosanna Sirignano of the University of Heidelberg for our discussions of Haddad's
from Spoer and Haddad’s *Manual*, but he did find the book to be “strictly a practical manual, but one of singular richness in construction, idiom, and vocabulary. It endeavors to state the facts of a standard educated dialect – that of the Muslim better classes of Jerusalem – and avoids confusing the beginner with local details”.

### 3.2 Working with Albright: *The Spoken Arabic of Palestine*

Haddad’s second foray into Arabic language textbooks was *The Spoken Arabic of Palestine*, co-written with W.F. Albright, first published in 1927 by the Palestine Educational Company of “B.Y. and W.A. Said”, and issued in a second edition in 1936 by the Syrian Orphanage Press as *The Spoken Arabic of Palestine: for use in Beginners’ Classes*. Haddad’s collaboration with Spoer was one of few such books available before the First World War; Haddad and Albright’s volume, however, entered a much busier market. An English-speaking colonial administration and occupation, as well as Zionist immigration and a growing tourism industry, heralded a growing and multi-faceted market for aids to language learning. Elias Haddad seems to have capitalised on his joint enterprise with Albright, publishing a parallel edition of *The Spoken Arabic of Palestine* in German, entitled *Arabisch wie es in Palästina gesprochen wird: Ein Leitfaden für Anfänger* (a direct translation of the full English title) and also issued in 1927, this time by the Syrian Orphanage.

The *Manual of Palestinean Arabic* appears designed for self-study; this might suggest that in 1909 the colloquial language was unlikely to be found being taught in a classroom, as – if the gaps in the market were accurately identified by Spoer – it would have made more sense to produce a book which more clearly accommodated
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41 *The Nation* 91, 235 (July 21, 1910), 61.


43 Sample titles from the period include a Yiddish-Arabic manual “For the use of the Jewish Legion fighting with the British Colors in the Holy Land. By Prof. G. Selikovitsch, formerly Head Interpreter with Lord Kitchener in Egypt and Soudan”. Published in 1918 by the New York-based Jewish Daily News, it promised the reader “a practical method to acquire in a month the spoken Arabic of Palestine and Egypt”.
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classroom teaching. The Spoken Arabic of Palestine is, however, explicitly aimed at “students of modern Arabic who have little grammatical knowledge and require the help of a trained teacher” or those who are working on their colloquial language “under a native teacher.” The book’s authority is established in the Preface, which asserts that it “is the result of many years of experience on the part of one of us [Haddad] in teaching the vernacular of the country to classes of English, Americans and Germans”. Haddad’s name is also given as the first author, suggesting, perhaps, that the work is largely his and that Albright’s role was primarily to help with the English and to provide respectability in international markets. Those thanked in the ‘Preface’ include members of the English College and American Church, Mr Jalil Irani (a Palestinian teacher who was to be a close collaborator with Haddad on future editions), and Mr Elias Shihadeh, Haddad’s colleague at the Syrian Orphanage. These latter two names point to the importance of scholarly and professional networks amongst middle-class (rather than elite, notable) Palestinians, an area under-studied at present.

On a pedagogical level, the approach taken by Spoer and Haddad in the Manual of entirely transliterating all Arabic was abandoned. The ‘Preface’ states that whilst it “has not been customary in the past” to give the vernacular in Arabic characters, the authors decided that transliteration is misleading to students in terms of pronunciation, “since they cannot entirely free themselves from the influence of the representation of wholly alien sounds”. This has various implications: it demands more prior knowledge of Arabic from the student, since they must now be able to read the alphabet. It also suggests a change informed by trial and error – presumably from those students who remained not “entirely free” – but possibly also by the decline of wider discourses about trying to develop a transliterated version of Arabic for popular use in the Arabic-speaking world itself, and a clarifying of the
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44 Haddad and Albright, The Spoken Arabic of Palestine, I.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid., III. My thanks to Reverend Dr Mitri Raheb of the Lutheran Church in Bethlehem for information on Elias Shihadeh.
47 A notable exception is Men of Capital, Sherene Seikaly’s recent volume on the entrepreneurial middle classes.
48 Ibid., II.
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authors’ ideas of the differences between Arabic and Western European languages.

Notable in the context of contemporary debates over the relationship between colloquial and standard Arabic is the assumption made in Haddad and Albright’s Preface that the days of the vernacular are numbered:

By presenting the vernacular in Arabic script, we have not intended in any way to depreciate the importance of literary Arabic. As long as the classical language remains an almost exclusive possession of the educated classes, and is used by few even of them in ordinary conversation, spoken Arabic becomes a necessity to foreigners. When literary Arabic becomes the language of social and business intercourse, this grammar, having fulfilled its purpose, will no longer be needed.49

There is a decided shift in tone here, from the confidence in the colloquial language found in Spoer and Haddad’s Manual to this prediction of the vernacular’s demise. Is this a change of views on Haddad’s part over the intervening eighteen years? Or should we see in it the influence, in the first volume of the ethnographer Spoer, and in the second of the more formal Albright, with his intellectual background in linguistics? The inclusion of this section of the 1927 Preface in Haddad and Irany’s 1955 edition of the book (under Haddad and Albright’s signature) suggests that Elias Haddad did not feel the need to disown these assumptions. They sit oddly beside his demonstrable expertise and interest in the finer points of rural dialects. But on the other hand, if we understand Haddad and his ethnographic colleagues as interested in recording, rather than preserving, a culture which Western scholarship saw as fated to die out in the face of progress, this evolutionary perspective implied in the Preface makes more sense.

In contrast to Elias Haddad’s grateful, almost deferential, tone towards Albright in some of his ethnographic writings,50 he omits Albright’s name from the German language manual, instead thanking Hermann Schneller for his help with the

49 Ibid.
50 As seen in statements such as “I wish here to express my thanks to Dr. W.F. Albright, Director of the American School of Oriental Research, who showed great interest in my work and was always ready to help me with it.” Elias N. Haddad, “Blood Revenge Among the Arabs.” Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society 1 (1921), 103.
text and stating that he has prepared this edition in response to requests from “German friends.” 51 In his “Jerusalem, April 1927” Preface, Haddad highlights his own practical experience of teaching Arabic, emphasising this aspect in the first lines, alongside his claim to “many years of language teaching with Englishmen, Americans and Germans”. 52 Haddad also defends himself against possible criticism for the book’s rough-and-ready approach and “makeshift” transcriptions, stressing that it is “aimed primarily at beginners, who wish to be introduced as quickly and thoroughly as possible to the Arabic colloquial language” and that “many of the rules and explanations that can be found in an academic grammar book” have therefore been left out. He is not, the Preface specifies, imparting any particular one of the local dialects of Palestine, but a common colloquial “understood and spoken by all who in some way or another take part in business or social life”; those with an ethnographic or linguistic interest in these more precise versions can use the book as the basis for further study. 53

Haddad’s collaborator, the archaeologist W.F. Albright, was a linguistic prodigy fascinated by ancient civilisations. Appointed head of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem in 1919, he arrived along with the Reverend Herbert Danby, an Anglican priest who played a major role in Palestinian archaeology. Palestine at this time was still in chaos, under the control of the British interim military administration and suffering the after-effects of the famine, flu epidemic and locust attacks which the region had endured in addition to the Great
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51 Haddad seems to suggest here a gap in the German market, although at least one German manual for learning Palestinian Arabic, Leonhard Bauer’s Das Palästinische Arabisch: Die Dialekte des Städters und des Fellachen, was published (formally in Leipzig but printed in Jerusalem) in 1910, with a reprint in 1926. It seems likely that Elias Haddad’s interest in and respect for colloquial Arabic was influenced by Bauer’s work. Leonhard Bauer came to the Syrian Orphanage as a teacher in 1890, married Maria Schneller in 1891, and became senior teacher in 1899, remaining at the School until 1948, so Elias Haddad would have been first his student and later his colleague. In addition to Das Palästinische Arabisch, Bauer published a more general Arabic textbook (1896-8), a collection of Palestinian proverbs (1903) and compiled some of the main Palestinian Arabic – German dictionaries (1933 and 1957). Ulrich Seeger, “Leonhard Bauer (1865–1964), ein Pionier der arabischen Dialektologie”. In Im Dialog bleiben. Sprache und Denken in den Kulturen des Vorderen Orients: Festschrift für Raif Georges Khoury, ed. Friederik Musall and Abdulbary Al-Mudarris (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), 390-396.

52 Elias Haddad, Arabisch wie es in Palästina gesprochen wird: Ein Leitfaden für Anfänger (Jerusalem: Syrian Orphanage Press, 1927), I.

53 Ibid., I-II.
War. On his arrival, Albright launched into organising his own excavations and into researching Palestinian colloquial Arabic and folklore. Although many of his theories are now considered obsolete, in his time he was one of the most important figures in Middle Eastern archaeology. The details of his relationship with Elias Haddad, though, throw the issue of imperialistic attitudes within intellectual relationships into sharp relief.

Elias Haddad was a key figure in Albright’s studies in Palestinian Arabic and folklore, alongside Tawfiq Canaan. In 1920 Albright was working with Haddad on folklore and possibly Arabic language, and they made ethnographic trips together in the environs of Jerusalem. The tone of Albright’s diaries suggests that his relationship with both Haddad and Canaan was warm, and that the social circle involved was broad and diverse. An account of a walking trip from Wadi Qelt, south of Jerusalem in the Judean Desert, to the Dead Sea, records that Albright, two of his colleagues and their wives “[at the Dead Sea] met the rest of the party – Dr and Mrs Canaan, Haddad, Linder and two Swedish ladies from the Swedish mission, the Kelseys from Ramallah, Esch and several more”. Haddad, Omar Salih al-Barghuthi and Tawfiq Canaan were all present at Albright’s wedding alongside the international diplomatic and scholarly communities of Jerusalem and, in attending their lectures and debates, he recognised the intellectual value of Canaan and al-Barghuthi’s work.

But Albright was happy to over-state his role in the joint projects he initiated with Palestinian writers, and documents he left behind reveal the difference between his encounters with Elias Haddad, and Haddad’s relationship with Henry Spoer. Talking about his intentions to write a colloquial Palestinian Arabic textbook with Elias Haddad, Albright does not mention the fact that Haddad had already co-authored a similar book with Spoer and was an experienced teacher of Arabic, and therefore had far more to bring to the project.

54 Davis, Shifting Sands, 47, 72-4, 93-4.
55 Running and Freedman, Twentieth-century Genius, 79, 81, 86.
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58 Ibid, 79, 86.
Although the Albright-Haddad book did go ahead, and was well-used by the English-speaking community in Palestine, Albright offered little ongoing support to his co-author and former friend. In contrast to the mutuality and respect which characterised Haddad’s relationship with Henry Spoer, in 1953 Albright wrote to Haddad “for the first time in many years” in response to a letter from Haddad broaching the subject of re-issuing their textbook. Albright “expressed sympathy with the misfortunes of the Haddad family,” over their displacement by the Nakba. However, he “could see no way to find funds for a new edition” of their book, claiming that “Printers in America received more pay than professors, therefore professors could hardly hire printers!” Such a comment is disingenuous. Albright, never a modest man, was well aware of the reach his name and approval would have commanded, had he chosen to act. This sense is compounded by the fact that Albright also told Haddad that he had not returned to Palestine since 1935 as, despite having visited Egypt and Saudi Arabia, the situation in the Holy Land was too disrupted. What Albright did not mention is that he was leaving for Israel the following day, to help the Israeli state acquire recently-discovered antique manuscripts.\(^{60}\) The contrast between this attitude and Henry Spoer’s stress on Haddad’s role in their joint work on Nimr ibn Adwan (discussed in detail in chapter 5) could not be more striking.

Samar Attar’s exploration of the idea of friendship in colonial environments, discussed in the Introduction, is useful in elucidating the difference between these relationships. As her model highlights, issues of power permeate even the most personal relationships in the colonial context, but genuine mutuality can occasionally exist. She also emphasises, drawing on Fanon, the way that for many imperial subjects absorption of the coloniser’s culture “creates an identity crisis and inferiority complexes... To be ignorant of one’s history, language and heritage [...] is the beginning of psychological problems in one’s life.”\(^{61}\) Canaan, Stephan and Haddad utilised the languages and media of the colonial West to record and study their own culture and history, and to assert their own role in choosing how to present it to the public.

\(^{4}\) (1921), 4.
\(^{61}\) Ibid, 43.
Other. But in Elias Haddad’s personal relationships, we also witness the negatives which Attar sees as typifying most colonised/coloniser dealings, with Albright’s attitudes mirroring the exploitative imperial figure of much postcolonial literature, even if, in Spoer, we find Attar’s second type of relationship, in which both parties find mutual benefit.\(^{62}\)

### 3.3 Friendship and colonialism: *Standard Colloquial Arabic*

In the absence of support from Albright, Haddad reworked their colloquial Arabic textbook with Jalil Zand Irany (the same ‘Mr Jalil Irani’ thanked in the ‘Preface’ of the 1927 version). In this section of the chapter, I look at this last edition of the book, particularly in the light of the political changes which had taken place in 1948 and the way in which Haddad and Irany changed their textbook to accommodate them, and of the questions raised by reviews of the new volume and the light they shed on the role of Haddad’s language manuals in the history of British colonialism in Palestine.

This third edition was published in 1955 under the name of *Standard Colloquial Arabic* by a new Dar al-Aytam press, the Matba‘a Dar al-Aytam al-Islamiyya, in Jordanian-ruled Jerusalem.\(^ {63}\) Haddad’s new co-author, Jalil Irany, was also a teacher. Originally from Tulkarm, he moved to Bethlehem in 1942 and, as headmaster of the Boys’ Reformatory School under the Mandate administration, was awarded an honorary OBE in the 1946 Birthday Honours List.\(^ {64}\) Their “entirely re-written and enlarged”\(^ {65}\) edition retailed at 8 shillings. The main additions to the contents are additional stories and longer written examples for students to practice their Arabic, and occasional mentions of Jordan and Jordanian sites, making the book
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\(^{62}\) It is also worth noting in this instance the case of Dschirius Jusif and his co-operation on folkloric publications with several German scholars, as described in my Introduction. In these, written under conditions of ‘informal’ imperialism rather than direct colonialism, Jusif is given prominent credit for his role in collecting the data used, with his German colleagues presenting themselves as editors and interpreters of the material presented. This prompts me to wonder when Spoer’s German origins are also relevant in this context, although there are many other factors which must be considered, and developing the metrics needed to assert a conclusion would be challenging.


\(^{64}\) *Palestine Gazette* 1499 (13\(^{th}\) June 1946), 573.

more relevant to its new prospective readers. The extent to which Haddad and Irany were, as individuals, central figures in decades of colloquial Arabic teaching to English-speaking colonial students is highlighted in Eric Bishop’s Whitsuntide 1955 *Foreword* to the book:

> The names of Haddad and Irany will bring back many memories to the foreign students, including the many British officials under the Mandate in Palestine, who pursued the difficult study of Arabic in the Holy Land during the last thirty-five years. We first met the Headmaster of ‘Schneller’s’ in 1921, while our personal touch with the Head of the Reformatory Schools began in the early twenties. We came to value both the friendship of Mr. Elias Haddad and that of Mr. Jalil Irany as well as to appreciate their teaching, coupled with a due concern that in their teaching they were rendering service both to God and men.\(^66\)

This almost nostalgic attachment to Haddad’s teaching also appears in a favourable review by the Scottish Arabist R.B. Serjeant, who commented that he “recalls using [the earlier Albright and Haddad version] to advantage in Palestine some time ago, and [the new edition] brings this well-known textbook up to date.” Haddad’s general approach to learning seems to be encapsulated in Serjeant’s description of the book as:

> a useful unpretentious piece of work, founded on long teaching experience... designed with a view to the possibility of the student proceeding ultimately to the study of literary Arabic if he [sic] wishes, a point of practical importance nowadays.\(^67\)

Another reviewer, James Robson (then Professor of Arabic at the University of Manchester) noted Haddad’s continued belief in the role of cultural knowledge in language learning, when he observed that “A few stories, proverbs, and idiomatic phrases are added”,\(^68\) while the extent to which Haddad’s work on teaching

\(^{66}\) Bishop, “Foreword”, n.p.  
\(^{68}\) Robson, “Review”, 219.
colloquial Arabic had permeated academic opinion is highlighted in Bishop’s Foreword:

[W]e trust that its circulation will include those places of ‘sound learning’ in the Western World, which is becoming growingly aware that Arabic is a living language, the inheritance of fifty million people on this planet. If Arabic has an undeniable past, literaly [sic] and linguistic, its richness of idioms and its flexibility should ensure a future of commensurate importance.

Serjeant also noted that the book still had a regional focus, “presenting features common to the majority of dialects... naturally basically Syro-Palestinian Arabic with occasional notes on Egyptian dialect.” However, it is telling that any mention of Palestine had been dropped from the title, and the Preface states that the book has been “prepared in such a way as to meet the need of a student in any Arabic-speaking country, with special reference to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Syria and Lebanon”. This change in the targeted readership made commercial sense, in that it conformed to the new, recognisable political situation in the region in which potential users would be working, but also seems designed to accommodate Jordanian political sensitiviti es over the identity of the West Bank and Jerusalem. From 1948 until its loss of control over the West Bank in 1967, policy was largely focused on incorporating the territory into the Jordanian state and suppressing separate Palestinian political identities and claims to Jerusalem. Highlighting the cultural and linguistic differences between Palestinian and other regional dialects would not have fitted into the political environment of the day.

The reviews which greeted Haddad and Irany’s textbook also highlight the extent to which Haddad’s work was embedded in the colonial structures of Mandate Palestine. The nostalgic responses of Bishop and Serjeant arise from their time
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working in the British administration in Palestine – a colonial regime which, by 1955, was seen by many Palestinian Arabs as having effectively handed their land to the new State of Israel. The tenor of Haddad’s professional life and written works suggest that he would have seen his role in introducing British officials to Palestinian Arabic as a bridge across cultures and a means of promoting Arab rights and Arabic culture. But in the light of later events, might he have come to regret his role in facilitating British colonial control?

3.4 Stephan and Steimatzky’s: Arabic Self-Taught: A Primer

Elias Haddad was not the only product of the Schneller School to author handbooks for students of colloquial Palestinian Arabic. As this section shows, Stephan Stephan also embarked on this course, more than two decades after Haddad’s first publication. His works were Arabic Self-Taught: A Primer and its German equivalent, *Leitfaden für den Selbstunterricht in der arabischen Sprache* (with an accompanying *Sprachführer*, or phrasebook). These were printed at the Syrian Orphanage Press in Jerusalem and published by the Jewish company Steimatzky’s in 1935, when it still had branches in Beirut, Damascus, Cairo and Baghdad as well as Jaffa, Haifa and Tel Aviv.73 This business relationship brought together a major Zionist enterprise and a printer usually associated with Jerusalem’s Anglophone and Arab communities; as such, the book and Stephan’s choices in producing it confound assumptions about the separation of social and commercial interests under the Mandate. At the scale of big business, Arab-Jewish co-operation was rare.74 But, as Stephan’s example shows, at the level of the personal and small-scale, the situation could be more complex, and could also be affected by practical issues such as supply and pricing.75

Stephan’s Arabic Self-Taught: A Primer is a much smaller and slimmer book than Haddad’s output, with a paperback cover and paper which feels cheaper and less

75 See also Sherene Seikaly’s discussion of Jewish use of Arab vegetable markets to circumvent attempts at price control (*Men of Capital*, 138).
robust. The Primer retailed at three shillings, around five pounds at modern prices,\textsuperscript{76} suggesting that it was aimed at a less affluent readership. The standards of production are comparatively poor and there seems to have been no proof-reading by a native English speaker: ‘bus’ is spelled as ‘buss’ for an entire section, and typographical errors such as to “squash [sic] a sentence” appear regularly.\textsuperscript{77} Unlike Haddad and Spoer’s work, Stephan’s was entering a crowded and competitive market, although demand and his skills from his Schneller upbringing meant that he could offer both German and English editions. The ‘In Preparation’ plans on the inner cover of Stephan’s English volume list Arabic primers for French and Hebrew readers, and future Hebrew manuals for readers of German, English, French, Russian and Arabic.\textsuperscript{78} The copyright information also states: “All Rights Reserved, especially that of translation into foreign languages” (my italics), an unusual addition for the time: it suggests that unauthorised translations were not unknown (indeed to be expected, as copyright law had been introduced to Palestine less than 20 years earlier\textsuperscript{79}) and that the publisher had clear intentions to issue their own versions. In both Stephan’s publications with Steimatzky’s, and the publisher’s plans for its series, we witness an acceptance of diversity rooted in pragmatism; the greater the number of languages catered for, the more customers both writer and publisher could hope to attract.

Stephan’s Foreword to the Primer states that it is intended as “an introduction to the Palestinian dialect” and a basic vocabulary and phrase list for those speaking Arabic in Palestine. As with Haddad and Spoer’s original volume, Stephan did not intend to use Arabic characters in his volume: he writes that these were “added at the editors [sic] express wish”.\textsuperscript{80} The extent to which the book is aimed at readers completely new to Arabic is indicated in the ‘Preliminary Remarks’, which include the information that Arabic, “like Hebrew and other Semitic languages, is written
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from right to left”. The general appearance of the Primer is not ‘user-friendly’ by
today’s pedagogical standards; much of it comprises densely-packed lists and blocks of
Arabic words with transliterations and translations, and conjugation tables for
colloquial verbs. Pronunciation is given in the colloquial form, with the letter qaf
dropped as in urban Palestinian dialect, rather than a hard ‘g’ as found amongst
Bedouin and Jordanian men. Compared to the sometimes politicised choice of
phrases and sentences in Haddad and Spoer’s Manual, Stephan sticks to an anodyne
selection which does not challenge the Mandate administration or present obvious
controversy for any of the communities in the Palestine of 1935. However, Stephan
does give a long list of Arabic-language newspapers, many of which would have
expressed views critical of the Mandate administration and of Zionist immigration.

In keeping with Steimatzky’s mainstream Jewish ownership, the back cover of
the book features a robust-looking young man of European complexion striding
across a map of Palestine, accompanied by the slogan “See Palestine with
Steimatzky’s Guides”. The image is redolent of the “new Jew” or Max Nordau’s
“muscular Judaism”, influenced by modernist ideas of health and hygiene,
expressing the ‘negation of exile’ with the vigour of the youthful Jewish worker, and
rebuttering the anti-Semitic stereotypes internally absorbed by many Jews raised in
Europe, as well as by non-Jews. This assertive, confident young man also lays clear
claim to the land of Palestine for the young, modern male, rejecting the exotic, old-
fashioned inhabitants. The designers at Steimatzky’s, influenced by socialist realism
and other modernist aesthetics, had a youthful Zionist immigrant in mind when
they drew this picture, but might Stephan, an urbanised Christian Arab Palestinian
who worked for the Mandate government, also have seen himself in this image? On
one hand, his writings show that Stephan had a clear sense of a Palestinian identity
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and history, which at times he asserted quite forcefully, as discussed below in relation to his article on the *Song of Songs*. On the other, in a letter to Hilma Granqvist, Stephan writes of her analysis of Palestinian peasant society that: “We never had this idea and have to learn a lot from the West. We just have to prove that we Orientals are students who are quick and eager to learn.”\(^87\) Whether or not this is Stephan flattering his employer, bolstering the praise of her book earlier in the letter, the tone is that of the colonised intellectual, automatically reading Western ideas as superior to his own. To this Stephan, the muscular modernism of Steinmatzky’s imagery, taking ownership of the land of Palestine, seems all too attractive.

Like Haddad and Spoer, Stephan includes European words adopted into Arabic, such as at-tūātrū for theatre, rather than maṣraḥ and basābūrt for passport, rather than jawāz safar.\(^88\) Other European influences can be seen in forms of address, in which a foreign man is to be called ‘khawaga’, his wife Madam and their daughter ‘Madmoazel’, presumably a transliteration into Arabic and back again of mademoiselle.\(^89\) Unlike Haddad and Spoer, Stephan’s advice includes differentiating between Christians, Jews and Muslims in respectful address: the two former are to be called *khawaga*, denoting a degree of foreignness, whereas Muslims should be addressed as *afandi*.\(^90\) The choice of vocabulary, meanwhile, highlights the anticipated readership for the Primer, giving detailed lists of names for departments of the Mandate administration and relevant terms. Under the vocabulary for the Department of Antiquities, for example, we find words and phrases such as Museum, prehistoric, “dealer in,” “Inspector of,” faked, archaeology and auditor.\(^91\) More touristic vocabulary also appears, such as words for use at a money-changer or terms for Christian pilgrimage sites, but the overall tone is of a book aimed at those with longer, professional stays in mind, such as junior civil servants, soldiers, policemen, students and religious staff.

The diversity of the population by the mid-1930s is also highlighted in example
phrases such as “Do you speak Arabic/English/French/Hebrew/German?” Key dates include secular events linked to the colonial government, such as the king’s birthday, alongside religious dates such as Christmas, “Mohammed’s birthday” and a long list of Christian, Muslim and Jewish festivals, highlighting the fact that the author assumed readers would need to be informed of the holidays celebrated by the many denominations of all three faiths inhabiting Palestine.  

3.5 Conclusion

In Haddad and Stephan’s selection of colloquial Arabic textbooks we see something of a continuum from scholarly to popular and, perhaps, from ideological to opportunistic. As the first main section of this chapter shows, in 1909 Elias Haddad and Henry Spoer’s *Manual* was, in its own small way, ground-breaking, a pioneering part of the spread of publishing and pedagogy on Egyptian and general Levantine colloquial Arabic to the Palestinian context. It was also indicative of a self-confidence from scholars and teachers working in Palestine in naming the territory and its culture according to their local identifications and allegiances. Like better-known members of the pre-WWI Palestinian intelligentsia and political classes, such as Yusuf Diya’ and Muhammad Ruhi al-Khalidi, the discourses of Haddad and Spoer’s textbook highlight a layered Palestinian identity, content to remain politically and administratively within a multi-ethnic Ottoman Empire. This choice of words also supports those who argue that there was a conscious Palestinian identity at work before WWI, even if it was not articulated through a political mass movement, and that it was not necessarily coupled to rising consciousness of Zionism.

In Haddad’s Mandate-era titles, both solo and in collaboration with Albright, there is a greater sense of tension, evident in the choices of vocabulary and the anomalous position on the fate of colloquial Arabic. By the time Stephan Stephan
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launched his English and German handbooks with the Steimatzky’s range in 1935, this was an established market. Both the existence of a Palestinian form of Arabic and the need for newcomers to the region to learn it were accepted by Mandate officials, scholarly researchers and even some Zionist immigrants. Indeed, one of Edward Goitein’s desiderata for the newly-established Palestine Broadcasting Service was that it should include Arabic lessons in Hebrew, and vice versa, which would be a “great service to the progress of Palestine.”

By the time Haddad and Irany issued the third edition of *Standard Colloquial Arabic*, however, any aspirations to a Palestinian Arab nation-state had been shattered by the events of 1948, and political realities were reflected in the disappearance of ‘Palestine’ from their last textbook.

How should we read Elias Haddad and Stephan Stephan’s authorship of these books? In many respects they contributed to the codification and assertion of, and identification with, a Palestinian linguistic and cultural identity. Rather than addressing a domestic audience, though, they introduced Western scholars and officials to that culture and language, perhaps with the hope of informing them about the Palestinian situation and culture. But despite the thread of a developing and shifting national identity which runs through the contents and even existence of these books, they are also irrevocably embedded in a colonial setting.

As this examination of Haddad and Stephan’s English textbooks shows, though, the shifting political situation was significant for the politics of language. In 1909, English may have been – alongside French – the language of the coloniser from the perspective of Egypt. But for Palestinians, still living under Ottoman rule, Britain was, with Germany and France, just one of several European powers trying to exert their influence, and the Christian bias they showed and manipulated in their machinations may have made them attractive to writers educated in a European Protestant environment. Less than a decade later, British Empire troops were hailed
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as liberators by some Jerusalemites. But by the mid-1930s, the picture had shifted significantly, even for those Palestinian Arabs with European sympathies and instincts towards co-existence with Jews. Stephan’s 1935 Steimatzky’s handbook did not go into further editions, and Haddad and Albright’s 1936 second printing of *The Spoken Arabic of Palestine* was not repeated until 1955, in the very different climate of Jerusalem under Jordanian rule. Possible explanations for this include lower sales (fewer visitors during the 1936-39 revolt, and a more hostile attitude towards Arabic from English-speaking administrators), or a desire on the part of the authors not to be seen overtly contradicting calls to boycott the British. But it seems more than likely that colonial relations, in one form or another, played a part.

This chapter’s analysis of Haddad and Stephan’s language textbooks sees them engaging with debates from both the Arabic-speaking and Anglophone worlds. In the first instance, the status they attach to colloquial Arabic by authoring manuals via which foreigners can learn the language confers validity and value on a version of Arabic sometimes dismissed as obsolete and debased. In the second, the images of people and social practices conveyed through the choices of phrases, ‘real-world’ examples and cultural material featured in the manuals deliver a set of implicit messages about how language learners should view Palestine and its inhabitants. This aspect continues even more clearly in the next chapter, which examines two more sets of writings aimed explicitly at Anglophone readers, namely Tawfiq Canaan’s tracts advocating for the Palestinian Arab cause in the early months of the 1936-39 uprising, and Stephan’s tourist guidebooks to Palestine and Syria, written for the military market during WWII.
4 Presenting Palestine to the Other: multilingual actors or colonised subjects?

The previous chapter showed how through the subtle but conceptually powerful means of language teaching manuals, Haddad and Stephan conveyed a particular image of a land and people labelled Palestine and Palestinian. They did so firstly by presenting what they felt to be desirable traits of modernity, democracy and manners to the readers of English who used their textbooks to build up their Arabic language skills. Secondly, they specifically wrote manuals for those learning to speak colloquial Arabic, a particular form which they identified as Palestinian Arabic, although it actually hewed most closely to the socially prestigious form spoken in Jerusalem. As such, they asserted the territorial and linguistic existence of the place called Palestine, the people of which had a distinct form of language and culture, as shown through media such as folktales and food.

This chapter moves onto a new facet of language, that of individuals in colonial settings who espouse a sense of cultural, or even political, nationalism, and yet choose to write in the language of the coloniser. The most famous example of this in Mandate Palestine is George Antonius’ *The Arab Awakening* (1938), a well-known polemic and plea in favour of Arab self-determination, written in English in a bid to appeal to the chief colonial power in Palestine and other parts of the Middle East. Antonius was not seeking to persuade or stir up his fellow Arabs with this eloquent text, but to sway those he perceived as holding the fate of Arab nations in their hands – in William Cleveland’s words, the “particular audience of British policy-makers he had targeted”.

But Antonius was not alone in targeting British public opinion in an effort to support the strikes and military actions taking place in Palestine during the 1936-39 Revolt. An English edition of the newspaper *Falastin* had already been published for
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several years before the start of the uprising; its hostile exchange with Einstein in 1930 demonstrates at least an occasional international reach.² Emile Ghory, a journalist and spokesman for the Arab Higher Executive, spoke at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) in July 1936, setting out the broad Palestinian position and calling upon British traditions of fairness to bring an end to Zionist immigration and settlement.³ Ghory was also responsible for letters to British newspapers such as The Observer, seeking to enlist public sympathies by using Christian motifs to represent the feelings of 1930s Palestinians.⁴ And in 1937 George Mansour, a Palestinian trade unionist, sought to appeal to international solidarity amongst British workers with a pamphlet called The Arab Worker under the Palestine Mandate, although his aims were defeated by existing links between the British Labour Party and the labour-Zionist movement in Palestine.⁵ Despite this, an occasional English-language edition of the Palestinian Arab trade union magazine al-Ittihad was published until the crisis of 1947-8.⁶ Michel Abcarius, a Beirut-born member of the Mandate administration who received an OBE in 1933,⁷ made a similar attempt to reach out to the English-speaking public at another moment of crisis for the Palestinian Arab population with Through the Fog of Propaganda (1946), and in 1948 Frank Sakran published the (retrospectively somewhat belated) Palestine Dilemma: Arab Rights Versus Zionist Aspirations.

This chapter examines two more instances of Palestinian Arabs writing for English readerships. The first, Tawfiq Canaan’s 1936 pamphlets The Palestine Arab Cause and Conflict in the Land of Peace very much follow in the tradition described above, aiming through polemic and appeals to British fairness to sway public opinion. My analysis of Canaan’s arguments and examples highlights the way in which he shaped his rhetoric to appeal to ideas of modernity and rationality, rejecting
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the notion that Zionism had brought benefits to Palestinian healthcare, agriculture and industry, and asserting that Arabs were able to improve these sectors of society for themselves. It shows how, during the course of the Mandate period, perceptions of Jews in Palestine had hardened, and that immigrants of declared Zionist intent were viewed even by the most peaceable of Arabs with suspicion and resentment.

In the subsequent section, I consider three tourist guides produced by Stephan Stephan, in collaboration with photographer Boulos ‘Afif, for the British military market during WWII. In analysing how Stephan presented himself and his scholarly credentials, and drew a particular image of Palestine, its surrounding countries, and its people, I argue that he was assembling a picture intended to persuade visiting British and Commonwealth troops and officers that there was a distinct Arab Palestine, that it deserved to be respected, and that its people were just as modern and civilised as the Jews of European origin who were regarded by many Westerners as having brought industrialisation and culture to an empty and primitive land.

In making this argument, I also highlight how Stephan, whilst asserting a national identity, was still employing values and arguments drawn from his German education and British employment, and that this can be read as both the influence of his colonial environment and a means of adapting the ideas of the coloniser for his own use in the national good. This study of Stephan’s tourist guides brings a new source to discussions of Palestinian knowledge production and representation in this period. Although there is a substantial literature on Zionist tourism under the Mandate, and on European visitors in the Ottoman era, very little exists on Palestinian Arab involvement in this sector. At the same time, the negative views directed at textbooks, as mentioned in the previous chapter, might also be seen as applying to other non-literary forms such as guidebooks, which should be seen as valuable sources for social, economic and cultural history.

4.1 The Palestinian Cause: Tawfiq Canaan’s Nationalist Pamphlets

In 1936, the first year of the three-year uprising in Palestine, Tawfiq Canaan published two booklets, *The Palestine Arab Cause* and *Conflict in the Land of Peace*,
both setting out the Palestinian Arab position in the face of Zionism, and urging English-speaking audiences to support Palestinian rights.\textsuperscript{8} This short section considers how Canaan chose to present himself and his arguments in these pamphlets, arguing that he attempted to create texts which he believed would appeal to British readers and values by focusing on what he saw as modern, rational means (such as citing statistics), and deliberately steering away from emotive arguments which he would have been aware were negatively associated with stereotypes of Oriental peoples. I also go on to argue that, despite other scholars’ distancing of Canaan from overtly political positions, an examination of these pamphlets against the content of his other work, both medical and ethnographic, suggests a stronger continuum than is sometimes assumed.

George Antonius was aware of the questions of language and power when he chose to write in English. “There appears to be no work, \textit{in any of the languages with which I am acquainted}, in which the story is told from the beginning” [italics mine], he wrote in his Foreword. “On re-reading the book in proof, it seemed to me that its primary asset was that it contained... information... which might be of use in the elucidation of the problems confronting the Arab world in its relations with the Powers of the West”.\textsuperscript{9} Given that he and Canaan socialised together, lived in the same city, and were acting in the same general interests when they wrote their English-language works, its seems fair to suppose that Canaan also considered these issues when he decided to embark on his pamphlets. For Antonius, educated in Britain, working for much of his career in an English-speaking civil service, and equally comfortable in elite social circles in London, Jerusalem or Damascus, a strategic decision to address the British public would have been easy, if not unquestioned. He could also employ styles and references calculated to appeal to his elite English-speaking audience, including references to classical Greece and emphases on the Arabic \textit{nahda}’s claims to modernity.\textsuperscript{10} He was not only writing in the colonial language, but in the specific register of the educated, upper-class

\textsuperscript{9} Antonius, \textit{Arab Awakening}, ix-x.
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decision-makers to whom he wished to appeal; as Cleveland notes, even politically opposed reviewers admitted the beauty of Antonius’ rhetoric and style.\textsuperscript{11} But for Canaan, accustomed to writing in academic English but for whom German and Arabic were mother tongues, a stronger sense of intent must have been required. In homing in on this Canaan’s life, and the texts themselves, can be searched for clues.

\textit{The Palestine Arab Cause} was first published as a pamphlet in mid-June 1936 and consisted of a number of articles which had been published in various English-language publications in the preceding months.\textsuperscript{12} According to Canaan’s Preface to the formal printed version, issued later in the year, the earlier had been in “cyclostyle form,” referring to the type of mechanical reproduction machine sometimes known by the brand name Gestetner. The English original was also translated into French and Arabic in the same year.\textsuperscript{13} In his Preface, Canaan lays claim to a kind of neutrality by stating that he has used facts solely from “British and Jewish authors” in an attempt to present a “statement untinged by Arab nationalist views”. Whilst in his text Canaan bends over backwards to accommodate British political worries and prejudices, the signature under the Preface has a more militant air, dated “July 2 1936/The seventyfifth [sic] day of the General Strike”.\textsuperscript{14} Despite these efforts to articulate a moderate position, Canaan and his wife were “dropped from the guest list at the British High Commissioner’s” on the pamphlet’s publication.\textsuperscript{15}

The language employed in the actual text continues this balancing act. Much of the contents is presented in dry tones, formatted with numerous lists, quotations and numbered points in a bid to frame it as strictly factual. To demonstrate the failure of the British administration not only to act fairly but to live up to its own promises, Canaan cites official and government documentation including the McMahon Letter to Sharif Hussein bin Ali, the Sykes-Picot Agreement, the Balfour Declaration, the treaties establishing the Middle Eastern mandates and a range of Mandate administration reports, ordinances and related White Papers.\textsuperscript{16} He also deploys
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agricultural and industrial statistics, as well as mentioning Jewish policies against employing Arab labour, in a bid to refute the common Zionist claim that Jewish immigration had improved the rural and urban economies.\textsuperscript{17}

On the other hand, Canaan’s comments maintain a strong nationalist position, stating for instance that:

The present uprising and all the past disturbances [1920, 1921, 1929, 1933] have had one and only one cause, namely the unnatural political conditions under which the Arabs of Palestine have had to labour since the occupation.\textsuperscript{18}

To individuals more familiar with Canaan as the devoted committee member of the Palestine Oriental Society, prolific contributor of English-language articles to its journal, habitué of expat drawing-rooms and “best doctor in Jerusalem”, words such as ‘unnatural’, ‘labour’ and ‘occupation’ may have been strong and surprising. Certainly none of Canaan’s published work during “all those past disturbances” seems to suggest what was to come. As the text continues, the recitation of political and economic facts and figures is punctuated by short, restrained, but unmistakeably angry comments; the British government’s treatment of Zionist immigrants amounts to “unjust favouritism”, other rulings are “unjust” or “unfair”.\textsuperscript{19} Canaan also frequently quotes Zionist sources in an effort to demonstrate that, despite emollient comments to the British press, the aims of the movement do not include sharing the land of Palestine with the Arabs. At times, seen with modern sensibilities and filtered through an awareness of the growth of fascism in Europe, particularly Germany, since 1933, statements such as:

These quotations clearly show that the general wish and only desire of every Jew is 1) to appropriate as much land as possible; 2) to increase immigration to such a degree that the majority of the population becomes Jewish and 3) to with-hold all work on Jewish land from every non-Jew.\textsuperscript{20}

steer dangerously close to anti-Semitic stereotypes, especially when observed side-by-side with the excerpts from German (sometimes Jewish, sometimes not) books
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and newspapers.

However, when seen in the light of the opinions gathered by Canaan from many of the leaders of the Zionist movement inside and outwith Palestine, an assessment which endeavours to judge Canaan against events in 1930s Palestine and not the coming horrors in Europe must focus on the enormous shift in Arab-Jewish relations over the preceding quarter-century. Far from being Sephardi brothers in faith and race, sharing a common language and history, ‘Jews’ were now Ashkenazi foreigners, excluding Arabs from the land on which both lived. Indeed, Canaan, in a later section on Jewish-Arab relations prior to the British Mandate, cites Jewish writers in support of an image of amity and peace which has been disrupted by Zionist aspirations and British maladministration.\(^{21}\) He also quotes Jewish authors such as Judah Magnes and Eugen Hoeflich (Moshe Yaacov Ben-Gavriel) who argued for binationalism or co-existence and, in Hoeflich’s case, blamed the decline in Arab-Jewish relations on Western imperialism and poor decision-making by Zionist leaders.\(^{22}\) Although German members of the Lutheran community (of which Canaan was a member) did espouse National Socialism during the 1930s, Canaan resisted essentialist ideas about Jewish people: his works did not call for Zionist Jewish immigrants to be returned to Europe, instead urging the British to establish a binational state, with the Jewish component capped at 30-35%.\(^{23}\)

A similar shift from amity to enmity is seen by Canaan as taking place in relations between Arabs and the British. Before WWI, he describes, the entire Arab population of the Mashriq “looked... to every Britisher as the identification of justice, gentlemanliness and honour”.\(^{24}\) After almost twenty years of broken promises and oppressive rule, however, Canaan states that everyone, “Mohammedan and Christian, Bedouin, fellah and city dweller, educated and illiterate” now finds themselves “endangered” by British policies. Although the previous phrasing emphasises the universality of Palestinian Arab opposition to the Mandate’s actions, Canaan deploys his personal position too: “We Arab Christians”, framed as the recipients of British
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education and as historically close and loyal to the British administration, find themselves experiencing policies which they “hate most bitterly” and regard as “unchristian” - a strong word for such a devoted member of the Lutheran congregation.\textsuperscript{25} In using this aspect of his identity, Canaan, from within the nationalist movement, turns the allegation of favouritism towards Christians made by some Muslim Palestinians on its head, portraying the situation instead as one of a natural religious affinity which has been abused and exploited by Europeans. British policy has been imposed “at the point of a bayonet”\textsuperscript{26} but Canaan seeks to contrast this with the opinion he believes exists amongst the British public, seeking to appeal to the reader’s sense of decency to inspire support against the administration.

It is this notional sense of British decency to which Canaan appeals most strongly in his Conclusion, combining this with language designed to arouse pity and concern for the danger of “extermination” of the Arabs of Palestine and sympathy for a struggle which will be conducted until death, but “in a peaceful way”.\textsuperscript{27} The impact of immigration on Arab poverty and the situation of the Palestinian fellahin is invoked, citing figures drawn from British health reports for the necessary area required for a family to live decently, and British policy in “the Punjab, Kenia [sic] and Egypt” proposed as a model for regulating Palestinian citizenship, making it illogical for a British reader to reject models from within their own empire.\textsuperscript{28}

This restrained but passionate political pamphlet does not necessarily chime with the image of Tawfiq Canaan, physician and ethnographer, as he is best known. However Canaan’s ethnographic work was not an exclusively academic affair, and much of his medical writing also carried a political message.\textsuperscript{29} Some of the most heartfelt sections of \textit{The Palestine Arab Cause} are those relating to rural poverty and the desperately marginal lives of many of the Palestinian peasantry\textsuperscript{30} – people he knew as an ethnographer and as a doctor treating infectious disease. Canaan had highlighted – albeit in a typically modernist, hygiene-oriented way – problems such
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as high infant mortality and infectious illness in a speech at the graduation ceremony of the AUB in 1923. In this he did not just demonstrate paternalistic care for the rural poor, but also for the Arab nation, which he saw as being eroded by poor healthcare, superstition and popular suspicion of ‘modern’ medicine.\(^{31}\)

Canaan had also been aware of, and opposed, the politicisation of health issues in Palestine since the mid 1920s. In 1924, for instance, he raised concerns with the secretary of the first Mandate administration ‘health week’ that such events should not be used for “political or publicity purposes to promote the Zionist endeavour”.\(^{32}\) Over the course of his career Canaan seems to have decided that trying to halt the progress of Zionism within administration activities was a waste of effort; in 1944, he established the Palestine Arab Medical Association, which published a number of reports which rebutted Zionist claims to have introduced significant health benefits to the ‘backward’ Arab population.\(^{33}\)

Politics and political activism also reveal themselves in Canaan’s personal life. His sister, Badra, had been actively involved in Palestinian women’s organisations since as early as 1919, making her a pioneer of women’s activism in Palestine. She was Treasurer of the Arab Women’s Association in 1938 and part of the group’s delegation to High Commissioner of the British administration that year; she was also one of the Palestinian delegates to the 1938 Eastern Women’s Conference in Cairo.\(^{34}\) Like her brother, Badra Canaan called for the national strike and political mobilisation of 1936;\(^{35}\) Norbert Schwake refers to her as “militantly anti-British”, suggesting that her political views went further than those of her brother; she spent “several years” interned or imprisoned by the British during WWII, rather than the nine weeks for which he was confined.\(^{36}\)

Tawfiq Canaan defended the use of arms in the struggle and signed the August 1936 Arab Higher Committee petition to the British demanding Arab self-
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determination, but although the reaction of the British administration (as well as Zionist pamphleteers) was “hostile”\(^\text{37}\), he remained involved with the Palestine Oriental Society until 1948. On the other hand, according to oral accounts, Canaan may have been involved in supplying arms to the rebels in 1936-39.\(^\text{38}\) The combination of this rumour (and the fact that experts on Canaan seem to find it credible) with his ongoing social and intellectual contacts with British and Jewish scholars, and his advocacy in *The Palestine Arab Cause* for a binational state, suggest that any enmity he felt for the Mandate and Zionism remained detached from individuals. Indeed, Canaan’s polemics support the idea of a “spiritual and religious centre for Jewry” in Palestine, along the lines of ideas advanced by his friend and colleague Judah Magnes or the writings of ‘cultural Zionist’ Ahad Ha’am.\(^\text{39}\)

In Canaan’s choice of English as the language for his polemics in 1936, he was explicitly taking up the role of “a visible face representing the Palestinian Arabs to the Western world”.\(^\text{40}\) This was not an unusual role for Canaan’s colleagues from the AUB, such as Dr ‘Izzat Tannous (whom Canaan would have known; both were active in the Jerusalem branch of the AUB alumni association), who had performed diplomatic functions. Tawfiq Canaan can also be seen as having spent much of his life as a kind of informal ‘cultural ambassador’, married to a German woman, working alongside Jewish and European doctors, and choosing to pour time and effort into a scholarly organisation made up mostly of Europeans. In 1936, however, he made a conscious choice to utilise this role in an explicitly political way, linking himself both personally and via his friend Dawud Haddad (sometime head of the Schneller School and a clergyman in the Lutheran church) with the Arab Higher Committee and with Hajj Amin al-Husseini.\(^\text{41}\) In addition to his pamphlets Canaan also sent a memorandum, setting out the Palestinian Arab case, to the Scottish
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Presbyterian Church in 1938. But by this point Canaan was disillusioned with the British, and the feeling was mutual.

The almost palpable disappointment with which Tawfiq Canaan, his pleas for justice derided by Zionists and rejected by the Mandate administration, withdrew into a more nationalist position and a less public role evokes Khatibi’s notion of the conflictual erotics of bilingualism. As Khatibi highlights, the Arabic homonym *fitna* bears twin meanings of seduction and strife. In it, we find echoes of Canaan’s dilemma as one who had spent much of his life between two communities, trying to find the best in each – adopting Western science and intellectual methods to improve health, whilst recording and promoting the culture of his native land. From a personal relationship of love, respect and admiration, in which he married into Western culture and adopted its languages, professions and ideas, he ultimately found himself rejected in favour of the rival, Zionism, with its stronger and more instrumentally used claims to ‘belong’ to the West. Instead of love, we find strife, and the retreat from organisations which cross the national divide.

4.2 “This is Palestine”: representing the ‘Holy Land’ to (an)Other

Stephan Stephan also chose to address an English-speaking audience; his chosen medium was the travel guidebook. His English-language guidebooks written for tourists consisted of *This is Palestine: a Concise Guide to the Important Sites in Palestine, Transjordan and Syria*, published by Bayt-ul-Makdes Press in Jerusalem in 1942 and issued in a second edition in 1947, and *Palestine by Road and Rail: a Concise Guide to the Important Sites in Palestine and Syria*, printed in Jerusalem in 1942. Both books are credited to St. H. Stephan along with Boulos ‘Afif, a Jerusalem-based photographer who had, during the 1930s, published several tourist maps of Palestine and had co-authored, along with one Jamal Nazzal, the *Path-finder*
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Guide to Palestine, Transjordan, & Syria.45

When read next to political writings such as *The Arab Awakening* or Tawfiq Canaan’s pamphlets, the question arises of whether Stephan and ‘Afif’s guidebooks might be seen simply as a commercial venture, the two men seeking to benefit from growing numbers of foreigners visiting Palestine and – as the wartime dates suggest – stationed there. Or was this an opportunity to present a specific view and narrative of Palestine to a potentially influential audience – perhaps a version of Palestine and its people with bearing not just on competition between national claims to the land, but also conversations about identity within the Palestinian-Arab community? In answering this question, in this section I offer a closer reading of the three Stephan-‘Afif guidebooks, focusing on issues such as claims of authorial authority and knowledge, statements of authenticity and heritage, loaded choices of name and of places to focus upon, and which narratives in the region’s history are privileged.

4.2.1 Tourism in Mandate Palestine

Firstly, it is useful to consider the market into which Stephan and ‘Afif launched their guidebook. With some of the holiest sites of the three major monotheistic faiths at its heart, Palestine has attracted travellers – pilgrims, missionaries, traders, officials, tourists – for centuries. A proportion of those who visited went on to write about it; the surviving accounts have been important sources of information on the society, religion, built and natural environments, and other aspects of historic Palestine. Such writings have also been significant in that they show how other peoples – in Europe, later America and also from the Ottoman Empire and other parts of the Islamicate world – saw and imagined Jerusalem, and the impacts this had on the behaviour of generations of colonial powers in the Holy Land.46 There is a
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copious academic literature on how travellers saw and experienced Palestine; however, more work needs to be done on how Palestine’s historical inhabitants saw and experienced their visitors.

Tourism was well-established in the economy into which Stephan and his collaborator launched their guidebooks; whilst occasional pilgrims had come to Palestine for centuries, by the 1860s visitors who should rather be called tourists were arriving in significant numbers (although they had started in the late seventeenth century). They were informed by guidebooks such as Baedeker and enabled by technological change such as rail travel and steamships. Increasingly, they came with tourism companies such as Thomas Cook (which started bringing groups to Jerusalem in 1869) and American Express, inspired by “cultural curiosity, education, and the desire to enrich themselves with new experiences”. Greek Orthodox and Armenian pilgrims gave way to Western Catholic, Protestant, and Russian tourists. This new breed of traveller was fashionably entranced by the Orient and fascinated by geography, history, architecture, nature, and social customs.

Importantly for the inhabitants of Palestine, such exploration required guides, hotels, dragomans, porters, and the opportunity to buy not only essentials but souvenirs, including images of the ‘Holy Land’. Touristic enthusiasm could be
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damaging, especially as the ‘souvenirs’ often included hastily-dug and robbed antiquities, and it must be assumed that, as tends to be the case with mass tourism, the social and economic effects included distortion and degradation. But by the end of the nineteenth century, tourism was established as a significant industry in Palestine, linked to Ottoman modernisation and nation-building projects such as an Imperial provincial museum, opened in Jerusalem in around 1901, with planned extensions after 1908 stymied by the outbreak of World War One.

For Western tourists, the establishment of British colonial rule was a further draw, with visitor numbers in the first decade of the Mandate reaching up to 70,000 per year for 1924 and remaining at 40,000 even in 1930, despite the deterrent of the violence of 1929. Archaeological tourism, in particular, helped to create a “British Mandate identity” in international circles, validating and “branding” the Mandate and its presence and authority in Palestine through its management of the region’s heritage. Much less studied, but also significant for the economic development of northern Palestine, were the thousands of Muslim tourist-pilgrims who disembarked at the port of Haifa to join the Hijaz railway to Mecca, and who spurred the growth of businesses such as “restaurants [and] small hotels” from 1905 onwards.

Under the Mandate another important new tourist market emerged: Zionists, in their thousands (in 1930, 10% of the whole), perhaps influenced by the images of ‘modern’ tourism to Palestine in Herzl’s *Altneuland*. Hybrid religious/political
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tourism was facilitated by Zionist organisations which encouraged visitors to make Aliyah, or to build links with sympathisers and prospective donors, whether Christians or Jews who did not themselves plan to immigrate to Palestine. Not all Jewish-run tourist enterprises, though, were overtly political in nature: after 1933 German Jews fleeing Nazism entered the tourist market because it was a good way to earn a living. Zionist tourism was shaped by the interplay of Yishuv economic and ideological needs and of tourist desires to visit archaeological sites, stay and eat in westernised hotels and cafes and, especially, view the fruits of Zionist projects in Eretz Yisroel. This multi-valency, blending ideological and commercial interests, shows in the marketing materials produced, with their linguistic and visual references encompassing a range from modern comfort to traditional religiosity. The modernist architecture of a wave of hotels built in the 1930s and 40s also stressed to Jewish visitors its roots in the “typical Jewish bourgeois home of Central Europe [translated to] the new homeland in Palestine” and to general onlookers the “increasingly secular, forward-thinking nature of Zionist tourism itself”. This message that modernity and success in Palestine was the product of European and Jewish influences was the image against which guidebooks written by Arabs such as Stephan struggled.

However, it was not only Zionists who saw tourism’s potential for growing the sub-national economies within Mandate Palestine, as well as getting a political message out: Arabs were active in the sector too, so Stephan and ‘Afif’s initiative was not an isolated one. The competition between Arab and Jewish tour guides was seen by British officials as a potential “flashpoint”, to the extent that the Mandate government sought to head it off with legislation. Zionist organisations based in Palestine alleged that Arab tour guides tried to divert tourists away from Jewish sites.
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and businesses, whilst in London, the Zionist Organisation lobbied Thomas Cook to do the reverse.\textsuperscript{70}

There is less evidence of co-ordinated Arab-Palestinian tourism sector development, but the Supreme Muslim Council took some action. In the early 1920s it appointed journalist and educator ʻAdel Jabre (at one time a subscriber to \textit{JPOS}) as director of the Islamic Museum and Aqsa Mosque Library. This job included acting as “head of tourism” for the Ibrahimi Mosque in Hebron and authoring visitor guides to the Aqsa and Ibrahimi Mosque complexes.\textsuperscript{71} Under the auspices of the Mandate Department of Antiquities, Naim Makhouly, the antiquities inspector for the north of Palestine, wrote a \textit{Guide to Acre}, a “local voice” (or a hybrid one, coming from an English-writing Christian Arab in the employ of the British authorities) in tourist information for English-speaking visitors.\textsuperscript{72} In 1929 the Arab Higher Committee also opened the Palace Hotel in ‘new’ West Jerusalem. It was one of the largest in Jerusalem, and backers hoped to appeal to wealthy Arab tourists. The venture was not a success; the Palace closed as a hotel in the 1930s and was leased to the Mandate government for use as offices.\textsuperscript{73}

\subsection*{4.2.2 Palestine Guidebooks}

Although travellers’ guides to Palestine have existed since the medieval period,\textsuperscript{74} multiplying rapidly in the second half of the nineteenth century\textsuperscript{75} and even more so with the foundation of the Mandate, attention has largely focused on those written by foreigners and visitors to the Holy Land, often former government officials and archaeologists. Immediately after WWI, the \textit{Palestine News} published a series of guidebooks to regions of Palestine; these were originally prepared by military
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intelligence to replace the army’s previous main reference – Baedeker’s 1875 guide, translated into English – and underline the intimate connections between colonialism and seemingly innocuous activities such as tourism.\textsuperscript{76}

Beyond direct military associations, however, scholarship on travel guides has highlighted the role they play in creating and shaping perceptions, imaginaries, and ‘knowledge’ within a colonial framework.\textsuperscript{77} The guidebook author often invokes a personal, on-the-ground knowledge of the destination and its people as the source of their authority. In constructing a travel guide, the writer claims the ability not only to deliver information about history, geography and culture, but also a more personal understanding of a society and the hidden, authentic details that will expose the real place. In London, guidebooks have reinforced understandings of imperial power, creating perceptions of place which emphasise the hierarchies between the British Empire’s centre and its peripheries.\textsuperscript{78}

But travel writing by inhabitants of colonised lands can also be a forum for ‘writing back’, rejecting the stereotypes and marginal roles imposed by imperial writers and asserting the right, and ability, to write one’s own history and country. These might overwhelmingly be the work of the “nationalist bourgeoisie”, but they are nevertheless the work of authors making tactical decisions about the narratives they produce and the way they use, or reject, European ideas.\textsuperscript{79} It is in this tradition, of bourgeois writers who engage with, sometimes incorporate, but maintain critical distance from, colonial discourses that I situate Stephan Stephan and ‘Afif Boulos.

The earliest travel guides written by Palestinian residents of any kind seem to be the (apparently popular and regularly re-printed) guidebooks by the “professeurs de Notre-Dame de France à Jérusalem”, published from 1901 onwards. Zionist organisations joined the market from 1922, with guides aimed first and foremost at a
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Jewish audience. These were published partly to satisfy demand for specific information and partly to ensure that, even for visitors without active Zionist sympathies, the desired version of Palestine’s history and culture was laid before them. Zionist publications were sometimes in Hebrew, but included guidebooks and maps in English and German (such as those produced from 1935 by Steimatzky’s); the demand for such guides was large enough to be “lucrative.”

Apart from ‘Adel Jabre’s 1920s guides to the Haram al-Sharif and the Haram al-Khalil, the earliest tourist guide to Palestine and the Levant written in a European language by an author of Arab origin is Abdallah Zehil’s *Petit guide historique de la Syrie, la Palestine & l’Égypte*, published in French by E. Maurin & M. Pagès in Marseilles in 1929. Zehil, from Beirut, was the Middle Eastern agent for the Fabre Steamship Line (Compagnie française de navigation à vapeur), so the guide may have been aimed at passengers aboard Beirut-bound ships. In 1934, Boulos ‘Afif and Jamil Nazzal published the 59-page *Pathfinder Guide to Palestine, Transjordan, & Syria*, published by the Said cousins’ Palestine Educational Company. This appears to be the first guidebook to Palestine overall, written by Palestinians.

### 4.2.3 “This is Palestine” and “Palestine by Road and Rail”

Stephan and ‘Afif’s guidebooks had to compete for attention with classic guides such as Baedeker and Thomas Cook’s, some of them written by eminent authors; with established local guides such as that published by the American Colony and Matson’s Photographers since 1920 (with numerous printings thereafter); and with the substantial body of work coming from explicitly Zionist or commercial publishers. The publication of guidebooks in the early 1940s, at the height of World War Two, may seem odd, but after a slump on the outbreak of war, Palestine saw a sharp upturn in tourism from 1940, peaking in 1945 with over 150,000 visitors, mainly ‘military tourism’ composed of soldiers and military support workers on leave. When Stephan and Boulos published the first editions of their two guides,
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they could still have hoped to persuade British opinion of the rightness of the Palestinian Arab position. Nazi atrocities against the Jews were still being reported in the British press as individual incidents, of a type recognisable from a British perspective as part of the standard repertoire of Eastern European anti-Semitic violence. Only in the summer of 1942 did new information from a report by the Bund change the way in which British newspapers framed anti-Jewish violence, confirming it as an overarching policy of genocidal extermination.  

The short, cheaply-printed and -bound paperback guides published by writers such as Stephan and ‘Afif were thus aimed at a mass military market. They are small, easily fitting in a pocket, and low-cost – very much designed to appeal to a brief visitor, probably an ordinary soldier on leave, rather than the hardback volumes produced in the nineteenth century for small numbers of affluent travellers. In this section, I present a reading of Stephan’s guidebooks, juxtaposed at times with examples from Abraham Marmorosch’s *Old and New Places in Palestine and Syria*, an archetypal tourist manual by a European Jewish tour guide of broadly Zionist opinions, of a similar date, type and price (250 mils) to Stephan’s efforts.  

Stephan and ‘Afif’s *This is Palestine: a Concise Guide to the Important Sites in Palestine, Transjordan and Syria* was published by Bayt-ul-Makdes Press in Jerusalem in 1942 and issued in a second edition in 1947, printed at The Modern Press, Jerusalem. ‘Afif had co-authored the *Pathfinder Guide to Palestine, Transjordan, & Syria*, so he had prior experience, but as a photographer by profession he chose to work with a more knowledgeable writer on archaeology and history to put together this more ambitious guide, which extends to over 200 pages (against *Pathfinder*’s 59).
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83 Abraham Marmorosch was a tour guide and author of guidebooks whose name suggests that his ancestry was Romanian Jewish. He established a tourist business partnership, F.M.R. Popular Trips, in Jerusalem in 1935 (*Palestine Gazette*, 28th November 1935, 1150). He first published *Old and New Places in Palestine and Syria* in 1931, with subsequent editions in 1934, 1941, and 1946. He also issued a German version, *Alte und neue Stätten in Palästina und Südsyrien; ein moderner Führer*, in 1931. All editions seem to have been printed at Azriel Press in Jerusalem. Numerous copies of his guide can be found listed in libraries in the Middle East and elsewhere, and substantial numbers are also available on second-hand book sales sites, which suggests that it sold well and widely.
The construction of *This is Palestine* follows a model established in European guides since the second quarter of the nineteenth century: a general historical background to the subject country is followed by details of the sites of interest and facilities. Stephan and ‘Afif’s guide is planned around the main routes leading out of Jerusalem and the sights along them, leading as far afield as Transjordan, Gaza and Lebanon, signalling an ability to cross borders and a regional outlook that would be sharply truncated in 1948. This viewpoint, harking back to pre-WWI Greater Syria, is also evident in Stephan and ‘Afif’s narrative of Palestine’s past. It is presented as “a connecting link between East and West, North and South”, a land of many peoples and with an emphasis on the different invaders who then “absorbed” the preceding inhabitants, implying cultural and physical mixing. An Arab presence is asserted from a very early date, as “beduins from the east had also invaded the country and held it under their rule (at least in parts) during the period of Judges and often before it.”

This proto-Levantine idea of Palestine’s culture and history also shows in the importance Stephan and ‘Afif’s narrative attaches to continuity and co-existence. At Rachel’s Tomb, near Bethlehem, the presence of a mihrab within the sanctuary and a “cemetery for the beduins living around Beit Sahûr” is stressed alongside Jewish worship at the tomb. The Coenaculum in Jerusalem is “now the Mosque of David” but the text notes free access by Jews and Christians on relevant feast days (without the usual tourist entry charge). The feast of St George or Al-Khadr at Lydda is “observed by Christians and Moslems alike” and is said to be “attended by thousands”, whilst the modern Arabic names of places such as “Wadi Joz” and “el-Azariya” are said to be variants on the Old and New Testament names of Jehoshaphat and Lazarus. The city of Hebron is cited as an example of Arab rebirth.
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when “the Prophet himself” granted it to his Companion Tamim al-Dari, after it had declined under Christian rule from its status as King David’s capital before he conquered Jerusalem.\(^\text{90}\) And, underlining precedents for co-existence and harmony between the three monotheistic faiths under glorious Arab rule, Sheikh Khalil al-Khalidi (1863-1941) is cited as calling the “ravishing” town of Beit Jala – perhaps not coincidentally Stephan’s home-town – a “piece of Andalusia, transplanted to the Holy Land”.\(^\text{91}\)

In line with this, there is no indication that Stephan and ‘Afif felt any hostility, or even competition, with Hebrew history in Palestine’s past; the Jewish presence is fully acknowledged and recognised. Figures such as David and Solomon are accorded significant status amongst the fact-laden and somewhat dry narratives,\(^\text{92}\) but not to the disproportionate extent (in relation to the length of time their kingdoms survived and the areas encompassed by them) of many Western and Zionist guides. The four synagogues of the Old City of Jerusalem are mentioned, along with aspects of their history,\(^\text{93}\) and the annual commemoration of the destruction of the Temple on Tisha B’Av is described as a significant part of the Jerusalem year:

large crowds, numbering many thousands, fill the place before the Wailing Wall and the lanes leading to it. The very impressive service truly reflects the emotions of the large, dense congregation.\(^\text{94}\)

The northern town of Tiberias is called the “spiritual centre of Palestine Jewry” and its location as the site of important moments in the codification of the Torah and Mishnah noted.\(^\text{95}\) The Jewish population is credited with cultural flourishing and
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prosperity in Safad, and the Samaritans, dubbed an “ancient sect” of Judaism, are widely discussed in the Nablus chapter, with Sebastia described as the “splendid capital of the Northern Kingdom” of Israel. Even in the 1947 edition of the guidebook the foundation of Zionist settlements is mentioned in the chronology and their presence listed alongside other sights with little comment, whilst the Tel Aviv suburb of Ramath Gan is called “beautiful” and Tel Aviv itself “ultra-modern”.

Although Stephan and ‘Afif seem willing to acknowledge the presence and at times the virtues of individual Zionist colonies in Palestine, their account differs from Zionist guidebooks in that they do not ascribe modernity and development to European or Jewish immigration. Indeed, Stephan and ‘Afif are keen to demonstrate that Palestinian Arabs are equally interested in and capable of being modern according to their lights; technological, economic and architectural manifestations of this are carefully mentioned. This can be contrasted with Marmorosch’s guide, in which a chapter entitled “Jewish work in upbuilding Palestine” claims that development of the country “had been carried on almost entirely by Zionists” until 1929, at which point the wider Jewish community has joined the effort, with the “Palestine Government […] also taking an active part in the re-building of the land.” Parts of Palestine not yet touched by this effort are depicted as wild and barren, with no role taken by the Arab population.

For Stephan and ‘Afif, though, an account of the Via Dolorosa notes the “Moslem” Rawdat al-Ma‘arif college, whilst the Armenian and Syriac convents are mentioned as home to libraries and printing presses; “one of the best and most up to date” of the latter is said to be found at the Greek Convent in the Old City of Jerusalem. A survey of the suburbs of Jerusalem includes ‘modern’ Arab areas such as Sheikh Jarrah and the Nashashibi Quarter; in contrast, Marmorosch’s account of the areas surrounding the Old City of Jerusalem makes no mention of
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these areas, confining its list of the “fine modern quarters of Jerusalem” to those labelled Christian, Jewish, or Greek.\(^\text{102}\) Farther afield, the “serene little” city of Bethlehem is home to a “large number of schools and charitable institutions”, whilst the “fashionable” ‘Ajami Quarter of Jaffa rivals Tel Aviv for its “beach, modern hotels, cafes and excellent restaurants”.\(^\text{103}\) And, implicitly countering Zionist claims that European Jewish migrants were solely responsible for reviving Palestinian agriculture after centuries of Arab mismanagement, Stephan notes how ancient aqueducts had been:

utilised in part for the last two generations by a rich Arab landowner, the late Muhieddin al-Husseini, who succeeded [sic] in constructing 47kms of canals for his extensive model banana plantations in the plain of Jericho.\(^\text{104}\)

If any sense of emotional identity emerges from Stephan and ‘Afif’s text, it stems from the reverential tone into which it shifts when describing important Christian sites. “The present Church of the Holy Sepulchre”, for instance, “contains what is most dear to every Christian, the place of the Passion of Our Lord and His Sepulchre, from which He rose gloriously on the third day”.\(^\text{105}\) Jesus Christ is regularly referred to as “Our Lord” and the olive trees on the hill of Gethsemane outside the Old City of Jerusalem are said to have “witnessed the greatest agony and the most fervent prayer history has ever recorded”.\(^\text{106}\) Unlike Marmorosch,\(^\text{107}\) Stephan’s descriptions of the Churches of the Holy Sepulchre and the Nativity do not include stories of tension and violence between the different Christian denominations. Whilst, therefore, Stephan and ‘Afif assert Arab abilities and authenticity in the land of Palestine in both ancient and modern periods, they do so as a distinctively Christian voice, perhaps because of their own personal beliefs but also, perhaps, with the aim of using a common faith as a way of communicating with European visitors.

Stephan and ‘Afif’s attitude towards the Islamic history of Palestine is

\(^{103}\) Stephan and ‘Afif, *This is Palestine*, 85, 153.
\(^{104}\) Ibid., 117.
\(^{105}\) Ibid., 14.
\(^{106}\) Ibid., 114.
particularly noteworthy, especially when set alongside their Christian sentiments. In common with the notion – widespread in Arab nationalism – that even non-Muslim Arabs were ‘culturally Islamic’ and benefited from the glories of Islamic civilisation, Palestine’s Islamic heritage is foregrounded:

The Sanctuaries of the Dome of the Rock and the Aqsa Mosque are considered by Moslems to rank in sanctity only after those of the Kaaba in Mecca and the Tomb of the Prophet in Medina. Whenever possible, pilgrims to Mecca and Medina would on their way home include these Jerusalem Sanctuaries in their pilgrimage.  

The early Arab conquerors of the Syrian region are regarded positively and, connecting them to the “beduin” mentioned as far back as Judges (that is, before 1,000BC), they are portrayed as natives of the land to the same extent as the Canaanites and Hebrews, and to belong to periods during which Palestine had a “comparatively high civilisation”. But while “As long as the Arabs ruled, peace reigned in the Holy Land; it was different as soon as foreign rulers held sway in Palestine.” Other Islamic rulers – Fatimids, Mamluks and Ottomans – are labelled “foreigners”, alongside the Crusaders, and seen as causing decline and chaos.

Stephan and Boulos treat European colonial influence in the Middle East in “the latter half of the nineteenth century” in a lukewarm fashion, not by any means condemnatory but not whole-heartedly enthusiastic in tone. “Conditions improved to a certain extent, and were beneficial to both Moslem and Christian subjects”, whilst the Mandate government is credited with digging artesian wells for the inhabitants of the Naqab. It is possible to detect an essentialist strand, in which the long-term residents of the land have an innate connection to it, whilst foreigners remain Other, failing to properly fit. Occasional exceptions serve only to prove the rule: “Unlike many other buildings erected by Europeans, this Hospice [of St Andrew’s Scottish church] adapts itself to the landscape.”
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This sense of belonging is also asserted in the tone used at points throughout the guidebook to stress the familiarity and depth of personal knowledge possessed by the authors. As well as their academic and intellectual expertise, conveyed through an emphasis on up-to-date information about archaeological excavations and new research, a more intimate kind of authority is posed in the behind-the-scenes, insider personae commonly assumed by the writers of guides.\textsuperscript{114} Such instances are often characterised by a suddenly familiarity of manner, communicating directly with the reader using the second rather than third person to suggest direct and immediate contact. Examples include:

The Tomb itself, now covered with marble slabs (of which the upper one is cracked), is guarded night and day by a Greek priest. (You may ask him to show you part of the living Rock, seen through a small window, against which he is standing).\textsuperscript{115}

and:

The medieval cloisters are in good condition. A small collection of antiquities is in the upper storey, where the western door is especially of interest. The keys are with the guardian. (Apply at the southern door).\textsuperscript{116}

Stephan and ʻAfif, two Christian Palestinian Arabs, thus frame themselves as able to offer an authoritative account of the Holy Land on more than one level. As well as ‘book learning’ and historical information, they present themselves as giving the reader a window on Palestine which is personal and authentic, to be trusted both as a tourist guide but also as the basis of how a European visitor should view the land and the competing claims on it.

\textit{Palestine by Road and Rail: a Concise Guide to the Important Sites in Palestine and Syria}, published, like the first edition of \textit{This is Palestine}, in 1942, is a condensed and cheaper version of the latter. The photographs and line drawings have

\textsuperscript{114} Such styles will be familiar to anyone who has attended journalism or travel writing classes; for an academic discussion of the mechanics of such writing, see Ana Alačovska, “Creativity in the Brief: travel guidebook writers and good work”. In Brian Moeran, Bo T. Christensen (eds) \textit{Exploring Creativity: Evaluative Practices in Innovation, Design, and the Arts} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 182-85.

\textsuperscript{115} Stephan and ʻAfif, \textit{This is Palestine}, 17.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 54.
been removed, and the historical background to Palestine heavily abridged, to create a small booklet priced at 100 mils (two shillings), as against 250 mils (five shillings) for the original printing of This is Palestine. It was printed at the Ahva Co-op Printing Press, a Jewish-run company, signifying Stephan’s continued willingness to work across national lines, even at this late stage in the Mandate, with the Jewish population at its highest and the acrimony of the Revolt a recent memory. The specific reason for publishing a smaller and cheaper guidebook in 1942 is outlined in a brief foreword by Stephan and ‘Afif, and relates to the conditions for tourism in Palestine during World War Two. As mentioned above, Palestine had become “an important Rest & Recuperation location of the British army in the Middle East”. “The aim of this pocket guide is to place the more important information about Palestine and Syria in a concise form at the disposal of members of H.M. Armed Forces in Palestine”, Stephan’s text reads, continuing that:

The handy size and limited scope of this guide make it an ideal companion for the soldiers, to whom it is inscribed and for whom it is intended. Its reliability recommends it above others of the same size and price.

The foreword goes on to mention Stephan and ‘Afif’s longer and more lavish (and expensive) guidebook “for those seeking a more comprehensive guide”.

Both editions feature a foreword by Eugene Hoade, an Irish Franciscan who also published A Guide to the Holy Land in 1942 at the Franciscan Press. Given the market at which Stephan and ‘Afif were aiming, and the paucity of Arab names amongst its authors, Hoade’s presence can be read as a way of making the book more trustworthy to European buyers. Hoade emphasises the significance and reliability of the information in Stephan and ‘Afif’s guide - “It has much useful information for which you will seek in vain in other books.” But he also flags the diversity and multi-
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117 Ahva existed until at least the 1980s, providing services for significant Israeli institutions including Yad Vashem and Hadassah Hospital. Seikaly notes the decline in the discursive and actual possibility of Arab-Jewish business co-operation as immigration and tensions increased in the 1930s (Men of Capital, 107, 117).


faith character of the Palestine described, mentioning the “sixty spoken languages” to be found, the “Christian, Jewish and Moslem denominations,” and the importance of Palestine to “Mohammedans” because of its “intimate connections with the life of the Prophet, in addition to those of the Prophets Moses and ‘Issa (Jesus)”. Hoade’s foreword is signed “Gethsemane, 9th December 1941”, adding his credentials (for the British reader) as a resident and religious figure of Christian Palestine to those of his European origins.120

To Palestinian nationalists who had demanded a boycott of the Mandate administration and fought in the Uprising of 1936-39, to produce a publication specifically for, and warmly dedicated to, British soldiers might represent a betrayal. After all, during the rebellion, working for the British administration attracted criticism and sometimes violence.121 However, with the 1939 White Paper signed by Musa al-ʻAlami, Jamil al-Husseini and (reluctantly) Hajj Amin al-Husseini, Palestinians with Western sympathies could justifiably convince themselves that British support for Zionism was waning and that the Mandate would eventually lead to Palestinian independence, as had happened in Iraq and Syria, or at least to benefits for their particular village or region.122 It is worth pointing out that Abraham Marmorosch, having issued his guide in 1931 and reprinted in 1934, had experienced a hiatus during the Revolt, but had brought out a third edition in 1941. Wartime Palestine might, indeed, be viewed as a microcosmic battleground in which tourist guides laid their visions of the country before a Commonwealth military audience. As well as grasping a commercial opportunity, in issuing this smaller, cheaper guide with its very targeted audience, Stephan and ‘Afif should be seen as directing their message at a mass readership in the hope that British public opinion would, in the end, support Palestinian Arab rights.

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter shifts from the language manuals of Haddad, Spoer and Stephan, and
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121 Abboushi, “Road to Rebellion”, 42; Cohen, Army of Shadows, 103-4.
122 Cohen, Army of Shadows, 133-4, 146-54.
from the comparatively hopeful conditions in which they first emerged in 1909 and the 1920s, to writings which spring from a much more urgent atmosphere. In Tawfiq Canaan’s nationalist pamphlets, I argued, we witness his employment of European styles of rhetoric and understandings of knowledge and rationality to try to persuade a British public of the rightness of the Palestinian cause. In stressing the affinity between Jews and Arabs, and the potential for tolerance and co-existence, Canaan plays a risky game, attempting to activate the Enlightenment values of his German-influenced upbringing and medical training to prove that such tendencies are not alien to “Oriental” peoples. In Stephan’s excursion into writing tourist guidebooks, we see similar ideas put into play, focusing on Arab-Jewish amity and on Arab modernity and “progress”, framed in a Western language of technology and social harmony in an attempt to show Anglophone visitors that Arab Palestinians were deserving of autonomy and respect.

The tendency of histories to focus on ‘big’ political issues can, as the example of Canaan and Stephan’s writings in English show, obscure the fact that similar tactics can be brought to bear in less obvious but equally strategic and potentially more far-reaching ways. As discussed in the previous chapter, we can attribute some of Stephan’s popular writings to personal needs, whether professional or financial. But the content of Stephan and ‘Afif Boulos’ cheap guides to Palestine, aimed at soldiers on leave, can also be read as part of a specific discourse on Palestine, its culture, heritage and territory, which asserts a model of Palestinian history largely in keeping with that of the national movement, although with a certain Christian sensibility. Although post-Nakba perspectives on Palestinian history tend to focus on the increased hostility between Arab Palestinians and the British colonial administration after the 1936-39 revolt, it must also be remembered that Zionist-British relations were also poor by the end of the uprising, though they had not reached the nadir of 1946-48. When Stephan and ‘Afif wrote their guides in 1941-42, the scale of Nazi atrocities against the Jews were not fully known, and sympathy
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for the aims of the Zionist movement not, therefore, so profoundly affected. Arguments for an Arab nature of Palestine, set in a long and diverse history, could still be deployed in the hope of swaying public opinion in the direction of Palestinian independence, or at least a binational state.

In choosing to write in English, therefore, Canaan and Stephan’s decisions can be seen as a combination of pragmatism and defiance. On one hand, their choice can be understood as a tool with which to construct an image and argument; on the other, it might suggest a weapon in the war of propaganda. This affirms the possibility of agency on the part of the colonial subject, even when operating firmly within the coloniser’s sphere. The colonised subject does not take on the coloniser’s language in an act of subservience and abandonment of their own culture. Rather, it is used strategically and deliberately, in an effort to combat the coloniser’s agenda, as well as (in Stephan’s case) to advance within the colonial system, to ‘play the game’.

This chapter closes the section on Canaan, Stephan and Haddad’s writings in English. In it, I have highlighted the way in which the three men interacted with Anglophone readerships. The initial examples were language textbooks which, in their earliest phases, were educational opportunities, partly arising from regional debates about the use of colloquial Arabic, but also ways of presenting a cultural and geographical entity called Palestine to international audiences, and stressing its social diversity and modernity. By the end of the period, with Canaan’s 1936 nationalist pamphlets and Stephan’s 1940s tourist guides, we see a more urgent assertion of Palestinian Arab rights, framed in attempts to persuade British readers of Arab virtues, depicted as including Christianity, modernity, and tolerance.

In different ways such arguments, touching on issues of identity, authenticity, power and strategy, are also constant features of debates in translation, both to and from colonial languages. In the next chapter, I examine some of Haddad and Stephan’s translations – between Arabic, English, German and Ottoman Turkish – and explore the intricate ways in which these two men use their knowledge of different languages, moving between them like Abdelkebir Khatibi’s footloose bilingual hero, to convey different images of their worlds and values, and to assert their visions of Palestine to multiple audiences.
5 Bibles and Borders

In the previous pair of chapters, I explored the books and pamphlets which Elias Haddad, Stephan Hanna Stephan and Tawfiq Canaan wrote for English-speaking audiences, be they students of colloquial Arabic, travellers and tourists in Palestine and the broader Levant, or a general public who might be swayed towards political support for the Palestinian Arab cause during the 1936-39 revolt. In the next two, I focus on the translated works of Elias Haddad and Stephan Stephan, arguing (drawing on functional theories of translation), that the choice of text, the manner in which the translating process was undertaken, and the target audience(s) for the new texts were informed by the intellectual, social and political currents of the day, and that they fed into contemporary discourses. As well as teaching languages, and instructing others how to teach themselves, Haddad and Stephan translated into and out of a variety of tongues and for different purposes and audiences: from colloquial and literary Arabic into English; from German into literary Arabic, and from Ottoman Turkish into English.

Although the translation movement of the Arabic nahda has been widely studied,¹ little has been written on literary translation done in Palestine.² In terms of language and translation during the Mandate era (that is, after the 1834-1914 period designated by Pierre Cachia as the nahdawi “Age of Translation”³), the focus is understandably on the relationship between Arabic and Hebrew, and on British language policy.⁴ These two chapters take a different approach, considering a


2 Exceptions include Scoville's work on Khalil Baydas, the Nazarene journalist and author who translated numerous Russian novels and short stories into Arabic, and articles by Gribetz and Levy on Shimon Moyal’s Arabic translation of the Talmud and other such projects by Arabic-speaking Jews prior to WWI.


4 See Halperin’s Babel in Zion.
mixture of translations by Palestinian Arabs and Europeans, into and out of English, Ottoman Turkish, German, and literary and colloquial Arabic, using a combination of translation theories and history. My aim in doing so is firstly to foreground translation as an important way in which multilingual Arab Palestinians such as Haddad and Stephan thought about Palestine and Palestinian-ness, and secondly to highlight their agency, exploring how processes sometimes seen as passive or colonised, in these cases, provided a means of articulating positions on social and political issues.

In order to achieve this, the present chapter takes as case studies a work (or set of works) each by Haddad and Stephan, each of which depict the geography, topography and society of Palestine in particular ways. I argue that Haddad and Stephan’s choice of projects was not random, but that the portrayals they found in these works – respectively, the poems of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan and the Seyahatnâme of Evliya Çelebi – met their translators’ aims in terms of how they wanted to present their country. However, I also suggest that these projects were rooted in the specific historical conditions in which they were undertaken, and that the translators’ choices of text, vocabulary and meaning were contingent upon the immediate environment and the prevailing sense of the possible.

Firstly, I argue that a long-term translation project by Elias Haddad and Henry Spoer, focusing on the works of the Bedouin warrior-poet Nimr Ibn ’Adwan and begun before WWI, offers a very ‘Ottoman’ view of Palestine, with fluid social and geographic borders. This section opens with a history of Ibn ’Adwan and his poetry, considering how the life and literature of a figure seen in the present day as epitomising tribal Jordan actually blurs the lines between Jordan and Palestine, and between the nomadic warrior-Bedouin and the settled urbanites and peasantry. To understand how Haddad’s work on Ibn ’Adwan’s poetry came about, I then consider the life of Henry Spoer, his colleague on both the Manual of Palestinian Arabic and on a four-decade project of recording, transcribing, and translating Ibn ’Adwan’s poems. The final part of this section brings the former together in order to interpret the translations Haddad and Spoer produced, and the image they present of Palestine.

Secondly, I examine Stephan Stephan’s 1930s translation of the Palestine
section of Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyahatnâme*. This highlights the more geographically and increasingly more socially circumscribed ideas that could operate as the British Mandate authorities enforced colonial borders on the region and as growing tensions between Palestinian Arabs and Zionist Jews disrupted working relationships. Given the importance of Evliya’s work as a source for his period, I first consider the work itself and the uses to which it has been put by historians. This informs a study of Stephan’s translation of the Palestine section of the *Seyahatnâme*. To perform this task fully, however, we must comprehend the role of the Jewish scholar L.A. Mayer, Stephan’s colleague at the Department of Antiquities, in the earlier phases of this work. This combination of biographical information on Mayer and an analysis of the text allows us to draw some tentative conclusions about this translation and its relationship with Stephan’s personal story as a scholar in colonial Palestine and with the wider political context in which it was produced.

This exploration of Haddad and Stephan’s work assumes a number of things about translation. It is informed by ‘function-oriented’ descriptive translation studies, which have been described as “a study of contexts rather than texts”. My focus is very much on the environments – political, social, cultural, religious and colonial, the “extra-textual factors and cross-cultural interactions” rather than “linguistic equivalence” – in which Haddad’s and Stephan’s translations were conceived, worked upon and published. Why did they select these particular texts for translation? What were their purposes and motivations for doing so? What were the processes of translation they performed? Who were their intended and actual readerships? And what can we tell about the responses to and impacts of the translated texts?

### 5.1 Nimr Ibn ‘Adwan

Alongside the *Manual of Palestinian Arabic*, Henry Spoer and Elias Haddad worked
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together on a number of ethnographic articles in English and German. These included a body of work on “Poems by Nimr Ibn ‘Adwan”, a long-running project to assemble poetry by the late eighteenth/early nineteenth-century sheikh from the ’Adwan tribes of the Balqa, on the Eastern side of the Jordan River. Transliterating, translating and publishing these poems became a life project, particularly for Spoer, and the story of this piece of work highlights a number of themes of this study. These include: the relationship between Arab and European scholars and the extent of local agency and power within this; the varying visions of Palestine and its geographical and cultural borders articulated by Palestinians in the first half of the twentieth century; the way in which these visions have entered later narratives and the ways in which they have been used; and the relationship between modernity and folklore/history in the Palestinian imaginary.

In particular, Spoer and Haddad’s work on Ibn ‘Adwan’s poetry is significant because of the image it presents of Palestine itself. Archaeology and anthropology played a major role in how Western audiences “imagined” Palestine, as a Biblical land inhabited by primitive peoples who, at best, could be regarded as degraded relics of a past populated by Christian and Jewish sacred figures. These visions also permeated political imaginaries, and later realities, in determining where borders should lie and which stretches of land should belong to whom. But in this series of articles, Haddad and Spoer posit a Palestine closely entwined with motifs of “authentic” Arab culture (the classical Bedouin, the heroic warrior-poet) and in which the dramas are not those of the Biblical past but of popular poetry and songs of the nineteenth-century Arab Levant.

5.1.1 Nimr Ibn ’Adwān and his people

The ’Adwan were (and still are) one of the main tribes in the Balqa, alongside rivals such as the Bani Sakhr. In present-day Jordanian national narratives and scholarship
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such as Andrew Shryock’s ethnography of the Balqa tribes, the ’Adwan are understood as historically associated with this specific area, ruling over sedentary cultivators, making occasional raids to the north, south, east and west, and sporadically engaging in confrontations with the Ottoman authorities.\textsuperscript{10} According to an account taken in the 1880s from a chief of the ’Adwan, the tribe arrived in the Balqa in the sixteenth century, fleeing a blood-feud in the Nejd region of Arabia, and had carved out substantial lands stretching from the Jordanian desert to the Ghor (Jordan Valley). This Nejdi origin also formed the basis for the ’Adwan’s claims to ‘pure’ or heroic blood and their attachment to a pastoralist, semi-nomadic lifestyle rather than the settled, agricultural way of life they portrayed as degraded.\textsuperscript{11}

Although Orientalist stereotypes of the ‘noble savage’ desert Bedouin are often applied to the ’Adwan (the Palestinian-German writer, farmer and educationalist Philip Baldensperger wrote in 1930 that they had been well-known as a “very wild tribe”\textsuperscript{12}), by the time of Haddad and Spoer’s early-twentieth-century expedition to the Balqa significant numbers of Bedouin, including ’Adwan, had sedentarised and/or registered land with the government (either by choice or under pressure from the Ottoman authorities) over the previous 30-40 years.\textsuperscript{13}

This focus on the Eastern side of the Jordan, however, masks the extent to which the lives of Nimr and the ’Adwan of his era were bound up with the more sedentary society on the Western side. Nimr himself had regular encounters – and clashes – with leading figures from the city of Nablus, which at times was an administrative capital for the Balqa, while one of his daughters married into the Abu Ghosh family of the village of Qiryat el-’Anab, West of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{14} Other nineteenth-century members of the clan, according to local memory and history, fought enemies in the Palestinian village of Taybeh, were imprisoned in Nablus, and

\textsuperscript{13} Michael R. Fischbach, State, Society and Land in Jordan (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 31, 46-53.
\textsuperscript{14} Van den Steen, Near Eastern Tribal Societies, 141.
banished to Jerusalem.\footnote{Andrew Shryock, \textit{Nationalism and the Genealogical Imagination: Oral History and Textual Authority in Tribal Jordan} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 77,81,200.} ʽAdwan raids, according to the British explorer Claude Conder, writing anonymously in an 1883 article on the Jordanian Bedouin, often stretched as far as Jerusalem and “even to Jaffa”, holding Judea in a “continual condition of terror”.\footnote{A Palestine Explorer, “The Belka Arabs”, 172. Conder later repeated this tale in his 1889 account of his travels in what he termed Heth and Moab, the regions' Biblical names. In both texts he recorded that Sheikh Diab met the explorer's assurance that the “righteous” British had no imperialistic designs on Ottoman land with an “air of courteous incredulity” (Ibid., 180).} Archaeological evidence underscores the fact that ’Adwan economic activities did not end with livestock sold in Damascus or Hebron, but that “members of the tribe participated in an exchange network that embraced the Red Sea, Greater Syria, and Europe”.\footnote{Bethany J. Walker, “Bangles, Beads and Bedouin: Excavating a Late Ottoman Cemetery in Jordan”. \textit{Essays in Economic and Business History} 19 (2001), 275.}

Sheikh Nimr was a leader of one of the two main branches of the ’Adwan. He was born around 1754 and died in 1823 and, based on the contents of his poems and information about him collected by European Orientalists, spent his life in the Balqa. The nineteenth-century Finnish scholar Georg Wallin, who visited Ibn ’Adwan’s home turf in the 1840s, insisted that the Sheikh was completely literate in both reading and writing,\footnote{G.A. Wallin, “Probe aus einer Anthologie neuarabischer Gesänge, in der Wüste gesammelt”. \textit{Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft} 6 (1852), 192-3.} that this would not be unexpected for a Bedouin poet of the time is confirmed by Saad Abdullah Sowayan’s study of \textit{nabati} poetry, which cites the existence of written \textit{diwans} of \textit{nabati} poetry from similar periods.\footnote{Saad Abdullah Sowayan, \textit{Nabati Poetry: the Oral Poetry of Arabia} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 102.} This suggests that, rather than being composed orally and transmitted by the same means, Sheikh Nimr’s poems may, to some extent at least, have been learned and passed on through written texts; certainly, the Swiss Orientalist Albert Socin (1844-99) reported that he had seen a written manuscript of Sheikh Nimr’s work in the Hawran region, and met at least one reciter of \textit{nabati} poetry who used such a text to supplement his mental recall.\footnote{Ibid.}

The figure of Sheikh Nimr is encapsulated in the title of a recent biography,
The Prince, Poet and (Bedouin/Arab) Knight.\textsuperscript{21} He is best known in Jordan as a warrior-poet who adored his bride Wadha, a love-match made after he rescued her from rapacious bandits and made her his eighth wife; many of his love-poems are about her or addressed directly to her. This is very much the image of popular portrayals, such as an eponymous Ramadan TV series in 2007 and an illustrated biography, published in Syria and probably aimed at younger readers, entitled The Works of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan and the Story of His Life.\textsuperscript{22}

The intertwining of Sheikh Nimr as a historical figure and the contents of his poems are highlighted by the latter example, in which his poems are incorporated into the biographical text as verbatim statements, answers to questions and challenges, and conversations, giving the sense of a character whose poetry is his primary means of expression and interaction.\textsuperscript{23} This image is very much one which accords with auto-expressions of Jordanian/Bedouin identity and values (and their complex and problematic use, in an often romanticised and ahistorical fashion, by the Jordanian state\textsuperscript{24}), which focus on virtues such as bravery, generosity and poetic talent.\textsuperscript{25} It also reflects the dearth of written information on figures such as Sheikh Nimr, whose character must be reconstructed from a combination of oral histories, his own poetry, and brief mentions by European travellers in the region such as Wallin (see above) and the Austrian explorer Ulrich Seetzen, who visited Nimr’s camp in 1806, hoping to take down some of his poems. The sheikh was not at home, but his followers pointed out that his relative “Abbas el Szalehh” (‘Abbas al-Salih) was also a renowned poet.\textsuperscript{26}

Scholarly literature on Nimr Ibn ’Adwan starts with nineteenth-century European Orientalists such as those mentioned above, a range which might be seen as including Spoer and Haddad’s collection. This literature often treats Sheikh Nimr
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and his verse as an ethnographic curiosity rather than as literature in its own right, although Spoer and Haddad occupy a mid-point between these two approaches. In more recent academic work, Sheikh Nimr tends to appear in relation to *nabati*, or oral, often Bedouin, poetry; in this context his poems are compared with those of other writers and composers of similar social and ethnic background and as an artistic or literary form. Examples include Sowayan’s examination of *nabati* poetry, cited above, and the work of Finnish Arabist Heikki Palva, who includes Ibn ʽAdwan’s verse in his intensive ethnolinguistic studies of *nabati* productions. The latter overlap with anthropologists in terms of the methodology of collecting oral poetry, but also note the literary qualities and stylistic sophistication of their subjects.27 Sheikh Nimr’s personality is also a theme throughout Andrew Shryock’s ethnography of memory and history amongst the present-day ʽAdwan, their expressions of identity and community, and their relations with the Jordanian regime.28

What is common to all of these recent examples, however, is that they conceive of Nimr Ibn ʽAdwan almost entirely within the logic of twenty-first century political borders; he is associated with Jordan and, to some extent, with the countries of the Arabian peninsula, in which *nabati* poetry is most commonly found. As Shryock describes, he is also integrated into the histories of the contemporary ʽAdwan and their narratives about relations with other social groups in Jordan,29 and into articulations of Jordanian national identity which seek to forge a unified nationality out of local Bedouin histories combined (despite past rebellions) with the Arabian antecedents of the Hashemite monarchy, and to “export” such images “to the rest of the Arab world”.30 Sowayan, meanwhile, regards Sheikh Nimr’s poems – or at least the versions of them recited to Spoer, Haddad and Palva – as “garbled” distortions from the Western margins of the true *nabati* poetry of the Arabian Peninsula, and as an illustration of the damage done when the latter “migrate outside the Peninsula and

29 Ibid.
are recited by nonnative informants” [by which he appears to mean Jordanians].

Although proving a negative is often difficult, a brief survey of Palestinian scholarly literature on this period turns up no substantive discussions of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan or his work.

5.1.2 Fruitful collaboration: the relationship between Henry Spoer and Elias Haddad

Hans Henry Spoer was, as we saw in chapter 3, Elias Haddad’s collaborator on The Manual of Palestinean Arabic. In my analysis of the latter publication, I commented on the differing attitudes shown by Spoer, W.F. Albright and Max Löhr to “indigenous” knowledge and scholars. Haddad and Spoer’s co-operation on their series of articles on the poetry of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan is another window on the relationship between the two scholars, one German-American and other Lebanese-Arab-Jerusalemite. The longstanding relationship and apparent sense of mutual worth and respect between the two men offers, as we have seen in their collaboration on the Manual, an example of more equitable, if not equal, relations between intellectual collaborators even under conditions permeated by imperialism and its values. The example I am about to lay out thus also provides an additional contrast to that of the relationship between Elias Haddad and W.F. Albright, as discussed in relation to their work on Arabic language textbooks in chapter three. As such, it raises issues both of agency for ‘native’ partners in intellectual production, and of the role of differing types of colonial influence in such interactions.

A German Protestant, Henry Spoer studied in the USA, at New York and Rutgers Universities, earning a Bachelor of Divinity in 1898 and a PhD (on “The Tetragrammaton and its Interpretation”, apparently under the name Johan Spoer) in 1899. He was ordained as an Anglican priest by the Bishop of Lichfield in England in 1911 but, like a number of Protestant divines and missionaries of the era, Spoer
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31 Sowayan, Nabaṭi Poetry, 8-9.
32 New York Graduate School bulletin, May 1, 1914, 72.
also had academic Orientalist interests. After gaining his PhD, he went to Jerusalem as a student at the American School for Oriental Study and Research in Palestine, and remained there for much of the period up to WWI. During one spell in Jerusalem, he married Ada Goodrich Freer, a disgraced psychic and appropriator of other people’s ethnographic work until she was unmasked in the British press and fled the country. Ada’s marriage and name changes allowed her to develop a new career, writing on the folklore and society of Bilad al-Sham. The only scholar who seems to have been sceptical of this output was Moses Gaster, a Romanian-British Semiticist with a particular interest in the Samaritans, and a president of the Folklore Society, who called her work “unreliable” and a “downright absurdity”. How much her books and articles relied on her former underhand methods (perhaps even on information collected by Elias Haddad and his wife) is a subject for future research.

Spoer served as an assistant chaplain in Cairo in 1912-3, returning to Jerusalem for much of WWI, before heading to Baku in Azerbaijan. There he...
narrowly escaped execution by Bolshevik forces,\textsuperscript{41} but stayed on in the city as High Commissioner for Relief.\textsuperscript{42} The Spoers seem then to have returned briefly to Palestine; in 1921 Henry donated a “number of brochures dealing with the prehistoric archaeology of Europe” to the library of the ASOR\textsuperscript{43} – apparently part of a clear-out in preparation for the couple’s return to the USA, after which he occupied various posts with the Episcopalian Church.\textsuperscript{44} Spoer continued to write and publish both scholarly and ecclesiastical articles on Middle Eastern history, languages and Eastern Christianity, including those in collaboration with Elias Haddad, until his death in 1951.

Henry Spoer seems to have initiated the project to collate and translate work by Nimr Ibn ’Adwan during a trip in 1904, when he collected several dozen poems. Haddad became involved after Spoer’s return, as noted in the first of the articles (dated 1912 and credited only to Spoer), in which Spoer writes that he is “greatly indebted to my friend Mr. Elias Haddad for help in the difficult work of translation”.\textsuperscript{45} The second article (1923) is also credited only to Hans Henry Spoer, but as well as acknowledging Haddad’s help in translating the poems, Spoer notes that his “further journeys” into “the country of the ’Adwan” and “adjointing districts” were “undertaken together with my friend Mr. E.N. Haddad”.\textsuperscript{46} The following four articles (1929, 1933/4, 1945 and 1946), which bring the total to six, all include a full co-credit of Elias Nasrallah Haddad alongside Spoer. They date the journeys made with “my collaborator Mr. E.N. Haddad” to 1908 and the spring of 1909 – that is, up to the point at which Spoer left Palestine for his seminary training in England.\textsuperscript{47} Spoer continued to name Elias Haddad as a co-author in the 1945 and 1946 articles

\textsuperscript{41} “REV. DR. H. SPOER, MINISTER 40 YEARS; Retired Member of St. Paul's Chapel Staff Dies--Faced Bolshevik Firing Squad”, \textit{New York Times}, 4\textsuperscript{th} October 1951.
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{The Spectator}, 4\textsuperscript{th} December 1920, p22. Accessed at http://archive.spectator.co.uk/page/4th-december-1920/22 25\textsuperscript{th} April 2015.
\textsuperscript{44} Campbell and Hall, \textit{Strange Things}, 219.
\textsuperscript{45} Hans H. Spoer, “Four Poems by Nimr Ibn ’Adwān, as sung by ‘Ōde Abu Sīmān”. \textit{Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft} 66 (1912), 189.
despite the fact that the two men had not been in touch for some time and Haddad had not been able to take an active role in their project, as Spoer sets out. Spoer was in his seventies by now, his wife had been dead for nearly fifteen years and he had not visited the Middle East for decades. As such, the passage has an elegiac tone that suggests that he felt a compelling personal need to complete the work which he and Elias Haddad had started forty years earlier:

Due to the disturbed conditions prevailing all over the world [i.e. World War Two], for several years already, communication with Mr. Haddad has been impossible. I must therefore assume the entire responsibility for the editing of the texts as well as for all the notes and comments. It is a pleasure to me to state here that the collecting of these poems and their translation, except for a few minor changes which I have made since, are our joint-work, the result of several happy years of working together and of occasional travels to places East of the Jordan and elsewhere in search of Nimr-lore and poems as well as Palestinian folk-lore. -H.H.S.48

5.1.3 Haddad, Spoer, and Nimr Ibn ʽAdwān

The bulk of the six articles authored by Henry Spoer and Elias Haddad comprise selected poems by Ibn ʽAdwan, taken from Spoer and Haddad’s collection, which appears to have finally consisted of over one hundred examples and which represents a considerable achievement in recording a major body of Arabic literature. In several of the articles there are Arabic transcriptions of the poems, in others only Latin-alphabet transliterations of the Arabic, accompanied by translations into English, commentaries on their context and content, and paratextual materials which include linguistic and historical notes and comparisons between ʽAdwan’s work and other Arabic literature. My contention is that the poetry of Nimr Ibn ʽAdwan, as translated and presented by Haddad and Spoer, presents a cross-border image of life in the Jordan Valley in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century which to some extent reflects the reality of that existence, but which more importantly, makes a statement

about how the translators chose to view Palestine and its society, in a political
context in which the resulting vision was highly contested.

The linguistic and ethnographic bent in conventional studies of Sheikh Nimr
and his poetry, and the resulting concentration on Jordanian-Arabian Peninsula links,
passes over an important aspect of the poetry’s content. This is its emphasis on
interaction between Bedouin and the settled, urban inhabitants of the region, and the
prominence, in its geographic breadth, of the fact that Nimr Ibn ‘Adwan’s world did
not stop at the Jordan River, but also encompassed large areas of non-nomadic
Palestine. This next section discusses the ways in which Spoer and Haddad’s work
highlights these aspects of Sheikh Nimr’s poetry, and the implications this has in
terms of how it presents a particular vision of Palestine, blurring its borders in
accordance with Ottoman outlines and, in continuing this after the imposition of the
Mandate, asserting both Palestinian Arab identity and Arab rights to land coveted by
the Zionist movement.

Spoer and Haddad’s analyses of the poems and their annotations and other
paratextual materials include repeated references to the authors’ own Manual of
Palestinian Arabic, as well as citing work by major names in the field such as Alois
Musil. They also repeatedly refer to the language used in ‘Adwan’s poems as
‘Palestinian Arabic’, suggesting a view of this Bedouin warrior-poet and his literary
production as part of a distinct Palestinian culture which pays little heed to the
Jordan River as a boundary. This impression is reinforced by ‘Adwan’s history, by
the reciters of the poems to Spoer and Haddad, and by the poems themselves. These
elements refer to a social and geographical sphere which extends to Damascus and
the Druze regions of modern southern Syria, but which is concentrated upon an area
with the Ghor (Jordan Valley) at its heart, the ‘Adwan heartlands of the Balqa to its
east, but also West to Nablus, Beisan, Jerusalem and even Hebron and Jaffa.

Examples of this dynamic occur in the list of reciters from whom Spoer and
Haddad received their versions of Nimr Ibn ‘Adwan’s work, many of whom came
from Salt but who also include an informant from El-Qubebe near Jerusalem.49

49 H. Henry Spoer and Elias Nasrallah Haddad, “Poems by Nimr Ibn ’Adwān, XXI to XLIV: Part II”.
exchange of poems between Nimr Ibn ‘Adwan and “Yusuf Abū Nṣēr of the Nṣērāt Arabs, who are living in the Western Ṛōr” on the subject of their intense grief at the death of their beloved wives also crosses this later border.\(^{50}\) Other interactions were both friendly and hostile, with the marriage of one of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan’s daughters to a sheikh from the feared Abu Ghosh family (who dominated the Jerusalem-Jaffa road from the village of Qiryat el-’Anab\(^{51}\)) contrasting with the exchange of insults between ’Adwan and “Mūsa Bēk Towqān”, mutasallim of Nablus, after Tuqan jeered at ’Adwan for writing romantic poetry towards his wife.\(^{52}\) These scattered mentions, taken as feature of the whole, combine with the factual elements of Sheikh Nimr’s life to suggest that his modern-day status as a symbol of an exclusively East-of-the-Jordan society and culture is anachronistic, and denies the interplay between the East and West banks which characterised his life and that of his tribe.

The absence of a sense of separation between the East and West banks of the Jordan might have been of little consequence when the first articles of the series were published, prior to WWI and at a time when the (albeit shifting) Ottoman borders usually crossed, rather than running along, the Jordan Valley. But in continuing to emphasise this geography as Palestinian after the imposition of the Mandate boundaries, Haddad’s and Spoer’s portrait defies two other imaginaries: firstly, that of the Palestine Mandate itself, which established an Eastern border on the Jordan. But secondly, it also challenges Zionist aspirations, outlined at the 1919 Peace Conference, to a state which did not stop at the Jordan River, but extended across it to the edges of the fertile regions of what was later designated as Transjordan.\(^{53}\) Article 25 of the Mandate allowed the British to exclude its duty to facilitate a Jewish national home in Palestine from the lands East of the Jordan; during the Mandate period some saw this as effectively granting “the Arabs” (without differentiation between Britain’s Hashemite allies and the Arab peoples of Palestine) an Eastern


\(^{52}\) Spoer and Haddad, “Poems by Nimr Ibn ’Adwān” (1946), 172, 180.

territory, with Jews given privileged status in that West of the River.\textsuperscript{54} Haddad and Spoer’s portrayal thus rejects both Zionist aspirations and British realpolitik.

In addition to its geographical vision, Haddad and Spoer’s project, with its mass of collected poems and translations, represented a long-running reconstruction of a life story and a literary corpus in which historic urban Palestine is bound together with the culturally and ideologically laden image of the Bedouin warrior-poet, a figure which resonates throughout Arabic culture from the \textit{jahiliyya} onwards. In doing so, Spoer and Haddad create a narrative which transcends the conventional dichotomy between a (culturally and agriculturally) cultivated Palestine, a place of cities, rules and written texts, and the “wild men” of the other side of the Ghor, the untamed Bedouin warrior-lover-tribesman of both Orientalist fantasy and Arabic literature.\textsuperscript{55} These two worlds are, they show, closely interlinked, and they demonstrate this by using the figure of a man who might normally be assumed to represent the most extreme version of the latter image. It seems certain that the project, begun within Ottoman borders, did not start out with a political intent in constructing this image of Palestinian culture and society. But after the establishment of the Mandate, this portrait took on strong political overtones which cannot be ignored given their implications for contemporary debates about Palestinian Arab territorial rights, cultural identities, and relationship to processes of modernity.

According to Shryock’s ethnography of the modern-day Balqa Bedouin, their image of the peasant and urban societies of Palestine is very much the Other against which much of their identity is defined.\textsuperscript{56} However, Ibn ʽAdwan’s poetry disrupts this picture, with its interchanges with notables west of the Jordan. The history of the Balqa tribes includes regular interactions – raids of, incursions from, or marriages with – the peoples of Nablus, Tiberias and other areas in the present-day West Bank and Israel.\textsuperscript{57} This image chimes with historical evidence of local feeling from the

\textsuperscript{54} S.D. Myres, “Constitutional Aspects of the Mandate for Palestine”. \textit{Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science} 164 (1932), 10-11.
\textsuperscript{55} See Shryock’s ethnography of the ʽAdwān, the poet Nimr’s own people, and the complex relationships between ideas of sheikhdom, war, poetry and agriculture which still pertained in the late twentieth century. Shryock, \textit{Nationalism and the Genealogical Imagination,} 82-3, 155-6
\textsuperscript{56} Shryock, \textit{Nationalism and the Genealogical Imagination,} 39.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 66-83; Spoer and Haddad, “Poems by Nimr Ibn ʽAdwān, XXI to XLIV: Part II”, 172. 183
nineteenth century, including the “violent protests” which took place in Nablus in the 1880s when the Balqa was subdivided between two Ottoman sub-provinces. These Nablus residents viewed the Balqa as geographically and culturally connected to their own lives, and believed that they should remain administratively united.

Haddad and Spoer’s choice of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan for their study thus presents a specific image of Palestine which stems from the borderless, Ottoman environment in which the two men started working together and in which the poetry was originally written. Like their Manual of Palestinian Arabic, however, Ibn ’Adwan’s poems – or, more precisely, those chosen by Spoer and Haddad and by later scholars – also offer a particular image of social values and mores. As Shryock observes, only Sheikh Nimr’s “debonair” love poetry was translated and printed in English by Haddad and Spoer (and later by Musil, in 1928) and in Arabic by al-‘Uzayzi in 1991. His “battle day” poetry has not, for instance, been reproduced, even though it is much more common in ’Adwani oral tradition and perhaps more ‘authentic’ in the categorisations of folklorists. Part of a poetic style dating back to the jahiliyya, “battle day poems” celebrate bravery, honour and loyalty – but also rebelliousness and independence. Shryock notes that his Jordanian interlocutor finds that “[t]he political messages it sends are delivered in a voice that is no longer fit to print”.

I broadly concur with Shryock’s conclusions here. The poems in Spoer and Haddad’s articles of 1912, 1929, 1933-34 and 1945 all consist of lamentations, most of them explicitly for the death of Wadha, with some addressed more generally. The 1923 article is more varied, featuring five poems, of which one is on Nimr’s loneliness during his exile with the Bani Sakhr, one a challenge to a Bani Sakhr.
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warrior who threatened him, the third a plea to his children to follow good examples in life, one on the theft of Nimr’s mare, and a final piece conversing with the poet’s gun about their plans to kill a leopard.62 The final article is also slightly varied, although the bulk of the contents (eight poems) are lamentations on Wadha or the pain of love in general. One confronts Musa Bey Tuqan of Nablus for his mockery of Sheikh Nimr, and finally come several poems lamenting the advent of old age and weakness.63

Where Shryock notes that, in present-day Jordan, political discourses cannot accommodate Sheikh Nimr’s battle poetry, Spoer and Haddad make the same choice but for different reasons, shaping their image of Ibn ‘Adwan’s diwan to present him as a wounded lover, philosophical thinker on youth and age, and correspondent with other literati in the region. In their choice of which poems to preserve and display to wider readerships, Haddad and Spoer betray a desire to foreground a ‘civilised’, cultured image of the Balqa Bedouin and their famous poet, sidelining those works which prop up the aggressive, warlike stereotypes already permeating Western images of the Arab. As we have seen in The Manual of Palestinean Arabic (which Spoer and Haddad were writing at the same time as they started to collaborate on Ibn ‘Adwan), they were concerned to convey a modern, liberal image of Palestinian Arab society, one in which poems about romantic love and contemplations of mortality were more appropriate for public consumption than songs intended to stir up warriors for the fight.

5.1.4 Conclusion

The example of Elias Haddad and Hans Henry Spoer’s work on the love poems of Nimr Ibn ‘Adwan, therefore, draws together two of the main themes of this study: the (geographical and social) image of Palestine envisioned and projected by those writing about her in the Late Ottoman and Mandate eras, and the varying relationships which existed between ‘native’ and ‘foreign’ scholars engaged in such study. In this case, Haddad and Spoer elected to present poems which on the one
hand gave a broad, cross-border, fluid sense of ‘Palestine’ in the social and linguistic sense, tying together through Sheikh Nimr and his poetry the figure of the ‘noble Bedouin’ with lands to the West as well as the East of the River Jordan, and identifying his poetry as written in the specifically Palestinian Arabic they had identified in their 1909 language manual. In selecting his love poems alone for publication, though, rather than opening up their corpus to his battle-day songs, they also carry across from the Manual their effort to imagine and display Ottoman Palestine as civilised and modern, rather than violent and savage.

In the second of this study’s themes, the history of this collaboration between Haddad and Spoer, extending over almost forty years and expressed in graceful, respectful terms, highlights the possibility of relations between Arab and European which, in an Ottoman-period friendship with a German-American scholar, represents the difference between many of the encounters we witness between Palestinian intellectuals and their European counterparts in the Mandate era. It contrasts sharply with two related examples: that of Ada Goodrich Spoer’s theft of information from her Hebridean informants (and the question of whether she repeated this act in Palestine), and Elias Haddad’s relationship with W.F. Albright and the latter’s dismissive attitude towards his former collaborator.

5.2 Stephan Hanna Stephan and Evliya Çelebi’s Book of Travels

Spoer and Haddad’s studies of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan’s poetry suggest a fluid imagining of Palestine, combining the work of translators from Jerusalem with a Bedouin poet-chief whose conception of his own social, political and romantic reach extends from the Eastern Ghor to west of Jerusalem, signalling that the border along the Jordan river was of limited political and even less cultural relevance. Geographical borders (across the Jordan River) and social ones (Bedouin/urban) are, in this conception, blurred, a source of both tension and energy. As well as presenting a broad territorial vision of Palestine and its cultural networks, the choice of Ibn ’Adwan’s works also lifts the image of indigenous culture above the level of folk songs to something approaching high culture, discarding the poet’s warlike works to concentrate on love
songs and literary exchanges with the urban nobility in a way which foregrounds Levantine claims to ‘civilised’ values (in the eyes of early twentieth century Europeans). Palestinian oral literature is not just the preserve of ethnographers, this model insists; it also has claims to literary worth and an appeal which calls to modern tastes as well as its original Bedouin listeners.

The second body of work explored in this chapter is Stephan Hanna Stephan’s translation from Ottoman Turkish of the Palestine section of Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyahatnâme*, or Book of Travels. This seventeenth-century account of a journey through Ottoman Palestine has been widely referenced by scholars describing the region since Stephan’s translation appeared, opening Evliya’s observations up to an audience beyond those who could read the Ottoman original. But, as with Haddad and Spoer’s work on Nimr Ibn ’Adwan, Evliya’s chronicle, and Stephan’s translation of it as an independent text in its own right, deliver a particular image of Palestine, its borders, its characteristics, and its peoples. The contrasts between this text and Ibn ’Adwan’s poetry, however, may go some way to explaining why Stephan’s translation of Evliya has been incorporated into accounts of historic Palestine, while Haddad’s work on the Bedouin poet has largely disappeared from Palestinian consciousness. The story of Stephan’s versions of the *Seyahatnâme* also, like that of the Nimr Ibn ’Adwan project, highlights the issue of intellectual relationships in Palestine under the Ottoman and Mandate regimes, and the shifting power relations and possibilities which these suggest.

Enacted and published much later, with European Mandates imposed on the Middle East and the dismembering of the region on Sykes-Picot Agreement lines, I argue that Stephan Stephan’s translation of Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyahatnâme* offers a much tighter definition, both of Palestine’s borders and of literary culture. Stephan’s series of articles, as we shall see, present a Palestine which accords closely with the borders within which Stephan himself was writing, those set by the Mandatory treaties that followed World War One and resulted from Anglo-French political machinations. Also offering a contrast with Spoer and Haddad’s prolific and personally warm co-operation, Stephan’s collaboration with the recently-immigrated Jewish scholar Leo Mayer embodies a different set of possibilities, and their failure,
despite the diverse image of Palestinian society which Evliya’s account puts forward.

Evliya Çelebi (the pen-name of Mehmed Zilli, 1611-c.1682) was a Turkish court employee and writer whose ten-volume account of his travels, the Seyahatnâme (Book of Travels), is an epic extending from the Netherlands to Persia and spanning four decades. His writings have been compared in breadth and historical significance with those of Nasir-i Khusraw, Ibn Jubayr, and Ibn Battuta, and he has been described as “generally acknowledged as one of the greatest of Muslim travelers”.

Stephan Stephan published his English translation of the Palestine section of Evliya’s Seyahatnâme in six instalments in The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities, the journal of the British Mandate authorities to which Stephan also contributed translations of and commentaries on various Ottoman Turkish documents and inscriptions from Jerusalem. The area covered by the excerpt corresponds to the northern half of that ruled by the Mandate administration, but does not extend into southern regions such as the Naqab desert or Gaza City. The translation was based on the original Topkapi Saray (autograph) manuscript of the Seyahatnâme. The six sections of the translation were published in sections from 1935 to 1942, and were accompanied by notes and commentaries on subjects such as place names, elaborations of stories Evliya mentions, connections to Arabic, Jewish, Turkish and other literature and traditions, and historical background. It is notable, however, that these annotations were only written by Stephan himself for parts five and six of the series; for sections one to four they were contributed by Leo Aryeh Mayer, of whom more later.

The image of seventeenth-century Palestine which can be built up from Evliya Çelebi’s account is one of a busy, populous territory, the inhabitants of which include Druze, Jews, Kurds, Christians and Muslims, and where the towns and cities are home to bathhouses, schools, mosques, synagogues, churches, caravanserais and markets, many with impressive or beautiful architecture and decorations.
entry from Evliya’s *Seyahatnâme*, describing the village of Hittin in the Galilee, notes that it:

is a flourishing little town, abounding with vineyards, orchards and gardens...
a large fair is held there once a week, when ten thousand men would gather from the neighbourhood to sell and buy... There is a mosque, a public bath, and a caravanserai in it. A shrine, called the Teykê Mughraby, inhabited by over one hundred dervishes, lies amidst verdant gardens, like that of Iram, where lemons, citrus medica, olive and fig trees and date palms grow.67

It is noteworthy that Evliya – as well as other Muslim travellers such as the 17/18th century Damascene scholar and mystic ‘Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulusi – presented an image of Palestine, and particularly Jerusalem, which acknowledged and gave status not just to Islam, but to the other Abrahamic faiths rooted there.68 In contrast to contemporary and later Christian visitors, Evliya and his co-religionists wrote about the Jews and Christians they met but generally they rarely “proclaim[ed] the need to convert them or to cleanse the land of ‘infidels’”.69 They were at times scathing about their beliefs, but Evliya focused especially on people he thought of as dissidents from Islam, such as the Druze, who he calls “heretic”, “loathsome” and “cursed,” and of whom he claims they would “kill a Muslim for a piece of bread”.70 By contrast, the presence of Christians is greeted in various ways. Sometimes they are not worthy of significant comment – as at Sebastia, near Nablus, of which Evliya merely says that it is “a prosperous townlet on a slope. It has at present Moslem and Christian inhabitants”.71 At other times they are criticised as “infidels”, but only for an act deemed particularly vile, such as the theft of the body of Yahya (John the Baptist) by Maltese pilgrims.72 At other times they are the recipients of respect, as in a description of the conquest of Jerusalem by Sultan Selim from the Mamluks and his confirmation of the clergy’s exemptions from tax derived from the Covenant of
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ʻUmar (the historically contested guarantee of protection to the ‘peoples of the book’ made by the Caliph ʻUmar ibn al-Khattab on the conquest of Jerusalem).  

Evliya was “impressed” by the women of Jerusalem, “in particular by their upbringing and education”; Dror Ze’evi contrasts this with the account of another traveller – a French Franciscan named Eugène Roger who was physician to the Lebanese Druze emir Fakhr al-Din in 1632-33 – who also visited Jerusalem in the seventeenth century and insisted that women of ‘the Orient’ were mere chattels, without status or freedom. The value of Evliya’s observations for comparative perspectives on early modern Palestine is thus highlighted. It also overlaps (albeit inadvertently) with the idea, common in Middle Eastern nationalist writings from the Egyptian Qasim Amin’s late-nineteenth-century works onwards, that the status of women was a measure of a society’s ‘progress’ and ‘modernness’, and thus provides us with another angle on Stephan’s motivations for selecting Evliya’s text. That Stephan shared this view is apparent from one of his first pieces of published writing, the essay entitled “Woman” which appeared in Sarkis in 1922, discussed in chapter 2. Evliya’s description thus concretises the images of Palestinian society which Stephan wished to highlight.

However, the significance of Evliya’s writings on Palestine goes beyond adding colour to historical outlines. The repeated use of the term Palestine to describe the territory through which he journeyed – both in reference to the classical Islamic and pre-Islamic eras and to his own period – has “the ring of something Evliya had heard from people in the area,” and suggests that the inhabitants of the land had a concept of it as a specific unit called ‘Palestine’, regardless of the official Ottoman nomenclature. Evliya also reproduces an Ayyubid inscription from Jerusalem, “dated 619/1213-14, which situates the building in arz Filastin, thereby
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avoiding the formal *jund* and opting for the more popular ‘land’.”\textsuperscript{79} This impression is replicated in Stephan’s translation, which uses phrases such as “the land of Palestine”\textsuperscript{80} and repeats assertion from Evliya such as “All chronicles call this country the Land of Palestine”.\textsuperscript{81} Comparing Stephan’s text of Evliya with Spoer and Haddad’s work on Nimr Ibn ‘Adwan, however, it is notable that Evliya’s account focuses very much on urban life. In his day, the spaces between towns were largely to be feared as the home of bandits and malarial illness, and to a Turkish urbanite such as Evliya the figure of a Bedouin such as Ibn ‘Adwan held little romance, however good his poetry. Evliya Çelebi’s Palestine – like Stephan’s – was urban in character, and that also meant modern.

As a religious Muslim, Evliya’s narrative pays particular attention to the city of Jerusalem and its links to the three Abrahamic religions – but, especially, to Islam. Evliya established his own personal and religious links to the city by recounting the story of his grandfather’s brother, Salimi, who travelled to Jerusalem and spent his life in service at the Haram al-Sharif. Evliya recounts tracking down his great-uncle’s grave and recording the inscription on it, giving Jerusalem a personal as well as historic status within his own devout faith.\textsuperscript{82} As a loyal Ottoman official, Evliya highlights what he perceives as the recognition by the Turkish sultans of Jerusalem’s special status, designating it a *hass-i hümayun* (imperial domain), along with Mecca and Medina the only city too holy for the Ottomans to make their own stylistic additions – such as minarets – to the religious architecture.\textsuperscript{83} At the same time, Evliya traces Jerusalem’s splendour and status back to its Israelite past, mentioning King David and emphasising that, whilst the city’s initial eminence came from King Solomon, its renewed glory has been conferred by the ‘second Solomon’, the Ottoman Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent.\textsuperscript{84} Alongside these, Evliya wonders at the beauty of Christian icons and other paintings and notes the importance of the special
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place granted to the city’s Christian clergy since the Caliph ‘Umar’s conquest.\(^{85}\)

Attitudes towards the reliability of Evliya’s information vary.\(^{86}\) My point, however, is not to discuss whether his information can be relied upon, but to demonstrate that, across a wide range of historical studies, many scholars do deem his accounts to provide solid and reliable evidence. On his accounts of the kingdoms of Kurdistan, for instance, van Bruinessen describes the *Seyahatnâme* as a mixture of usefully detailed observations in Western Iraq, and reporting on land further to the East in which “his descriptions are so vague and confused that one wonders whether he actually visited the places,” with sections on Iran which plagiarise older works.\(^{87}\)

For historians of the seventeenth-century Ottoman empire, Evliya’s work remains a default reference (Gisela Procházka-Eisl observes that “No subsequent historian seriously dealing with guild or labour history in Ottoman Turkey has disregarded Evliya’s account [since its rediscovery in the 1830s]”\(^{88}\)), whilst using its contents with caution. For Amy Singer’s research into Ottoman ‘*imarets*, or public kitchens, the *Seyahatnâme* provided the foundational list of these institutions across the empire, with other, less reliable and/or wide-ranging accounts adding details.\(^{89}\) Even when Evliya is writing things which seem far-fetched or bizarre, it has been argued that – at least for his European journeys – these are designated as such in the text, either under actual headings which declare them to be “strange and wondrous” or via a narrative style which highlights the storytelling function of a passage.\(^{90}\)

The veracity of most of Evliya’s account of Palestine does not, however, seem to be disputed, and in instances where the events are, to the modern reader, fantastic, Özay’s suggestion that this is ‘signposted’ by Evliya seems to hold true. One

\(^{85}\) Ibid, 120-21.
\(^{86}\) Suraiya Faroqhi, for instance, notes in her Foreword to Robert Dankoff’s monumental study of Evliya and his sources that the latter had a “tenacious and only partly deserved reputation for unreliability”, whilst insisting on his importance as a source for social, linguistic and architectural history (Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality: the World of Evliya Çelebi* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), x, xv-xvi, xvii).
\(^{87}\) Martin van Bruinessen, “Kurdistan in the 16th and 17th centuries, as reflected in Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyahatnâme*”. *Journal of Kurdish Studies* 3 (2000), n.p.
\(^{90}\) Yeliz Özay, “Evliyâ Çelebi’s Strange and Wondrous Europe”. *Cahiers balkaniques* 41 (2013), 63-64.
example is Evliya’s version of the capture of the citadel of Akka by the Mamluks, in a story which attributes the victory to a Sheikh from Aleppo who threw his shoe in the air. When the shoe landed after its flight from Aleppo to Akka it destroyed the city’s walls and the Crusader forces were routed. Evliya follows this fanciful account by writing, in a manner which implies scepticism:

It behoves one not to deny the hidden things, for our holy books of faith state themselves that the miracles of the saints are true. The noble eye of the Sheikh Abdin, which ‘suffered martyrdom’, is still kept in an etui profusely adorned with jewels in the treasury of the richly illuminated mausoleum of el Melik ez Zahir at Damascus. However, I have not seen it myself.91

Stephan’s translation of Evliya’s writings on Palestine is one of the most important references for scholars who do not read Ottoman Turkish,92 and the use of Evliya’s evidence in arguments about the settlement of Palestine before Zionist immigration makes their truthfulness and trustworthiness very much a live issue.93 Evliya’s descriptions of buildings and urban environments, as rendered by Stephan, are widely cited by historians, particularly on the subject of Jerusalem, but his observations also feature in cultural and social histories of the peoples of seventeenth-century Palestine.94 Despite its importance, there is still no definitive

91 Tshelebi, Travels in Palestine, 40.
92 This assertion is based on the frequency with which Stephan's translations of Evliya appears in the citations of articles on aspects of regional history ranging from architecture to warfare or gender to popular religion. Most sources for this period in Palestinian history are of two types: official documents written in Ottoman Turkish, either from central or local government (as described by Beshara Doumani in Rediscovering Palestine, 2, 9-12); or travellers' accounts by occasional European visitors, who brought with them their own particular religious and (proto-)racial assumptions (as outlined in Hayden and Matar's Introduction to Through the Eyes of the Beholder: The Holy Land, 1517-1713, 3, 9-11).
93 References to Evliya's work appear repeatedly in arguments on Palestine solidarity websites such as Mondoweiss, see e.g. comment dated January 8, 2015, 5:52 pm on http://mondoweiss.net/2015/01/reporter-palestinians-concessions/ and comment dated July 1, 2017, 6:05 pm on http://mondoweiss.net/2017/06/palestinian-dehumanize-subjugate/ (both accessed 21st July 2017).
critical version of the *Seyahatnâme*, even in the original or in modern Turkish, and no comprehensive translated edition.\textsuperscript{95}

The existence of Stephan’s Mandate-era translation is, therefore, significant, as it allows scholars of this period of Palestinian history access to one of the few, and most important and detailed, accounts of the region from a non-Western perspective. As well as its many citations in English-language scholarship, Stephan’s translation is mentioned in ʽArif al-ʽArif’s monumental history of Jerusalem as an event in its own right.\textsuperscript{96} Robert Dankoff, one of the main scholars of Evliya’s work, cites Stephan’s suggested correction for the name of a city mentioned in the Palestine section of the *Travels*. In doing so, he implies that Stephan’s work deserves to be viewed as a work of research, rather than just a route from one language to another.\textsuperscript{97}

However, in some respects, Stephan’s presentation of Palestine in his translation diverges from the source text. Evliya’s *Seyahatnâme* was a wide-ranging chronicle of travels across time and place. The sections entitled “Travels in Palestine” by Stephan and Mayer were drawn from several different sections of the original text,\textsuperscript{98} thus creating the appearance of a coherent whole which was not presented as such by Evliya himself. Palestine in Evliya’s time was divided into a number of administrative units; the borders of Stephan’s Palestine were largely meaningless to Evliya at a time when cities such as Acre, Jaffa and Nablus had closer and more significant relations with (respectively) Beirut, Sidon or Salt than with one another.\textsuperscript{99} In selecting the specific sections included in his translations, Stephan
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\textsuperscript{95} Crane, “Pamphylian Plain”, 157. Indeed, for scholars of some of the regions covered by Evliya's travels – for instance Kurdistan – sections of the original remain completely unpublished, so that researchers can only work from the original manuscripts (Martin van Bruinessen, “Kurdistan in the 16th and 17th centuries, as reflected in Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyahatnâme*”. *Journal of Kurdish Studies* 3 (2000), 1-11).


\textsuperscript{98} Tshelebi, *Travels in Palestine*, 9.

\textsuperscript{99} See, for instance, Daniel Crecelius, “Damiette and Syrian-Egyptian Trade in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century”. In *Syria and Bilad al-Sham under Ottoman Rule: Essays in Honour of*
effectively creates a new text which accords with the Palestine of his own day. In contrast to the open, unbounded image of Palestine conveyed in the logic of Haddad and Spoer’s work on Nimr Ibn ‘Adwan’s poetry, Stephan’s focus on the sections of Evliya’s travels which correspond to the Mandate borders of Palestine suggests an acceptance of this colonial logic and the outlines of the Palestinian nationalist project once its leaders had realised that pan-Syrian or pan-Arab aspirations would never be attained. Whilst in the early days of the Mandate many Palestinian intellectuals and nationalists saw the country’s future as lying within a Greater Syria or a Pan-Arab nation-state, by the 1930s most were focusing on a circumscribed territory which conformed to the borders of Stephan’s translation.100

5.2.1 Stephan Stephan’s choices as translator

There are two main themes which stand out when reading Stephan’s translation of the Seyahatnâme: a sense of continuity which runs through Jewish and Muslim beliefs, and the deep, organic relationship between Islam and the land of Palestine. Drawing on functionalist theories of translation such as skopos theory, which focus on the social environment and purpose of a translation and its translator, rather than on the original text, I see these themes as key to Stephan’s choice of document in the first place. Although Stephan performed some translations as part of his work at the Palestine Archaeological Museum, we also know that these were seen by his employers as outside his regular duties, as signified by extra payments he received.101 He therefore had at least some scope for agency in this aspect of his work, and it is significant that he chose to translate and publish a text which highlighted these themes, which were prominent in strands of Arab and Palestinian nationalist thought at the time.102 In combination with features which have already

---

101 Israeli State Archives B/28/34, letters dated 7th May 1934, approved 16th May 1934.
been noted, such as Evliya’s use of the term ‘Palestine’ and his depiction of a cultural and religious space which corresponded geographically with the borders of Mandate-era Palestine, Stephan thus presents us with a text which strongly asserts a socially and geographically coherent Islamicate Palestine.

Firstly, there is a strong sense of continuity between Jewish and Muslim beliefs and scriptures, with Christianity featuring in this relationship, but as a distant third. From the very beginning of his journey, in northern Palestine, we find Evliya describing the shrines and holy places he visits, many of which are linked to Jewish as well as Christian and Muslim figures and tales from the Old Testament. At the (Crusader-era) castle of Tibnin (in modern Lebanon), Evliya makes the impossible claim that the fortress was “built by the Children of Israel, who took refuge in it because Bukht an-Naṣr (Nebuchadnezzar)” was victorious”. At Safad, Evliya calls the city “the citadel of the country of the Jews,” important because it was the second town to have been built after the Flood of Genesis receded. The Sanctuary at Safad is seen in miraculous religious terms, hiding-place of Yaʿqub, “a mosque, yet it is not built.” Its mihrab is said to point to Mecca but via Jerusalem, which is geographically impossible as the two lie at quite different angles from Safad. The claim, though, conceptually binds the two holy sites through human worship but also through a ‘mosque’ which has shaped itself out of the living rock, implying a divine hand.

But whilst linking Judaism and Islam, Evliya simultaneously undermines the position of contemporary Jews, stating that Safad is the site of the original Temple and that “it is like the Kaʿba to them, even to this day”, thus disconnecting the Jewish people from claims to Jerusalem. Whilst Evliya does not dispute the longevity of the Jewish connection to Safad and its Sanctuary, he also takes care to call the Sufi rites performed in the cave-mosque “time-honoured”, emphasising that the Islamic heritage there is also strong.

103 Tshelebi, Travels in Palestine, 14.
104 Ibid, 18, 24.
105 Ibid, 25. Petersen notes that the Mamluks under Baybars built several zawiyas, or Sufi places of prayer, in Safad, and a mosque and tomb-shrines in the cave named after “Banat Yaqub” or “Jacob’s Daughters”. This places significant Sufi ritual in Safad as early as the fourteenth century, i.e. 300 years before Evliya (Andrew Petersen, The Towns of Palestine Under Muslim Rule, 600-1600 (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 2005), 73).
Alongside this conditional recognition of the Jewish and Christian histories of Palestine, Evliya also seems concerned to establish not just the historicity of Islamic rule over the region, but the strength of Islamic religious connections to Palestine, not just to the city of Jerusalem. This focus on Islam as a central, but not exclusive, aspect of identity would have fit well into mainstream Arab nationalist narratives of Stephan’s time, and particularly into many manifestations of Palestinian nationalism under the Mandate. Islam, in Evliya’s account, is not just a faith which has come to the Holy Land with the first Caliphs, but one which is rooted in the land via people and miracles dating back to the very earliest days of Islam, and even before. In Safad, for instance, Evliya claims that a cave holds the tomb of an unnamed wife of the Prophet. In the northern Galilee, he describes a site which was said to have been visited by ‘Ali, companion of the Prophet and future Caliph, when he was just a boy and then again as an adult. On both occasions Ali was said to have performed miracles and his horse Duldul to have left hoofmarks on the rock. In this story, Islam is thus firmly rooted into the land, leaving visible marks on the rocks themselves and claiming longevity for the link; a similar effect is created by the claim that there are sites in the Marj ibn Amir at which a number of Companions of the Prophet were buried. As with some of Evliya’s claims cited earlier in this chapter, the literal truth of these claims is not the point; more significant to my argument is the narrative put forward, one of deep-rooted, physical links between Islam and the land of Palestine.

An even closer link between Islam and water is created in Evliya’s descriptions of springs which respond to the names of Muslim holy man and of Allah:

Any one who wants to drink from this spring would go to the source and implore, ‘O Sheikh Mas‘ūd, I am thirsty’ (yā sheikh Mas‘ūd, ʿaṭshāni(!)). By the order of Allah the spring would immediately overflow and the man would drink.

107 Tshelebi, Travels in Palestine, 27.
108 Ibid, 11-12, 34.
Again, Islam is connected to Judaism by the association of Islamic figures with Jewish prophets, principally Ya’qub (Jacob).\textsuperscript{110} Even a common Islamic tale\textsuperscript{111} – that of the monk Bahira, who, meeting the young Mohammed on a trading journey near Damascus, told him that he would become a prophet – is reworked to incorporate Palestine. In Evliya’s version, Bahira tells Mohammed to:

“go directly to the two springs called the ‘Two Blessings’ at Acre. Moses entered one of them and was safe from Pharaoh’s charm. He then rescued the Children of Israel from Egypt. Christ entered the other one and was saved from the hands of the Israelites, and then ascended into heaven. You, too, have to enter those springs and to wash yourself to become immune from the charm of the Bani Quraish”.\textsuperscript{112}

Evliya thus not only ties together the three faiths, giving Mohammed at least equal status with Moses and Christ, but also takes this story to Palestine, an addition not found in classic accounts of the life of the Prophet such as Tabari, Baladhuri and Ibn Ishaq.\textsuperscript{113}

\textbf{5.2.2 Leo Aryeh Mayer}

However, the story of the \textit{Seyahatnâme} translation would not be complete without considering the involvement of L.A. Mayer, and the light it sheds on the complexity of intellectual life in Mandate Jerusalem. Leo Aryeh Mayer (1895-1959), Stephan’s collaborator on four out of the six sections in which the \textit{Seyahatnâme} translation was published, was part of a community which existed in a state of increasing tension with Palestinian Arabs such as Stephan. Born in Eastern Galicia in January 1895 to a line of rabbis, and with parents who were early sympathisers with the Zionist cause,

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid, 12-13.
\textsuperscript{112} Tshelebi, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, 44.
\textsuperscript{113} Roggema, \textit{Legend of Sergius Bahira}, 38-40.
he had become fascinated by Islamic art whilst studying at the Oriental Institute of
the University of Vienna.\textsuperscript{114} He completed a doctorate in Islamic urban architecture
and became librarian at the Institute, whilst also studying at the city’s rabbinal
seminary. He helped to found the Hashomer Jewish youth movement which, at this
stage, under the influence of Martin Buber, was mostly concerned with the cultural
and spiritual revival of Jewish youth.\textsuperscript{115} It later became the main Zionist organisation
in Palestine to recognise Palestinian Arab national rights and advocate a bi-national
state.\textsuperscript{116} The latter may suggest why Stephan and Mayer’s collaboration had any
chance of happening in the first place.

But Mayer was also one of the Zionist migrants to Palestine feared by so many
Arab Palestinians: in 1920 he moved to Berlin to take up a position in the Oriental
Department of the Prussian State Library, but in 1921 he followed his beliefs and
moved to Palestine. Once in Jerusalem, Mayer – with degrees from prestigious
European universities – had all the career advantages that Stephan lacked. He rapidly
found a job as an Inspector in the Department of Antiquities, under director John
Garstang, immediately outranking Stephan, the minor bureaucrat. According to HZ
Hirschberg’s obituary of Mayer, he found the situation congenial:

He also found his place in the circles of English society, and became friendly
with the educated Arabs who opened their libraries to him... His work was
fully appreciated by the Government, which made it possible for him to travel
abroad and further his studies by visiting museums and libraries.\textsuperscript{117}

He was promoted to librarian and curator of documents in 1927.

Under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities Mayer excavated in
Jerusalem with Eleazar Lipa Sukenik, one of the foremost Jewish archaeologists of
the Mandate period,\textsuperscript{118} and conducted research on the Hittites with Garstang.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{114} HZ Hirschberg, “Professor Leon A. Mayer – In Memoriam”. In M. Avi-Yonah, HZ Hirschberg, B
Mazar and Y. Yadin (eds) Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies
volume Seven: L.A. Mayer Memorial Volume (Jerusalem: 1964, Israel Exploration Society), XI.
\textsuperscript{115} Elkana Margalit, “Social and intellectual origins of the Hashomer Hatzair Youth Movement”.
\textsuperscript{116} Joel Beinin, “Knowing Your Enemy, Knowing Your Ally: The Arabists of Hashomer Hatzair
(MAPAM)”. \textit{Social Text} 28 (1991), 102.
\textsuperscript{117} Hirschberg, \textit{In Memoriam}, XII.
Alongside this, he was involved from the start in discussions on the establishment of an Islamic and Oriental studies institute at the planned Hebrew University,\textsuperscript{120} started lecturing there as soon as it opened, and was officially employed as a lecturer in Islamic art and archaeology when the School of Oriental Studies opened in September 1925. Mayer’s brand of historical research is noteworthy in that, in a number of his later books, one of his main concerns seems to be to give names and life-stories to Arab artisans and craftsmen, sifting through items in museum collections in search of signatures, and reconstructing the links between objects whose common origins had hitherto been unknown. In an important presentation at the International Congress of Orientalists in Istanbul in 1951 he reported that he had identified hundreds of individual artists and craftsmen of Islamic arts, bringing to light the names of formerly anonymous creators of masterpieces in “stone, wood, metal and glass”.\textsuperscript{121} He later published separate volumes on Muslim architects, astrolabists, and woodcarvers, with those on metalworkers, armourers and stonecarvers issued posthumously.\textsuperscript{122}

Despite his fascination with the Islamic world and culture, and with individual Muslim artists rather than abstract notions of ‘art’, Mayer was also described by Hirschberg as a “proud and devoted Zionist”\textsuperscript{123} and by Rice as a “convinced and staunch Zionist.”\textsuperscript{124} Whilst the two facets of Mayer’s life are not inherently contradictory, they were unusual for the period: of work sponsored by the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society and Hebrew University during the Mandate period, only Mayer’s studies and Moshe Stekelis’ work on prehistoric Palestine were not on ‘Jewish’ subjects such as synagogues and Jewish burial sites.\textsuperscript{125}

As well as moving himself and his family to Palestine and working as a mainstay of its main intellectual institution, the Hebrew University, Mayer joined the

\textsuperscript{119} Hirschberg, \textit{In Memoriam}, XII.
\textsuperscript{120} Menahem Milson, “The Beginnings of Arabic and Islamic Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem”. \textit{Judaism} 45,2 (1996), 171-2.
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\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., XV.
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\textsuperscript{125} Moorey. \textit{A Century of Biblical Archaeology}, 50.
Jewish Palestine Exploration Society (later the Israel Exploration Society) in 1922 and served as its president from 1940 until his death in 1959. However, his social and intellectual circles included Palestinian Arabs as well as European colonial figures and fellow Jews. Hirschberg remarked that he “knew how to cooperate with other scholars and publish results jointly. Other scholars acknowledged his helpfulness and were therefore always willing to help him in return,” and his work with Stephan attests to this. Rice’s obituary also claims that whilst Mayer was “unwavering in his strong Zionist convictions”, he “had from the start supported all moves for an entente with the Arabs and counted many of them among his friends.” If Mayer was indeed a Zionist of the ‘cultural’ variety, these two statements are not contradictory. Early in his career Mayer also apparently took a brief diversion into Arabic language studies, working in the 1920s on a dictionary of Palestinian spoken Arabic (never published) with the philologist (and fellow Galician) Naftali Tur-Sinai. Might this have been a common point of interest with Stephan?

Information on Mayer’s political views or on his personal brand of Zionism is scarce: his obituaries are full of descriptors such as ‘retiring’ and ‘secretive’, emphasising that he “did not encourage familiarity” and that “only the barest details of biographical interest are known.” But some evidence suggests that his sympathies lay with a ‘cultural’ Zionism which saw Palestine, and particularly Jerusalem, as the centre of an artistic, linguistic and spiritual renaissance, in contrast to a ‘political’ Zionism which demanded an ethnically exclusive, settler-colonial state. Such a position would have placed him alongside other key figures from the early years of the Hebrew University, such as university president and leading advocate of a bi-national state Judah Magnes. One biographical essay notes that Mayer was close to members of Brit Shalom, which sought Arab-Jewish

126 Hirschberg, “In Memoriam”, XIV.
127 Rice, “In Memoriam”, 454. Increasing attention has in recent years been paid to Arabic-speaking cultural Zionists such as Nissim Maalul and Esther and Shimon Moyal (see work by Lital Levy, Moshe Behar, Jonathan Gribetz et al). However, and despite prominent examples such as Ahad Ha’am, these trends have been less thoroughly researched amongst Ashkenazi Jewish migrants to Palestine.
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rapprochement and co-existence, but that he was not active on a regular basis. Such ambiguities were not uncommon amongst the founding generation of the Hebrew University; many came from a European Orientalist tradition in which Jews were at the forefront of scholarship, and were seen as having a greater affinity – religious and linguistic – with Muslims and Islamic culture than was possible for Christians. However, there was a spectrum of political motives for this interest amongst Mandate-era Zionists. The Hebrew University taught Arabic as a living, changing modern language, not only a written script of classical text, which was a forward-thinking position for the time. But there were practical reasons for the policy, too. Some wanted to establish better relations with the Arab neighbours of a future Jewish state, whilst others saw knowledge of the societies, economies and cultures of the surrounding countries as a strategic necessity. Indeed, the kind of scholarship advocated by Mayer and Magnes – translations of medieval Arabic texts and literature – was a source of tension with those who urged a more pragmatic approach. After all, a 1918 article by the revisionist Zionist leader Vladimir Jabotinsky on the laying of the university’s foundation stone declared that the institution would be both a civilising force in Palestine and a beachhead for Zionist state-building; the British FCO’s Middle East advisor William Ormsby-Gore edited out the second of these sentiments, afraid that it would foment opposition. There may, therefore, be good evidence for Mayer’s genuine love of and respect for Arabic
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130 Brit Shalom was a small organisation existent within Mandate-era Zionist intellectual circles, founded in the 1920s and especially associated with members of the newly-founded Hebrew University. It advocated restricted Jewish immigration into Palestine, a binational state rather than a Jewish one, and promoted the idea of Palestine’s Arabs as political partners rather than opponents. Judah Magnes and Martin Buber are the names most usually associated with the group, but other members included Arthur Ruppin (sociologist and major Zionist land agent) and Gershom Scholem (scholar of Jewish mysticism and religion). Rachel Fish, “Bi-Nationalist Visions for the Construction and Dissolution of the State of Israel”. *Israel Studies* 19,2 (2014), 17-20; Zohar Maor, “Moderation from Right to Left: The Hidden Roots of Brit Shalom.” *Jewish Social Studies* 19,2 (2013), 79-81.
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culture but his institutional setting harboured more hostile viewpoints.

What does this, then, suggest about Stephan and Mayer’s collaboration on the first four instalments of the translated Seyahatnâme? The appeal of having Mayer’s name on the articles seems clear for Stephan. Although he had by this time published numerous articles in the Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society and other in the Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities, in the Department’s hierarchy he was still a comparatively junior member of staff, lacking a degree or other academic qualifications. As such, the signature of a university lecturer and PhD on his articles would have added weight. Mayer’s incentives are less clear: intellectual curiosity? Friendliness between colleagues? We shall probably never know for sure.

What is certain is that their co-operation did not last the length of the project; the annotations and footnotes to the final two pieces are all Stephan’s work. The publication dates of the six sections may offer a clue: two of those annotated by Mayer appear in 1935, one in 1936 and one in 1938. All are short sections of the whole – five, ten, four and thirteen full typed pages respectively, suggesting a slow and either cumbersome or meticulous writing process. Three of these were probably written, then, before the Palestinian Uprising of 1936-39 and the last not long after its start. Did the relationship break down under political pressure, between the two men or from their colleagues? The pattern seems to fit with wider events – the rising tensions between Jews and Arabs and the spike in immigration after the Nazis took power in Germany in 1933 – and with the fact that Stephan never followed up on his other notable collaboration with a Jewish partner, his Arabic handbook for Steimatzky’s. Indeed, Mayer’s departure from the project seems to symbolise a sadder trajectory; the fatalities of the Palestinian Uprising included several Jerusalem scholars from Stephan and Mayer’s social and professional circles.137

5.2.3 Reading Stephan and Mayer’s paratextuals

Although Leo A. Mayer contributed the annotations for sections I-IV of Stephan’s

---

137 For example, Brit Shalom member and Hebrew University Arabist Levi Billig was shot in August 1936; Avinoam Yellin, an Arabist and Mandate Government Inspector of Jewish Schools was killed in 1937.
published translations in the *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine*, and Stephan wrote his own footnotes for only the final two parts of the series, Stephan’s translations and additions comprise 44 pages of the total, and Mayer’s form part of 36 pages (including blanks and illustrations). In addition to the formal paratextual materials – the footnotes – Stephan added some minor comments and markings throughout all sections of the text. Most commonly these are exclamation marks in parentheses, used when Evliya’s accounts overstep the merely fanciful and become simply incorrect; examples include the assertion that Hebron is “near Jerusalem” or in the description of the walls of Jerusalem, in which Evliya frequently gets his cardinal points mixed up and reverses north and south. Oddly, Stephan seems not to have noticed Evliya’s claims that Christ was born in Jerusalem.

A small percentage of the footnotes written by both Mayer and Stephan deal directly with the text of this version of the *Seyahatnâme*. This is not a ‘critical edition’ of Evliya’s work, in the sense of comparing different editions and rectifying errors and lacunae. Both annotators, therefore, find themselves pointing out typographical errors and spaces where Evliya apparently planned to return to the manuscript to fill in names or dates. In several places Stephan notes that he is giving a “conjectural translation” where the “text... is corrupted” or where the meaning is ambiguous, highlighting his active role as a translator. Stephan also comments on some of the choices he has made in translating, as when he notes that:

> The letters allow a double reading, though ‘Kurd’ [the version chosen in the published text] may be preferable over ‘Georgian’ in determining the meaning of a word describing the origins of a wrestler executed outside one of the gates of Jerusalem.
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139 Ibid, 63-68.
140 Ibid, 56.
141 Ben-Naeh, “‘Thousands great saints’”, 5.
142 See, for example (Mayer notes) p14 n1, p16 n4, p18 n5 and n7, p35 n6, (Stephan notes) p48 n1, p51 n1, p56 n3 and n4, p59 n2, p60 n3, p93 n1 (all in 1980 edition of Evliya Tshelebi’s *Travels in Palestine*).
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In the more detailed annotations, there are – unsurprisingly – differences of emphasis and tone between the two writers. Mayer, for example, displays a great depth of knowledge on Jewish history in Palestine, as in, for instance, the following detailed observation on Evliya’s writings about the Lower Galilee:

So far as I am aware no Muslim author before Evliya ever considered this part of Palestine specially fertile in tombs of prophets. But early in the sixteenth century J. Luria, the famous Jewish cabbalist of Safad, during his peripatetic lessons with his pupils, has indicated the sites of hundreds of holy tombs [...], thus creating a special literature and a tomb-worship hitherto unknown, at least so far as his followers were concerned. It is not unlikely that Evliya’s information about the numerous tombs of ‘prophets’, both in the neighbourhood of Safad and in that of Mount Tabor, are [sic] derived directly or indirectly from a Jewish guide.145

By comparison, Stephan’s ability to cite events in the Jewish history of Palestine is still impressive but, in sheer numerical terms – and even allowing for the varying concentration of Jewish shrines in different parts of the country – his attention to this issue is less than Mayer’s (seven of the 68 references written by Mayer deal with subjects particularly to do with Judaism or Palestine’s Jewish community, as against 10 of Stephan’s 212 references).146

The displays of erudition from both men are considerable (both cite works in English, Arabic, German, French and Ottoman Turkish), but variable. Mayer’s information is more obviously ‘academic’, lacking the immediacy of some of Stephan’s notes and apparently intimate knowledge of the contemporary people of Palestine. Stephan’s notes, as a generalisation, contain more contemporary and ethnographic knowledge, often not credited to other sources and therefore presumably either from his own research or from what he might consider ‘common’ knowledge in Palestinian Arab society. Examples include his claim, in response to Evliya terming Nablus a ‘Samaritan’ sanjaq, that “the present-day inhabitants of many former Samaritan villages would resent being considered of Samaritan

145 Ibid, 33 n3.
He also states that many of Nablus’ Muslim families “are known to have converted to Islam as recently as two generations ago, the foremost of whom are the Darwaza” and that there “are families in Hebron” with the same name as a construction supervisor at the Mosque of David in Jerusalem who are “of Turkish stock, yet have become Arabs”; these kind of unattributed assertions, again, suggest that he is drawing on his own general knowledge (even gossip), rather than from scholarly research.

Such statements by Stephan also suggest a flexible and inclusive view of local identity, which incorporates conversion and change under a broad sense of belonging. Although some of this information might have been considered controversial by the families involved (for example, the claim that a leading Nablus family converted to Islam from Samaritan Judaism only in the nineteenth century), it does suggest that Stephan himself had a distinctly ecumenical view of local identity, incorporating ethnic and religious shifts and conversions with little comment.

Stephan’s contemporary commentary also includes statements such as “No trace of the Turkish name is nowadays known to the guides,” as well as information which records technological change in Palestine: “The number of lamps hanging now in the Aqsa is stated by the Guardians of the Sanctuary to be four thousand. Electric light has been installed for the precincts only.”

Despite the sense that Stephan’s footnotes often stem from the local knowledge of one born and raised in the area, there are gaps in his awareness, in sections where Evliya’s travels take him further from larger towns and cities. Question marks next to the names of the villages of ’Askar and Yānūn, both still extant in the Nablus area, seem to suggest that Stephan does not recognise them (an alternative explanation is that the names are unclear in the original manuscript, but Stephan usually annotates such incidences). In other places, however, the precision
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of his corrections suggest a pedantic enjoyment in pouring cold water on Evliya’s more extreme flights of fancy. Where Evliya states that: “Between these columns [in the Dome of the Rock] of the third row an iron grill has been placed. It is a masterpiece, marvellously wrought and attributed to David,” Stephan responds with a deadpan: “This is work dating from the time of the Latin Kingdom”. Likewise, Evliya’s assertion that the Dome of the Rock “has been so richly gilt that its glittering can be seen at a distance of a day’s journey” is countered with a terse: “This is not in agreement with facts”. Stephan goes on the state more realistically that:

The greatest distance from which the Dome of the Rock is visible in the vicinity of Jerusalem does not exceed three miles as the crow flies, as the mountains around Jerusalem do not allow a view of the Haram from a place farther off.

5.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, therefore, we witness two contrasting examples of the type of relations which might occur between imperial scholars and citizen/subjects of colonised nations, and the way in which personal and historical factors intertwine to shape these interactions. In the case of Spoer and Haddad, the birth of this co-operation in the Ottoman era, with its imperial, rather than colonial, environment and its less sharply defined and racialised official hierarchies, permitted a relationship comprising a level of genuine mutuality and long-lived support. The two men were able to commence an enterprise in which Spoer collected the initial materials, Haddad became involved in translating and explicating them, and further joint expeditions to collect more material grew out of the first co-operation. Despite geographical separation, this eventually resulted in six articles on this topic alone, stretching over forty years, and ending with sentiments of genuine affection and respect. This coincides with the portrait of Palestine drawn in Spoer and Haddad’s long-running project on the poetry of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan, in which clear, defining
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delineations and confinements are not yet imposed, presenting a sense of possibility in its image of identity and territory.

By contrast, the same triad of environment, authorship, and content generates in the case of Stephan and Leo Mayer a very different outcome. Here, the impact of twenty years of British Mandatory rule, Zionist politics and Jewish immigration, is intertwined with a partnership which, under the resulting social and political pressures, did not survive to finish the translation of the Palestine section of Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyahatnâme*. Here, Stephan and Mayer, united in a Mandatory department which already included a range of potentially clashing positions on Zionism and Christianity in Palestine, managed to work on the first publications of a series of annotated translations.

But growing national tensions and the British Mandate’s logic of separation between Arabs and Jews were strong elements of the environment in which the work took place, and soon after the first sections were issued, the 1936-39 Uprising broke out. The different image of Palestine’s territorial existence embodied in the text obeys a similar logic to the restrictions placed on the co-operative relationship from outside. The result follows the borders assigned by the Mandate and WWI treaties by dint of Stephan and Mayer’s assemblage of parts from Evliya’s text to fulfil their 1930s image of the unit to be labelled “Palestine”. What was feasible under this heading prior to WWI, for Spoer and Haddad, had been strictly curtailed, and this is reflected in the content and the authors of the Evliya text.

The picture is not entirely hopeless. The territorial boundaries of this geographically bounded image can be contrasted with the socially open Palestine found in Evliya’s writings and foregrounded in Stephan’s translation and his and Mayer’s paratextual materials. Rather than open borders, Stephan presents openness of faith and social interaction, with Muslims, Christians and Jews living alongside one another, sharing religious and urban space, and co-existing under Islamic rule. The same possibility is raised, and then dashed, in Stephan’s working relationship with Leo Mayer. By the time they were working together, the tensions and power relations in Mandate Palestine were much starker; in August 1936, for instance, Levi Billig, a Brit Shalom member and Arabist colleague of Mayer at Hebrew
University, was shot by a sniper. Both the individual, professional statuses of Stephan and Mayer and their social positions as elite-educated Zionist Jewish professor versus junior-clerk Palestinian Arab were moving increasingly out of sync. If the clues left by the dates of publication of the sections of the translated *Seyahatnâme* are correct, they reveal a collaboration which simply could not stand the pressures of the increasingly hostile political environment.

Moving on from the territorial, political aspects of textual translation, and the colonial relations of the translation process itself, the next chapter investigates another facet of the entangled relationship between translation, orientalism, and Eastern and Western scholars. This is the complex ways in which orientalist ideas and assumptions could obscure social and cultural specificity, appropriating Palestinian culture for European aesthetic ends, but could also be re-appropriated and reversed in order to assert Arab ownership of history and of moral values claimed as their own by colonisers and missionaries.
6 Literature and Orientalisms

In the previous chapter, I argued that Elias Haddad and Stephan Hanna Stephan’s translations of the writings of Nimr Ibn ’Adwan and Evliya Çelebi implicate them in creating specific images of what constitutes “Palestine”, and that their ideas on this informed their choices of text in a way that was shaped by their historical and personal/professional environments. Under these influences, I see the portrayal of Palestine as an entity shifting from the pre-WWI period to that of the British Mandate administration, from a broad Ottoman model in which internal borders were of limited importance to a more circumscribed version which followed the limits imposed by British and French colonial plans. I also argued that actual processes involved in creating these translated texts offer a perspective on the relationship between “native” intellectuals and their colonial collaborators in circumstances which shifted from the Ottoman period, with its scope for a comparatively equal and stable relationship between Elias Haddad and Henry Spoer, to the more fraught period of the 1930s as a setting for Stephan Stephan and Leo Mayer’s shorter-lived and prematurely truncated encounter.

In this chapter, I move on to an examination of Stephan Stephan’s scholarly translation of a collection of Palestinian folksongs, his theory that they represent a thematic continuity from the Biblical poetry of the *Song of Songs*, and the academic translation’s ‘second life’ in a version by the Orientalist versifier E. Powys Mathers. This is followed by Elias Haddad’s translation from German into Arabic of Gotthold Lessing’s *Nathan der Weise*, the eighteenth-century German Enlightenment play of religious tolerance.

The first reason for reading these translations side-by-side are the lessons they represent for my overarching argument on networks. In Stephan’s case, we see a piece of research which in itself intervenes in important debates of its era about the nature of Palestinian rural culture and its relationship to the past, and makes some bold assertions in doing so. But, via one of the most far-reaching of the cultural
entanglements which are key to this thesis, Stephan’s scholarly work found new audiences in a form versioned and published by well-known figures in the artistic scene of interwar Britain. Through the sculptor Eric Gill this entanglement extends even further, linking into the architectural colonisation of Palestine by the British Mandate authorities in the shape of the Archaeological Museum in which Stephan himself spent most of his career. In the case of Haddad’s translation of Lessing’s Nathan der Weise into Arabic, we encounter a reminder that Palestinian cultural production in this period was known about in the Arabic-speaking world, carrying diverse ideas and opinions from this very specific political context into more general intellectual conversations.

Secondly, there are two main themes which unite these texts: relations between Muslims, Christians and Jews in Palestine (in actual encounters in Mandate Palestine, and in literary and historical depictions of the land); and the interplay between how Palestinians ‘wrote themselves’ and how Western Orientalist scholars and translators wrote them.

With regard to the first of these themes, most accounts of relations between Palestinian Arabs and Jews in the periods before and after World War One emphasise tensions and differences, particularly in the context of increasing Zionist immigration. A growing body of literature, however, complicates this picture, stressing interactions between Muslims, Christians and Jews and offering images of day-to-day conversations, businesses and co-operations in the intellectual, economic and domestic spheres. This is not to say that all relations were amicable, rather that they were normal, quotidian and domestic, and often cross-cut by identifications and allegiances other than those of religion/ethnicity – class, gender, locality, commercial interest and so on. The two bodies of work which Stephan and Haddad chose to translate and analyse, and which I discuss below, reflect this dynamic, offering images of the place of Jews in the Palestinian Arab imaginary which go beyond a Palestinian-Zionist binary. Key to this understanding is the idea (albeit
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romanticised), highlighted in different ways in these texts, that coexistence between Jews, Christians and Muslims is an autochthonous and ancient characteristic of Palestinian society, not something which needs to be learnt or introduced from outside, specifically Europe.

The second theme which emerges from these translations is the relationship between Palestinian Arab ideas and discourses about the land and the people living in it, and the versions written by European Orientalist translators and scholars. In my first example, Stephan Hanna Stephan’s analysis of Palestinian folk songs collected, translated and published in *JPOS* is underpinned by Western scholarship to make the assertion that these folksongs represent a continuity from the Biblical era to the present day. But Stephan’s literal translations and commentary were taken up by E. Powys Mathers, a well-known versifier of Eastern literature into poetry designed to meet the tastes of twentieth century Anglophone readers. In a second example, we see Elias Haddad carrying Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s eighteenth-century play of religious toleration, *Nathan der Weise*, back to its Jerusalem setting, and in his introduction and other paratextual materials using it to reclaim as indigenous to the East a “Levantine” model of social relations imbued with equality and respect. Both works continue earlier discussions of the agency possessed by “native” intellectuals and translators, the power dynamics involved in translating to and from colonial languages, and issues of domestication and representation.

This chapter is divided into two main parts. The first focuses on Stephan’s research on the parallels he identified between Palestinian folksongs and the Biblical *Song of Songs*, and the versification of some of Stephan’s folksong translations by the British poet E. Powys Mathers. This section looks at the contents and contexts of each of these publications, and discusses the evidence they provide for my arguments on networks, on Stephan’s vision of Palestinian culture, and on the effects of domestication in translating this work. The second section looks at Elias Haddad’s Arabic translation of Lessing’s *Nathan der Weise*, discussing how the play has been seen in its European context, how Lessing chose to translate and present it, and what his choices and the reactions to them from the Arabic press tell us about views of Muslim-Jewish relations and identities in Palestinian history.
6.1 Stephan Stephan: Palestine and the *Song of Songs*

This first main section of the chapter looks at Stephan Hanna Stephan’s 1922 article “Modern Palestinian Parallels to the *Song of Songs*,” published in the second volume of the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*. I examine Stephan’s collection, translation and analysis of folksongs in the light of Tamari’s analysis and other evidence for Stephan’s purpose. I then continue the tale of these translations, which were re-worked by the British ‘versifier’ E. Powys Mathers into a volume of poetry entitled *The Smell of Lebanon*, which appropriates Stephan’s portrayal of a distinctive Palestinian culture to create a very different text. Having described the cultural context in which this versified volume was created, I discuss the entanglements it demonstrates between Palestinian and British intelligentsia and literati, but also how Orientalist assumptions and views on the British side over-rode the historical and cultural richness and complexity of Stephan’s original vision.

6.1.1 Modern Palestinian Parallels to the *Song of Songs*

The 1922 article “Modern Palestinian Parallels to the *Song of Songs*” starts with a brief introduction by Stephan which outlines his basic intention: to record a number of Palestinian songs “which are in use to-day” and to compare them with the “beautiful love ditties” of the *Song of Songs*, which he feels “we may safely assume... circulated among the people, who sang them on different occasions”.

There is, Stephan contends, a “striking resemblance” between the contemporary songs and those of two millennia past, and he picks up on specific aspects – such as the “ancient and modern modes of describing the beauty of the man and the woman” - as particularly comparable. He identifies metaphors, similes and other imagery used in “both Canticles and the folksongs” and, in a series of short chapters, selects phrases and passages which illustrate the strongest of these comparisons.

Judging by the many approving mentions the article received in Western
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journals on Orientalist, theological and folkloric topics, Stephan’s work caught the eyes of scholars around the world with its combination of textual and ethnographic data. The piece runs to 110 pages, of which 32 pages are songs collected and transcribed in Arabic and 53 pages the same songs transliterated and translated into English with copious annotations; the remainder provides an introduction to the songs and a discussion of the main themes and motifs of the Song of Songs (referred to by Stephan as the Canticles). Stephan compares his folksong collection not only with the Biblical text, but also with classical Arabic poetry and popular Arabic literature such as A Thousand and One Nights.

The transcribed, transliterated and translated folksongs are heavily annotated with ethnographic observations from Palestine and to a lesser extent Transjordan and Syria (most of them from Stephan’s own observations and experience) and from further afield, including Egypt, and from Classical Greece, placing Stephan into a genre of comparative Orientalist studies which brought together contemporary, Biblical, Classical and historical examples to comment on ethnographic content. German Orientalists are notably prevalent amongst Stephan’s references: foremost amongst them is Paul Haupt, a Semiticist who published on the Song of Songs. Gustav Dalman’s ethnological work on Palestinian folk-songs is also mentioned, with minor citations from the British-American Assyriologist Stephen Langdon and the Canadian scholar Theophile Meek, who argued that the Song of Songs was an
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6 Examples include Stanley A. Cook's roundup of scholarship on Old Testament topics in The Journal of Theological Studies 26, 103 (1925), 334; P.A. Vaccari, “Il Cantico dei Cantici nelle recenti pubblicazioni”. Biblica 9, 4 (1928), 444; and “Reviews and Notices of Publications”. Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 56,1 (1924), 46, in which Stephan's article is described as “the chief feature” of the issue and “an important contribution” to the field.
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incantation from a Babylonian cult of the goddess Ishtar and her consort Tammuz.  

Tamari discusses Stephan’s article in his examination of the ethnographic works of Tawfiq Canaan and his colleagues, the “least acknowledged” of whom was Stephan. Tamari’s analysis of “Modern Palestinian Parallels” considers Stephan’s ideas in relation to nativist anthropology, seeing Stephan’s work very much as part of intellectual currents which viewed the twentieth-century inhabitants of Palestine as descendants of the earliest inhabitants of the land, arguing that some level of continuity could be seen in their culture and customs. These ideas were held by Arab scholars such as Canaan and Stephan, but also, in the pre-war years, by Zionists such as the Labour Zionist leader and future prime minister of Israel David Ben Gurion, and his colleague and future Israeli president Yitzhak Ben-Zvi. These are one of the most important themes in Stephan’s article, as highlighted by the title and by his conclusions that: “A comparison of these early Palestinian songs with those which are in use to-day, some 2500 years later, shows a striking resemblance between the old and the new.”

Stephan’s interpretations demonstrate other features of nativist thinking, such as a capacious, all-encompassing understanding of Palestinian culture as able to absorb a range of influences – in this case from ancient Assyria to Egypt – and combine them to create something distinctively Palestinian. As Tamari hints, Stephan’s article (and Canaan and Haddad’s works) differ from the ideas of Western visitors who saw contemporary Palestinians in a Biblical light. Foreigners often saw Palestinians as degraded relics of the peoples of the Bible, but the Palestinian nativists saw themselves as heirs to a culture which brought together many influences, remaining healthy and vibrant, rather than as a sad shadow of former greatness. 

I do not challenge Tamari’s conclusions insofar as they considers Stephan’s
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article as a work of Palestinian ethnography. However, two other aspects of Stephan’s study merit attention. First is the issue of colloquial Arabic and Stephan’s transcriptions of it, in which he maintains the colloquial language of the folk-songs in his Arabic transcription and transliteration. The colloquial pronunciation is not, however, found in the transcription: for example, the letter qaf, dropped in many Palestinian dialects, is written according to Standard Arabic rules in the Arabic script, but indicated by a ’ in the transliterations, as, for instance, in a song in which each line is opened with ‘âmat in the transliteration, denoting the pronunciation, but the conventional قامت in the transcription.\footnote{Stephan, “Modern Palestinian Parallels, 240, [Arabic section] 6.} or قعدت rendered as ‘àdat.\footnote{Ibid., 242, [Arabic section] 7.} Although this can simply be seen as hewing to ethnographic accuracy in presenting the texts, the fact that they are seen as valid comparisons (on the level of content if not of aesthetics) to both the Bible and the Thousand and One Nights implies a certain respect for orality and the heritage embedded in popular culture. But the disparity between the transcribed and transliterated versions also suggests a lingering ambivalence over the status and literary value of the colloquial language.

Secondly, it is striking that Stephan refers to the ancient inhabitants of the land as Palestinians.\footnote{Ibid., 199.} This contrasts with many Western (and Zionist) discourses on the relationship between the historical and modern-day peoples, amongst which terms such as Canaanite or Israelite are much more commonly used, betraying assumptions that changing material remains equated to actual differences in the people depositing them.\footnote{As discussed by Uzi Baram, “The Development of Historical Archaeology in Israel: An Overview and Prospects”. Historical Archaeology, 36, 4 (2002), 15. Examples include Philip Baldensperger's The Immoveable East (Boston: Small, Maynard & Co, 1913), or the address of the Bishop of Salisbury to the Palestine Exploration Fund, widely quoted since its citation by Edward Said, in which he celebrates the “supersession” [sic] of the Canaanites by the Israelites (“Annual Meeting”. Palestine Exploration Quarterly 35:4 (1903), 291; also quoted in Edward Said, The Question of Palestine (New York: Vintage, 1992/79), 79).} To effectively dub the Song of Songs Palestinian suggests considerable confidence in Stephan’s choice of nomenclature. Palestinian did not at this time signify a specifically Arab identity; many Zionist enterprises and organisations of the Mandate era also used the word. But used by Stephan, and in this context, it implies a broad identity which could include both Jews and Arabs, as well as other peoples.
To lay claim to the *Song of Songs* as a Palestinian text, identified with the land and not with specific religions or faiths, becomes an even more assertive act when one considers that, in Jewish religious tradition, the book has long been popularly understood as an allegory, recounting in erotic verse God’s love for his Chosen People, the Jews. “From the early twentieth century on”, according to Israeli literary scholar Ilana Pardes, “secular Zionism embraced the *Song* with unparalleled passion”. Indeed, the very secularity of the *Song* (which barely mentions the name of God and the inclusion of which in the Jewish religious canon was itself controversial) made its expressions of love and longing all the more appealing to the secular Second Aliyah Zionists. It replaced faith with references to the beauty of the land and its fertility and fruitfulness, which strongly echoed Zionist narratives about the Jewish connection to the soil, flora and fauna of Eretz Yisrael, and the role of Zionist colonists and kibbutzniks in improving Palestinian agriculture and restoring fertility to land which generations of Arab inhabitants had allegedly neglected. To take this eroticised encounter between God and the Jews, or the Jewish people and the Land, and replace the Jews with Palestinians is to claim a much wider and less ethnically exclusive identity for the Lover.

However, in translation practice, intention does not always correspond to the impacts that a work has on its readers. Published in a specialist scholarly journal, Stephan’s English-language versions of the folk-songs he collected were largely intended for an academic audience and with an informational purpose; it is doubtful that, when he carried them out, he anticipated a readership beyond this or considered a purpose outwith intellectual debate. The translations themselves are often stiff and obviously evidential rather than aesthetic in purpose, sometimes including parentheses: “O people, do not blame me for loving her;/She loved me and I loved
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her (also in the present tense)” or “Oh you, whe [sic] are marrying the white ones, chink chink your gold coins!/Wait for the white ones till the apricot is green (spring season)”. They capture none of the “freshness and vigur [sic]” which Stephan found so appealing in the originals. But six years later, some of the poems presented by Stephan in the *JPOS* appeared in a different form, versified in accordance with early twentieth century literary aesthetics and conveying a very different message.

### 6.1.2 Mathers’ *The Smell of Lebanon*

The 1928 publication of *The Smell of Lebanon; twenty-four Syrian folk-songs collected by S.H. Stephan, with English versions made by E. Powys Mathers* highlights the wide-ranging intellectual and artistic networks into which Palestinians writing in English launched their work (whether or not they were conscious of this fact, or of the numerous and repeated points of contact between the two apparently distant worlds). It was issued in a small run of 375 elegantly-bound, hand-numbered copies, dedicated to the ‘Queen of Bohemia’, the artist, writer and muse Nina Hamnett (1890-1956), with many of them signed by the versifier and/or the publisher. The former was E. Powys Mathers, a major versifier of ‘Oriental’ literature. The latter, Francis Walterson, also had a long-standing interest in Middle Eastern cultures: Walterson was a pseudonym for Donald Attwater, a significant twentieth century scholar of Eastern Christianity and Catholic history. A soldier in the British army in Egypt and Palestine during World War One, he maintained an interest in the region beyond that of his historical researches, writing several articles
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for the Catholic magazine *The Commonweal* on the situation of Palestinian Christians. As ‘Frank Walterson’, he issued two books by his mentor and employer, the controversial sculptor Eric Gill, on Christianity and art. Gill and Attwater were part of a close-knit social and intellectual group and it is likely that Gill would have seen copies of *The Smell of Lebanon* at their shared home and workplace in rural Wales, Capel-y-Ffin. One wonders how he found the collection in comparison with his own 1925 limited, illuminated edition of the *Song of Songs*, issued by another small craft press, Golden Cockerel. An additional link between Gill and Mathers, the ‘versifier’ of *The Smell of Lebanon*, lies in Gill’s drawings for Mathers’ erotic poem cycle *Procreant Hymn*, published in 1926, also by Golden Cockerel Press.

In a physical manifestation of these links with a particular strand of the British artistic and political community, Gill was also a friend of C.R. Ashbee, the architect and planner whose Arts & Crafts movement community at Chipping Campden had informed some of Gill’s ideas for his own intentional communities, as well as his ideas about the purity and virtue of manual labour and agricultural life. Ashbee, in his turn, played a major role in shaping the post-WWI Jerusalem in which Stephan lived and worked. Invited by the military administration to help plan the renovation of the city, he worked with Ronald Storrs, the British authorities and the Pro-Jerusalem Society on projects which included restoring the Dome of the Rock, renaming Jerusalem’s streets along grandiose Biblical and historical lines, and promoting what he and Storrs saw (with a racialised colonial mindset) as indigenous craft industries, particularly suited to the Arab population. There is a further continuity in that Gill was to carve the bas-relief decorations for the Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem between 1934 and 1937. During his stay in Jerusalem Gill (a non-conformist turned Catholic) seems to have been overcome by

27 The two shared a large house at Capel-y-Ffin in rural Wales as part of an experiment in communal living by a group of Catholic craftsmen and writers, and Attwater was later to marry Gill’s niece (Fiona MacCarthy, *Eric Gill* (London: Faber & Faber, 1989), 170, 181-82, 197).
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the kind of religious orientalism which spurred many nineteenth-century Victorian Christians to Palestine: he wrote of his time in Jerusalem that “Palestine is the Holy Land... to me it was like living with the Apostles. It was like living in the Bible”. Gill’s biographer described such an impact that his “life can almost be divided into pre- and post-Jerusalem phases”, and recounts how (with echoes of the fancy-dress photos many nineteenth and early twentieth-century European tourists had taken in Palestine), Gill took to working in “Arab dress”, swapping his customary artisan’s smock for a “galabea” and “caphia” (kuffīya). Gill may well have met Stephan, whilst the former was carving the decorations for the Museum and the latter was working in its library. Did Gill have any idea of the links between his former home at Capel-y-Ffin and his Palestinian commission?

Despite the interest the creators of these English-language versions of Stephan’s translations showed in the Islamicate world, the result was very much the product of Western orientalism. Theories of translation talk of readers’ “genre expectations”, which provide the impetus for translational domestication not only in terms of names, customs, and imagery, but also in style. This is certainly the case in Mathers’ versioning. On the one hand, the English-language poems in The Smell of Lebanon tend towards conventional English rhymes and rhythms, with additional words and phrases often added or subtracted so that the result conforms to the domesticated rhyme scheme and scansion, as in: “Henna, henna, and O drops of dew,/Bringer of passion, I would see you,” the second line of which is derived from “ašūfak ḥabībi, ya ’ēni, jallāb al-ḥāwa”, translated by Stephan as “I would see you my beloved, my eye, bringer of passion” (the phrase “my eye” is dropped); or
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“Barhum, Barhum with curly locks, Barhum of ours” comes from “Barhûm ya Barhûm, yà-bu-l-jidîle” and Stephan’s translation of “Barhum, O Barhum, you with the curled locks”, adding a new possessive phrase to allow the line to rhyme and scan with that following.

The effect was not particularly successful, as highlighted by one of the few reviews of the collection. D.S. Margoliouth, Professor of Arabic at Oxford, acerbically described the poems as “obscure where the original is clear... On the whole this ‘smell of Lebanon’ is of doubtful fragrance”. The versification is designed to appeal to an English-speaking readership of fairly conservative literary tastes, with conventional rhyming and structures. Culturally specific references are sacrificed to the rhyme scheme and to a more general domesticating urge, as where henna decorations on a young man’s hands are replaced with “red... dyes”.

The title of the English collection also draws it in the direction of classics of English-language writing; it is taken from verse eleven of the Song of Songs in the King James Version of the Bible, which reads: “Thy lips, O my spouse, drop as the honeycomb: honey and milk are under thy tongue; and the smell of thy garments is like the smell of Lebanon”. Rather than referring the reader to the actual basis of the book – Arabic folksongs – the translator and publishers of the versified work chose to reinforce the Biblical links with a quotation which stands at a remove from Stephan’s collection. Where Stephan emphasises his peasant poems as modern continua from the Song of Songs, Mathers’ translation refocuses them with Biblical style and framing.

The change of title also eliminates the point, robustly made in Stephan’s choices of terminology, that he is asserting a confluence between specifically Palestinian folk-songs and the Biblical material, and in doing so claiming for Palestine a cultural continuity down the ages. Instead, Mathers and Attwater elect to
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refer to Lebanon in the title of the collection and to Syria in their description of the origins of the songs. In doing so, they create a less focused image, distancing the anthology from a territory which at the time was ruled by the British and instead associating it with regions less interwoven with their own government’s colonial project and political difficulties.

In 1919-20 nationalists such as 'Arif al-'Arif still thought of ‘southern Syria’ as a possible identity and political unit for Palestine (as witnessed, for example, by the newspaper of that name, Suriya al-janubiyya), but as a practical option this was quashed by the French defeat of King Faisal’s Syrian government in 1920. Although there were many links between Damascus and Palestine, they lacked the longstanding, solid institutional or familial connections needed to maintain a unified vision, and the vast majority of Palestinians abandoned the concept after Faisal’s defeat at the battle of Maysalun. Amongst some activists belief in the idea lasted into the 1930s, but these were a small minority, and it is extremely unlikely that British literati with few contacts amongst natives of the region and speakers of Arabic would have been aware of this marginal discourse. To label the poems from Stephan’s article as products of Lebanon was, then, symptomatic of the “imperial vagueness” which Said ascribes to Orientalist thought, in which the ‘East’ is an exotic, timeless mass rather than a place of historical process and everyday life.

Stephan was not, however, the creator of these songs; they were collected by him from sources across Palestine and the Levant. As an educated urban male, associated with the Mandate authorities, he must also be seen as occupying a privileged, not to say colonising, role in relation to his informers amongst the men and women of the Bedouin and peasantry. The discourses of peasantry shaped by Canaan, Haddad and Stephan are, indeed, “elite,” however much the colonial context in which Stephan was operating might also be seen as creating a unity of purpose

---

41 Khalidi, Palestinian Identity, 165.
43 Said, Orientalism, 50.
between him and the nameless peasant masses.\textsuperscript{44} With the exception of one “Marie N.”\textsuperscript{45} of Nazareth, the most recognition they receive from him is to be denoted as “the Kedkan Kurds between Jerablus... and Mimbij”\textsuperscript{46} or “a lady from Nazareth”.\textsuperscript{47} In relation to Stephan, let alone the versifier Mathers, one might see these singing peasants and Bedouin, recorded at their weddings and harvest celebrations, as Spivak’s silent/silenced subaltern. In the hands of Mathers and Attwater they are doubly silenced and the few traces they have left in the songs, in the shape of identifiable local words and images, are stripped away to an even greater degree.

Gill and Attwater, with their creative and philosophical roots in the Arts and Crafts movement and their back-to-the-land living experiments in rural England and Wales, embody parallels with the Canaan circle’s search for authenticity and moral values in the Palestinian peasantry, and the Syrian Orphanage’s beliefs in countryside exercise and hygiene. These ideas, both drawing on and reacting against core modernist themes of the pre- and post-WWI periods, converge in the figures of these writers and craftsmen and their uneasy relationships with their national peasants, both real and imagined. Tamari dates the “seemingly perennial cultural obsession on the part of the urban intelligentsia of the Mashraq [sic] with the authenticity of the peasant” to the turn of the twentieth century, embedding it in the development of Arab cultural nationalism in the previous decades.\textsuperscript{48} Whilst Swedenburg’s linkage of peasant identity to Palestinian nationalism focuses on the post-1948 experience, many of the themes he foregrounds (connection to the land, assertion of historical presence in the face of settler colonialism)\textsuperscript{49} were already in play in the Mandate period, and dovetail with Stephan, Canaan and their colleagues’ interest in and images of peasant culture.

Swedenburg’s analysis also highlights the way in which Palestinian

\textsuperscript{44} Cesari, “Cultural Heritage”, 71, 79.
\textsuperscript{45} Stephan, “Modern Palestinian Parallels”, 214.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 208.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 217.
nationalism – like many other (often Romantic) nationalisms searching for keystones of cultural authenticity – uses the peasant as a signifier, a symbolic figure with little agency of their own, conceived of as obedient and passive, thus justifying the leadership of a middle-class vanguard. This dichotomy between rural and urban, peasant and educated urbanite, modern and primitive is clearly visible in the works of Stephan, Canaan et al; it is also prominent in the ideas of Eric Gill and his clique, with their notions of rural authenticity and Gill’s own practice of wearing rough smocks and homemade boots.

On one hand, in Mathers and Walterson/Attwater’s version of his translations we see Stephan’s work being taken to readerships far beyond those he is likely to have foreseen for his Song of Songs article. The ‘virtual’ networks take us from rural Palestine, via Stephan’s folkloric scholarship and Biblical framing, to the British literati of the 1920s. But the domestication and neutering which Mathers imposes on Stephan’s admittedly unaesthetic versions of the folksongs truncates the ability of Stephan’s work to extend its reach in a meaningful way. The removal of specifically Palestinian and identifiably Arabic cultural references and motifs renders the poems’ origins obscure and vague, appealing to the generalised interest of Mathers and Attwater in an amorphously demarcated Middle East and its Christian legacy in the West, rather than any cultural continuity which Stephan saw within contemporary Palestinian society. Literary translation is often held up as an opportunity for intercultural communication, exploration, and understanding, but this example highlights the limits of this aspiration, and instead reinforces the potential for hegemonic power to be re-asserted through the erasure of cultural specificity in the

50 Anthony Smith, Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History (Cambridge: Polity, 2010), 29-34; Anderson, Imagined Communities, 54, 73, 116. Importantly in the context of this study, Smith also foregrounds the German origins of this focus on authenticity and purity within Romantic ideas of the nation and identity.
51 Swedenburg, “Peasant as National Signifier”, 27.
52 Tamari, Mountain Against the Sea, 96-7, 105.
53 MacCarthy, Eric Gill, 110, 195; see also Gill’s relationship with C.R. Ashbee and Ashbee’s work in Jerusalem for Ronald Storrs in the early years of the Mandate, described earlier in this chapter.
54 This utopian view of translation is highlighted (and critiqued) in the work of scholars such as Venuti, particularly in his famous essay “Translation, Community, Utopia” (Lawrence Venuti, Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), 11-30), but is still implicit in, for instance, the names of literary/activist organisations such as Words Without Borders.
6.2 Elias Haddad’s *Nathan der Weise*: re-appropriating European Orientalism

As mentioned in the introduction to this section, one of its themes is the relationship between Arab translators and scholars and European Orientalism. In *The Smell of Lebanon*, we witnessed a Western versifier re-introducing his own Orientalist visions of the East into the versions he created, and in so doing obscuring the specificity and identity of Stephan’s text. The following section of this chapter looks at Elias Haddad’s translation of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s German Enlightenment play *Nathan the Wise*, generally viewed as an archetypal story of Jewish-Muslim-Christian brotherhood. By considering the history of Lessing’s play, the contents of Haddad’s translation and the paratextual materials he wrote to accompany it, and the context and reception of the work, I argue that Haddad was promoting ‘Enlightenment values’ to his Arabic readership, but that he saw them not as new or alien but as fundamental to his own cultural setting. I suggest that he was articulating a particular vision of Palestine, one which drew on a mythologised history in order to convey the future he hoped for for his nation. In choosing to do this by translating a canonical German play, I suggest that, rather than deferring to European values as superior and ‘enlightened’, he was re/claiming these values as native to Palestine itself, and exploiting the cultural capital attached to European sources to help reinforce his claim.

The first – and until the 1990s the only – Arabic edition of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s 1779 blank-verse play *Nathan der Weise* (‘Nathan the Wise’),

55 Elias Haddad’s version was published56 in 1932 at the Syrian Orphanage printing press,57 a vocational training workshop at the Schneller School which was one of the most advanced printshops in Jerusalem.58 Haddad also produced a short dictionary of...

56 Or printed; at this time the difference was still slender. See: Ayalon, *Reading Palestine*, 65-6.
vocabulary specific to the play and wrote a Foreword; together these prompt Jan Kühne to interpret his motives for the work as twofold: “teaching the German language, while attempting to introduce Secularization and Enlightenment into the Arab world. In the foreword to his translation, Haddad emphasizes the necessity of this enterprise”. I disagree with Kühne’s analysis, arguing in this section that Haddad did not see secularism and enlightenment as values which needed to be “introduced into the Arab world”, but as virtues already inherent to it; his version of Nathan der Weise represented an opportunity to reclaim these values, re-framing them as indigenously Palestinian.

In contrast to Mathers’ Westernised, eliding versioning of Stephan’s collection of Palestinian folksongs, in Elias Haddad’s Arabic version of Nathan der Weise we see a translator into Arabic taking a European play with an ‘Oriental’ setting and using it to convey a specific set of ideas about his own society and its political trajectory. This would not have been unusual; figures such as Jurji Zaydan had throughout the nahda period seen translation as key to social and cultural renewal in the Arab world, bringing new ideas and understandings of the world into the Arabic language. The writer, journalist and educator Khalil Baydas (?1874–1949), who made a significant contribution to theorising translation in the Arabic context, as well as translating for a local audience, shows that a Palestinian strand of nahdawi translation existed, and I suggest that we can see its influence in Haddad’s project.

Given that Haddad had a family, was a senior teacher at the Syrian Orphanage, and was involved in other intellectual and parish affairs, one may speculate that the 1932 publication date of Nathan al-Hakim suggests he was working on it in the late 1920s and early 1930s. This was an era of fluctuating tensions between Palestinian Arabs and Jews, which had peaked in 1929 with the Western/Buraq Wall Riots, which saw 249 Jews and Arabs killed. In addition to violent outbursts, day-to-day factors reinforced the lines between Jewish and Arab Palestinians. The nation-building project of the Yishuv, the British Mandate authorities’ policy of classifying

60 El-Shakry, Darwin in Arabic, 11.
62 Matthews, Confronting an Empire, 64.
people according to faith, and an overarching environment of population growth, economic downturn and rapid urbanisation, all combined to create social tensions which were exacerbated by Zionist immigration and political nationalisms. For Palestinians who – like Elias Haddad – had seen in Western ‘modernity’ and education a route to nationhood, facilitated by the British Mandate authorities, there was a growing realisation that they were not going to be allowed to follow Iraq, Egypt and Lebanon into some kind of qualified independence.

However, the rising tensions of Mandate Palestine had not yet reached the heights of the 1936-39 revolt. Indeed, it could be argued that this translation and its publication could only have taken place at this time, in the few short years of a “plastic period” when in some quarters there was a desire for rapprochement after the violence of 1929. Zionist immigration was comparatively low at this point, curbed partly by the Passfield white paper, and Palestine had not been hit as hard as much of the rest of the world by economic depression. Only a year or two later, the play’s conciliatory message would, perhaps, have been too challenging in the face of rapidly rising Jewish immigration, spurred by Hitler’s seizure of power in Germany. Sometimes, translation can be influenced not only by the general social and political environment, but by events and attitudes which can be pinpointed with a fair degree of precision.

We can also locate Haddad’s translation of Nathan in a wider political and cultural context, that of Elias’s Germanophone personal and professional environment, with its ongoing process of cross-fertilisation between Palestine and Protestant communities in Germany itself. The Nazis had been trying to suppress Lessing’s play for a decade by the time of Nathan al-Hakim, and had sought to stop

---

64 The artist C.R. Ashbee, who worked for the Mandate authorities in the 1920s, used this phrase to talk about an earlier period of possibility in Palestine’s political and community relations, the years between the end of WW1 and the April 1920 Nebi Musa riots (Hoffman, Built Jerusalem, 282-3).
65 Edelheit, Yishuv in the Shadow of the Holocaust, 120.
67 Edelheit, Yishuv in the Shadow of the Holocaust, 62, 103; Nicosia, Third Reich and the Palestine Question, 100.
68 Shamma, Manipulation of Difference, 5, 15-16, 121.
screenings of a 1922 film based on the script, instead promoting performances of Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice*, with its anti-Semitic portrayal of the Jewish character Shylock. Was Elias Haddad aware of these trends, too, and trying to make a point about their own histories of tolerance to his German colleagues at the Syrian Orphanage? We know that members of the Schneller family in Palestine were enthusiastic supporters of the National Socialists later in the 1930s; were they already expressing views which Haddad wanted to counter? The full weight of Nazi censorship fell on the play in 1933, the year after Haddad’s publication, when the Nazis consolidated their rise to power. One might wonder whether the editions of *Nathan al-Hakim* which found their way into German university libraries during the 1930s did so under the noses of Nazi officials who could not read Arabic script, and did not know that they were witnessing a banned text.

### 6.2.1 Nathan der Weise

The German Enlightenment thinker and writer Gotthold Ephraim Lessing published *Nathan der Weise* in 1779, towards the end of his career. Having become embroiled in a bitter theological dispute with one Pastor Goetze of Hamburg over the relationship between faith and rationality, which resulted in Lessing’s exemption from censorship being revoked, he turned to the theatre as a forum to express his views (although motifs which appear in the play are identifiable in writings of almost three decades earlier). The play is set in the Jerusalem of a wise and open-minded Salah al-Din, a well-established character in Western writings since the medieval period. Lessing had been aware of positive images of Saladin since early in his

---


70 Wawrzyn, *Nazis in the Holy Land*, 12.

71 At least one definite example exists of *Nathan al-Hakim* lodged in a German university library during this period, in addition to the copy in the national library in Berlin. The University of Leipzig’s copy bears swastika-and-eagle stamps which can be seen through the later solid circles which were printed over them post-1945.


career, as in 1751-2 he published a translation of Voltaire’s historical essays which included a tribute to the Ayyubid leader. Nathan der Weise also features a Jewish central character (Nathan) and his adopted Christian-born daughter Recha, and between these and other representations of Jews, Christians and Muslims it is often held up as a model for tolerance and inter-faith dialogue, as well as one of the most significant and widely-performed German plays.

Lessing did in-depth research into Arab and Crusader history for the play, as shown by notes left in his papers. A fictitious and somewhat bizarre plot twist involving Saladin’s sister and her marriage to a Crusader noble is seen by some as signalling that Lessing was willing to play fast and loose with Middle Eastern history, in classic orientalist mode. In his defence, though, it can be said that the details of Ayyubid family relations are poorly known and understood, so that while the tale is ahistorical, it is not necessarily counter-historical. Lessing delved deep into the less-known byways of Islamic history for other inspiration, with the Sufi renunciant Bishr bin al-Harith al-Hafi (c.152/767–227/842) appearing in the shape of Al-Hafi, the ‘Dervish’ and friend of Nathan. Lessing may have come upon the historical figure “from Johann Jakob Reiske, the Latin translator of Abu ‘l-Fida, or perhaps come across it in d’Herbelot’s Bibliothèque Orientale”.

Studies of Nathan’s early history tend to see the play as emblematic of toleration, or even of the idea that symbiosis between German and Jewish culture was possible. This has tended to be the over-riding liberal reading of the play through the twentieth century: Nathan der Weise was used to re-open most of the major public theatres of Germany after the fall of the Third Reich and it tends to be

---

74 Nisbet, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, 91.
staged for its political rather than aesthetic qualities.\textsuperscript{80} Other readings, however, challenge this ‘accepted version’, seeing Nathan as a world in which liberation comes only through renunciation of Jewishness – through assimilation and, in accordance with the values of the Enlightenment, a blurring of ethnic or religious differences.\textsuperscript{81} In such readings, the absence of ethnic or cultural detail in Lessing’s depiction of Nathan as a Jewish character detracts from this aspect of him; the character is that of a ‘good Jew’ because he isn’t outwardly very Jewish at all. Instead, he is an Enlightenment ‘Mensch’, Lessing’s preferred image of man, “independent of nationality [or] religion.”\textsuperscript{82}

But this tendency to see Nathan through the lens of nineteenth and twentieth-century German history may also influence present-day readings; as one scholar has put it, it is “an emblematic Enlightenment-era play whose evaluation has been drastically affected by the appalling history of the twentieth century”.\textsuperscript{83} By transcending interpretations of the play which are bounded by the tendency to seek ominous precursors of Nazi anti-Semitism, though, we might instead see in Nathan the Wise something more akin to what I argue to be Haddad’s perspective, a pluralistic sensibility which evokes ideas of Levantine or Ottoman diversity, or Andalusian convivencia, between Muslims, Jews, and Christians.\textsuperscript{84} Other commentaries have also sought to push the play’s message beyond the binary of in/tolerance, seeing in it instead a more radical positing of multi-faith societies. Some draw on Ella Shohat’s critique of the domination of Ashkenazi and Zionist experiences in many discussions of Jewish life and of anti-Semitism.\textsuperscript{85} Others suggest readings of the play which see in it not a message of ‘tolerance’ (with its implications of a more powerful party ‘tolerating’ and perhaps reluctantly ‘putting up with’ an inferior partner), but one of fundamental equality and a searching critique of

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid, 286, 289.
\textsuperscript{81} This view may partly be based on the widespread assumption that the character of Nathan was based on Moses Mendelssohn, a close friend of Lessing and a controversial figure in the debate over assimilation/ism in German Jewish history. See: Ned Curthoys, “A Diasporic Reading of Nathan the Wise”. \textit{Comparative Literature Studies} 47,1 (2010), 75-78.
\textsuperscript{82} Robertson, “Ambiguities of Tolerance”, 115-116.
\textsuperscript{83} Curthoys, “Diasporic Reading”, 70.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid, 70-71.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid, 80-81.
Christian cultures. What they have in common is that they present the possibility that Lessing, in *Nathan the Wise*, is actually offering a much more challenging view of a world where different faiths and peoples exist on a genuinely equal footing. The question is, of course, which of these various readings Elias Haddad hews closest to, writing in the early 1930s in the increasingly tense atmosphere of Mandate Palestine.

### 6.2.2 Nathan al-Hakim: the translation and Haddad’s paratextual materials

Before turning to Elias Haddad’s Arabic text of *Nathan der Weise* it is worth commenting on his choice of play. In selecting this specific text, I read Haddad’s objective as a reclamation of Palestine, and Jerusalem in particular, as a place in which Jews, Muslims and Christians are meant, and able, to live together. In choosing a play in which the Crusader Christians of Jerusalem are portrayed as fanatical and duplicitous as they try to regain their hold over the city, Haddad emphasises the fact that no single faith should be dominant, and that those who seek to dominate are those who do not live up to his, and Lessing’s, standards of moral excellence.

Haddad’s translation itself is fairly straightforward, employing formal literary Arabic in a style which replicates the late-eighteenth-century German of the original. One aspect of Lessing’s original which has been criticised by some writers is his alleged elision of Nathan’s Jewishness into a kind of nominally Jewish but ultimately culturally non-specific ‘Enlightenment Mensch’. In the light of this, it is worth noting that Haddad changes the Hebrew name of Lessing’s character Recha (Nathan’s adopted daughter), making her the Arabic Rayhana. Changing this character’s somewhat unusual name is not unknown: a 2003 British production of the play, for instance, called her Rachel. But the name Rachel still has an identifiable Jewish heritage, whereas Rayhana does not have the same overtones in Arabic. It is not a common name, and it does not carry the denominational associations of many.

---

87 Curthoys, “ Diasporic Reading”, 72-5; Robertson “Ambiguities of Toleration”, 105-6.
Arabic forenames, but has no particular link to any faith or ethnicity. What, then, are we to make of this choice? Might Haddad’s choice be read as glossing over the overt Jewish signifiers in Lessing’s play? Maybe, but there is another possibility, albeit one which is nigh-impossible to prove. With his broad education and friends of Muslim as well as Christian faith, Elias Haddad may have known about the figure of Rayhana bint Zayd, a Jewish woman who, after her husband was killed in battle, became a wife of the Prophet Muhammad. According to some versions of the tale, she even converted to Islam – although the histories differ as to whether this was voluntary or by force. Might Haddad, then, be playing with another example of Jewish-Muslim familial encounter from deep in Arab history?

The most illuminating part of Elias Haddad’s *Nathan* project is not the translation of the play itself, but the Arabic paratextual materials which accompany it, and which consist of a translator’s introduction; background to the play (in terms of Lessing’s ideas and theology); historical background; the setting; an outline of the plot; the story’s characters; theme of the play; biographical background on Lessing; a summary of the main plot and events of the play, divided into chapters; a brief note on Arabic translation; and footnotes throughout the text of the play itself. A separate volume comprises a German-Arabic word-list of terms used in the translation, implying that he foresaw it being used as a pedagogical aid, oriented to native speakers of German.

Immediately noticeable from the first paragraph of Haddad’s introduction are the two main, interlinking, themes which he draws from the play and the story of its writing. One of these is the conventional focus on tolerance between faiths; the other is a ringing condemnation of fanaticism and extremism by people of any faith. His concentration on this second point is especially worthy of note because – as he acknowledges from the first – the characters in the play who epitomise this evil are from his own religion, Christianity. But Haddad does not see the conflict between the Patriarch and his allies in *Nathan al-Hakim* as an issue of conflict between faiths, but

---

90 All translations from Arabic are mine.
one between rationalism and fanaticism. \(^{91}\) “When a country is affected with religious fanaticism”, he writes, “it results in degeneration and retrogression”. \(^{92}\) Instead, Haddad holds up as an example the separation of religion and politics – or ‘church and state’ – as seen, he says, in the Turkish Republic after World War One, implicitly critiquing the British administration for the growth of religious tension on its watch. But, he says, religious toleration and mutual respect must precede such a political development: “to you, your religion and to me, mine” he says, going on to quote the Qur’an and the New Testament side-by-side. \(^{93}\)

In his biographical description of Lessing, Haddad returns to his defence of enlightenment values of rationality and humanism, highlighting Lessing’s role in “demolishing all the traditions which his country clung to”. Haddad roots his arguments for rational humanism not only in the text of the play, but also in the historical background he describes, citing the conflict between Lessing as part of the “school of thought which favoured doctrines which permitted rationalism” and the Pastor Goetze as a “fanatical follower of [traditional] Christianity”. Goetze’s “zeal”, he says, led him to “bigotry” and to unwarranted personalisation of his quarrel with Lessing, which resulted in Lessing being censored by the authorities of the time.

Haddad also follows the various critical editions of Nathan the Wise in telling the story – already well-documented by then – of the influence of Cardanus, Boccaccio and other writers on Lessing’s ideas and on his use of Boccaccio’s motif of the three rings for the centrepiece of the play. Haddad does not name any sources for his research, but as German was close to being Haddad’s first language, it can be assumed that most of this translation was done from an original text of the play. However, internal evidence from the footnotes suggests that he may also have used

\(^{91}\) This discourse was strongly articulated by other Palestinians at the time. ‘Isa Bandak, a Christian Arab nationalist newspaper editor from Bethlehem is described as having “offered a critique of religious fanaticism” in general, with the clear implication that both Christian missionaries and Islamic zealots could cause problems. […] Bandak […] stressed the importance of Muslims tolerating Christians as well as Christians tolerating, and indeed respecting, the country’s Muslim majority” (Haiduc-Dale, Arab Christians, 83-4). Bandak’s position, made explicit in response to attempts to hold a missionary conference in Palestine in 1928, makes it clear that the idea of an Islamicate Palestine, numerically dominated by Muslims but with full mutual respect between faiths, was not unique to Elias Haddad.


\(^{93}\) Ibid., 4.
Maxwell’s 1917 edition as a source for some background material.94

In summing-up the play’s plot and characters, Haddad remains completely willing to critique Western Christianity, highlighting the death of Nathan’s wife and seven sons at the hands of Crusaders in a massacre in the town of Darun. He does not try to create a distance between ‘Christians’ (messhiun) and ‘Crusaders’ (salibium) by using the latter term for those who kill or have bigoted opinions, whilst reserving the former for ‘good’ Christians. Instead, he uses the terms interchangeably, suggesting that he is willing to acknowledge the potential for violence by Christians.

Haddad also seems particularly keen to mention a fairly minor character, indeed one who is already dead before the beginning of the play. This is As‘ad, the brother of Salah al-Din, who married a Crusader noblewoman and went to Germany with her, fathering both a son who appears in the play as a Templar Knight and a girl, Blanda or Rayhana/Recha, who is brought up by Nathan. As‘ad, as Haddad points out, is “Muslim by birth, converts to Christianity, and is a friend of Nathan the Jew who brings up his daughter Rayhana. Uniting Leu von Filnek with his sister Rayhana and with Nathan and Salah al-Din as a single family symbolises the coming-together of the followers of the three doctrines and the overcoming of fanaticism” 95

This final scene is always commented upon in analyses of the play, but it is more unusual to find the character of As‘ad – and his background as a Muslim (a Kurd, not an Arab) - foregrounded in such a commentary. 96 Haddad insists later in his summary that “Lessing reckoned the three united religions at a single level and described the character of Salah al-Din as honourable and noble and high-minded and as not exceeded in humanity by any of the other characters”. He asserts that “Lessing believed that every one of the monotheistic faiths was necessary and important for the instruction of humankind” and that quarrels over dogma were fruitless, but that the best way to argue a religious position was to demonstrate it by moral excellence – and that this was something which was possible from within all three faiths. 97

95 Lessing, Nathan der Weise/Nathan al-Hakim, 15-16.
96 Ibid., 19.
97 Ibid., 4.
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There are two main reasons why these paratextual materials are significant. Firstly, they challenge the prevailing stereotypes of Mandate Jerusalem. There is a tendency to contrast Jerusalem and other Palestinian cities with Beirut, Damascus and Cairo, seeing Jerusalem as a provincial city which, if it were not for its religious significance and its focal role in Zionist ambitions, would be of little interest.98 Whilst it is true that Jerusalem did not contribute to Arabic culture to the same extent as larger and more exciting cities, it did have a lively and wide-ranging intellectual community, and we see an example of it here – Arabic literary translation, drawing on German art and possibly also on English scholarship. Elias Haddad may not have been a member of the cosmopolitan elite, educated in Istanbul or Europe, but he was a man of learning and sensibility with a genuine contribution to make on an aesthetic level and in the key issues of his time.

Secondly, as I argued in the introduction, whilst ethno-national politics were undoubtedly a major and growing source of conflict in Mandate Palestine, I believe that many of our understandings of the period are filtered through the events of 1948. In Haddad’s work, however, we see a very different vision – a plea not only for ‘tolerance’ but also for ‘equality’ between different religions. If we go back to the different ways in which Lessing’s original work has been read, I suggest that we need to look to the most radical readings of Nathan the Wise to see where Elias Haddad seems to be coming from. His is a model which is not just about behaving well towards the ‘other’, but about not seeing them as other. Whether or not his reading of Lessing’s own views is correct is beside the point; it is the nature of Elias Haddad’s own position which is significant here, in disrupting assumptions that all discussions of Christian, Muslim and Jewish identity in Mandate Palestine must have revolved around competition and conflict. And yet Haddad’s account is not a naively idealistic one; at this point in history it would have been difficult for such naivete to

98 Ami Ayalon, for instance, calls Palestine “a secondary branch of an empire that had known better days” (Reading Palestine, 4) and states that the nahda reached Palestine long after Cairo and Beirut (ibid., 49). Roberto Mazza refers to Jerusalem as a “small provincial centre”, although he goes on to point out that Ottoman rule was not as “calamitous” as it is often portrayed when seen through the lens of the Empire’s final years (Jerusalem: from the Ottomans to the British, 11). Rashid Khalidi goes to the opposite extreme, citing Jerusalem alongside Cairo and Beirut as a “centre of Islamic learning”, which is perhaps too optimistic (Palestinian Identity, 41).
have survived. He fully acknowledges the dangers of fanaticism and of the desire of people of one faith to best those of another – he even acknowledges it most strongly of those within his own faith. His solution – a call for enlightenment values, for modernist ideas of rationalism and humanism, for tradition to be swept away in a search for a universal humankind – may seem in some respects dated and colonial. But put into context, he should be seen as proposing a position which seeks to reclaim Palestine as the place in which such values originate and can flourish, and as such it remains radical even today.

6.2.3 Translation and power

Much discussion of the power and politics of translation assumes that power lies with the translator and with the translator’s culture. The act of domesticating the text – changing names or characteristics to make them accord with the cultural or aesthetic expectations of the reader – tends to be seen as one of violence, based on a perspective from the colonising West and its translation and appropriation of other cultures. Lawrence Venuti’s work on this aspect of translation, whilst of immense value in uncovering some of these power relations, can be critiqued as assuming a unidirectional relationship between source and target cultures. Elias Haddad’s translation of Nathan der Weise can be read as an example of the potential for domestication to function instead as a form of empowerment for the colonised translator. Haddad returns Lessing’s original story to its home setting and in doing so reclaims those values from within the text which he not only believes are praiseworthy, but wants to assert as indigenous to the Middle East. In returning Nathan to its home – perhaps the ultimate in translational domestication – and in making domesticating changes such as the shift from Recha to Rayhana for the name of Nathan’s stepdaughter, Haddad adds layers of meaning beyond those in the play, re-Easternising the story to create a polemical statement about his own time and place.

For Shaden Tageldin, translating European texts into Arabic, rather than an

expression of empowerment or independence, signals the vulnerability of the colonised translator to being a means of colonial seduction, the route by which Western ideas and distortions enter the thinking of colonised subjects. Other scholars, however, have interpreted the phenomenon differently. Sami Zubeida, for instance, has seen foreign texts as offering a neutral space in which different peoples can find common ground, because it is equally alien to all. Written neither by an Arab (Christian or Muslim) or a Jew, but by a German with liberal attitudes towards both, Lessing’s play offers, in this light, the triple advantages of being external/foreign: by a representative of values seen (in the 1930s) as associated with ideas of objectivity and proof in the modernist sense; and from a part of Europe not associated with the Mandatory powers of the contemporary Levant.

In addition to Zubeida’s argument, various writers have noted that translations have been enlisted by national movements all over the world to enrich national literatures or to support particular ideas or cultural trends against political opponents or colonial domination. Venuti mentions the cases of Qing China and Prussia during the Napoleonic Wars; one might also add Marti-Lopez’s contention that translation from French was key – and consciously so – in the development of a national Spanish literature during the nineteenth century, and Birkalan’s discussion of the turn towards Western literature as part of the Turkish secularisation project.

One of the dynamics in this deliberate use of translation by anti-colonial and national movements is that actors select for translation texts containing values or discourses they wish to promote. The translated text, standing at one remove, can be seen as somehow neutral, and therefore powerful, in contested situations.

More than any other work discussed in this thesis, Elias Haddad’s translation
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of *Nathan der Weise* poses significant questions about Palestinian, rather than foreign, readerships. The other titles are all aimed primarily at Anglophone audiences, and in most cases scholarly ones. Haddad’s Arabic text, however, is likely aimed at a domestic readership. It may have been directed at a theatre audience; although we have no knowledge of the play being performed; at this time it was not uncommon for plays to be viewed as texts to be read and the existence of Haddad’s accompanying German-Arabic *Wörterbüchlein* (short dictionary) suggests a pedagogical, rather than theatrical, purpose.\(^{105}\) Indeed, the fact that the dictionary is titled in German, follows left-to-right layout, and is in alphabetical order in German, shows that it is intended either for German-speaking learners of Arabic or advanced Arabic learners of German, disrupting the image of the published version of the play (entirely in Arabic script, right-to-left manuscript assembly, and reviewed in several Arabic-language publications) as a text aimed at Arabic readers. The presence of large amounts of vowelling on the Arabic script in the wordbook suggests an intended audience of students learning Arabic. How to account for this discrepancy? One possibility is that Haddad, having carried out the translation for an Arabic-speaking readership, realised that he also had a useful pedagogical tool; the absence of publication data on the dictionary means that the reference booklet could have been printed simultaneously with or after the play. The information currently available makes reaching a firm conclusion difficult.

The conventional view of literacy amongst the Palestinian Arab population in this period is one of a small, educated elite dwarfed by an illiterate majority, implying that very few people would have had access to a work such as Haddad’s or to coverage of it in the local media. Certainly at the start of the Mandate period literacy was still the preserve of a “thin social layer”.\(^{106}\) Moving beyond this was certainly a slow process, although by 1931 British investigations put literacy amongst the sedentary Arab population at 20%, with Christians at a considerably higher rate than Muslims.\(^{107}\) However, there was also a considerable thirst for news


\(^{106}\) Ayalon, *Reading Palestine*, 2.

\(^{107}\) Ibid., 16-17.
and information, with newspapers often read aloud to large groups in cafes and village guesthouses, and books borrowed from educated individuals or private lending libraries. Economies of scale also played a part, as newspapers shifted from an expensive subscription item to something sold singly on street corners, and as books became increasingly affordable.

The realm of ‘new literacy studies,’ developed in fields such as anthropology since the late 1980s, presents us with possibilities in terms of how we think about access to Haddad’s Arabic work in such a context. As one of the seminal articles of the discipline puts it: “The study of literacy has often presumed dichotomies such as literate vs illiterate, written vs spoken, educated vs uneducated, and modern vs traditional”. This highlights not only the basic issue of whether we understand the Palestinian masses as able to read works such as Haddad’s, but also how we conceptualise the results of that understanding. Such theories have been adopted by scholars of the Middle East and Ottoman Empire to question the idea of a clear-cut binary of il/literate and to explore ways in which texts and their context might be understood to have permeated society. Although some remain sceptical of the extent to which this in-between population’s reading was enough to take in meaningful information, descriptions of these quotidian, functional literacies provide a way of envisaging how ordinary Palestinian Arabs might have at least been aware of Haddad’s opus, through shared newspapers and conversations, even if they never handled or read a copy of the play itself.

Certainly Nathan al-Hakim (as I shall refer to the Arabic version of the play) was reviewed in the general book reviews section of the widely-distributed Arabic magazine al-Hilal in summer 1932, in a two-paragraph piece which occupies one of the page’s two columns. As such, it was brought to the attention of literate readers, but also potentially to those who heard the print media read in public. Headed

---

108 Ibid., 34,54-52,85.
109 Ibid., 91-2.
111 Useful examples in this context include Timothy J. Fitzgerald, “Reaching the Flocks: Literacy and the Mass Reception of Ottoman Law in the Sixteenth-Century Arab World”. Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association 2:1 (2015), 5-20; Hoda Yousef, Composing Egypt.
112 Ayalon, Reading Palestine, 17.
113 Yousef, Composing Egypt, 1.
“Riwayat Nathan al-Hakim – authored by Lessing, the German poet”, the article notes that “[t]his is a religious tale of five chapters which has been translated into many European languages” and then summarises the play and its moral position. It quotes Haddad’s introduction at length in a way which foregrounds the message of co-existence which he draws from the text, but there is no indication of surprise:

The play represents the three revealed faiths – the Mosaic, the Christian and the Islamic; in Asad, the brother of Salah al-Din, the three faiths are embodied. He is Muslim by birth and converts to Christianity and is friends with Nathan the Jew who becomes stepfather to his daughter Rayhana. And Von Filnek is brought together with his sister Rayhana and Salah al-Din as a single family, symbolising the uniting of the three doctrines, and the absence of religious differences, and the connection of the people of each with those of the other – and this is the message of the tale.\textsuperscript{114}

In Palestine, the newspaper \textit{Mirat al-Sharq} reported on the publication of Nathan al-Hakim, describing it as a “poetic” play by the “great German poet” Lessing.\textsuperscript{115} The article, which occupies two-thirds of a column on the inside front page of the paper, starts by summarising the plot of the play as set during the “Crusader wars” and reign of Salah al-Din, and as depicting encounters between the faiths. Haddad’s introduction and explications of the text are described, before the article’s author comments on the difficulty of translating classical European literature due to issues of style, and interprets the message of the play as one of “longing” for past civilisations and values.\textsuperscript{116} 

\textit{Mirat al-Sharq} was edited by the Christian Boulos Shehadeh and associated with the Nashashibi opposition to the Husseini family; on several occasions it criticised the Husseinis, and Palestinian Muslims generally, for raising communal tensions, and defended Jews living in Palestine.\textsuperscript{117} But Shehadeh also differentiated between Zionism and Judaism, and emphasised the need for tolerance, whilst calling

\begin{flushright}
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on Palestinian Arabs to use parliamentary rather than militant means to assert their demands. One of the editors of *Mirat al-Sharq* around the time this article on *Nathan al-Hakim* was published was Akram Zu'aytir, the Nabulsi lawyer and later co-founder of the Istiqlal Party. In 1931 he was arrested for criticising the Zionist movement; when the article on *Nathan* was published he was under house arrest in Nablus.

The short piece thus suggests that Haddad’s translation was uncontroversial to the writers of a newspaper which had a reputation of supporting the British authorities in Palestine, but the editors of which also had a history of critiquing Zionism. The *Mirat al-Sharq* article was the only reaction I could find in the Palestinian press to Haddad’s translation; however, the memory of it survived at least until a list of ‘Palestinian Arabic books’ issued by the Committee for Arabic Culture in Palestine in 1946. On the other hand, an extensive article on *Nathan the Wise* in the Egyptian journal *Al-Risala* in late 1945 made no mention of Haddad’s translation; outside Palestine it seems to have drifted out of memory.

Stereotyped and ahistoric understandings of Arab and particularly Palestinian attitudes towards Jewish people have led to the assumption that Haddad’s translation of *Nathan der Weise* was an unusual, if not unique, event, and that the support for tolerance expressed within it was a European import with little longterm impact on the Palestinian psyche. This is not borne out by reactions such as that of the *al-Hilal* and *Mirat al-Sharq* articles, or by broader studies of concepts of tolerance in Arabophone political thought, as discussed by significant figures from the nahda for a century before Haddad’s work. With particular reference to Lessing’s play, though, the existence of at least two possible versions of *Nathan der Weise* in the Arabic-speaking world prior to Haddad’s printed translation also affects how we
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should understand the 1932 edition.

The first of these was a play written in Beirut in the 1870s which drew heavily on Lessing’s work. *Intisar al-Fadila aw Hadithat al-Ibna al-Isra’iliyya* (“The Victory of Virtue, or The Story of the Jewish Girl”) was penned by Antun Shihaybar Bey, a Lebanese lawyer, teacher and writer, possibly of Jewish origin, who taught at various Christian and Jewish schools in Beirut during the 1870s.123 Antun and his brother Ilyas Shihaybar were authors of a number of plays performed at Tiferet Yisrael school (of which Antun was director) between 1875 and 1883 as end-of-year events; *Intisar al-Fadila* was produced as one of this series in April 1879. The suggestion that *Intisar al-Fadila* could be based on *Nathan* would not have been a slur to the Shihaybars; adapting works from European writers was normal amongst Middle Eastern writers of the period, and the brothers drew on Moliere for several of their other plays.124

In a speech of unknown date at Tiferet Yisrael, Shihaybar called himself an advocate for “the noble religion of Judaism”, but also identified himself with “We, the Syrian Arabs” and a hope of “Long live the Syrian, Arab, Jewish director” of the school.125 This recognition and promotion of a combined Arab-Jewish identity and of the Jewish role in Arab linguistic and cultural revivalism chimes with the themes and messages of the play. *Intisar al-Fadila* replicates Nathan’s themes, plot and characters,126 but expresses a sense of Arab-Jewish cultural unity linked to the political and social context in which Shihaybar was writing. Both the 1860 Druze-Maronite conflict and Damascus ‘blood libel’ incident of 1840 were within living memory, and portrayals of unity may have been intended to counter sectarian ideas.127 Whilst an end-of-year school play may seem a parochial environment, the Shihaybars were prolific and prominent writers, poets and translators. The plays at Tiferet Yisrael were announced in the local press (other plays by the brothers had
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been produced at the National Theatre) and attended by the Governor of Syria, Midhat Pasha.\textsuperscript{128} So this “first time in the history of modern Arabic drama that plays had been written with modern Jewish dramatis personae, set in a Jewish milieu... with the entertainment of a Jewish audience in mind”\textsuperscript{129} may well have reached a surprisingly wide and influential audience.

The second possible version of Nathan der Weise was performed on April 16, 1882 in Cairo. Faraq ba’d al-Diq (The release from suffering) was, like Lessing’s play, set in Crusader Jerusalem and featured a similar central character, an elderly Jewish man named Nathan, and a theme of religious toleration. This play was also staged before an august audience, including the Khedive, ministers, foreign consuls and other figures from the local elite. It was reviewed in Al-Ahram, which “praised the excellent performance of Shaykh Salama in singing the role of Nathan. Some Europeans were heard to remark that even their actors were not up to his standard and again the audience demanded encores”.\textsuperscript{130}

Whether or not Elias Haddad was aware of these earlier adaptations of Nathan der Weise into Arabic, they highlight that the play, and its message, were not alien to the Arab world, and that they had a longstanding appeal to Eastern audiences. This reinforces my argument that Haddad was not trying to introduce foreign, enlightened ideas to readers of his translation, but that these were positions he saw as already present in his society. He may have thought his readers or audiences were in need of a reminder, but this may well have been a reminder of the better side of German culture, not just of the potential for Arab-Jewish amity within his own society.

Haddad’s choice of play and the contents of his paratextual writings point clearly to a view of Palestinian history and culture as diverse, tolerant and Arab in nature, completely in keeping with the ideas which permeate the ethnographic and other writings of Haddad, Stephan and Canaan.

\begin{footnotes}
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6.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined Stephan Stephan’s translation and analysis of a collection of Palestinian folksongs, which he saw as embodying continuities and parallels with the Biblical Song of Songs, and the versification of a selection from this research by E. Powys Mathers. I contrasted the results of these works with Elias Haddad’s translation of and paratextual materials for an Arabic edition of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s German Enlightenment play Nathan the Wise, with its message of Arab-Jewish-Christian coexistence.

Stephan’s translations of Palestinian folksongs and comparison of them with the Biblical Song of Songs, and the subsequent versioning of them by Mathers and Attwater, follows rather the opposite trajectory to Haddad’s work on Nathan. Stephan’s initial work on the songs and intertwining of their themes with those of the Canticles suggests a mirroring of Haddad’s re-appropriation project, emphasising the Palestinian provenance and continuity of the Biblical poetry and proposing a broad definition of the term ‘Palestinian’ which incorporates Jewish/Hebrew as well as Arabic and other identities and cultures. But the ‘re-re-appropriation’ of the texts by the British versifiers strips much of this out, eliminating the distinctiveness of Stephan’s interpretations and commentary. Whilst the project emphasises my point about the multi-layered and international networks in which Palestinian cultural production must be located, with Stephan’s work finding its way into artistic circles in interwar Britain, it also shows how the ripples issuing outwards from the Palestinian creator flatten and dissipate as they encounter the Western transformation. If Stephan was fully aware of the Mathers versioning of his folkloric research, and hoped that it represented a way to communicate Palestinian culture to Anglophone audiences, he would have been disappointed by the results.

In choosing to translate Nathan der Weise into Arabic in Palestine in the aftermath of the 1929 violence in Jerusalem, Hebron and Safad, Elias Haddad goes beyond an urging of foreign values onto the translation’s Arabic-speaking audience. The play’s outward foreignness offers Haddad the opportunity to highlight values which he sees as needed in his immediate environment – diversity, tolerance and the
transcendence of difference – not to promote them to his audience but to re/claim them as indigenous to that audience. Contra Tageldin’s argument that the colonised subject is seduced into making foreign values seem indigenous through translation into Arabic, I believe that Haddad’s intention is to bring this play set in Jerusalem ‘back home’, to reject the claim of the European Enlightenment to be the sole possessor and arbiter of tolerance, and instead to assert the Palestinian domesticity of toleration and religious equality. In this reading, I see conflict between Jews, Christians and Muslims not as intrinsic to the Levant, but as something introduced to or imposed on the region by European (Crusader/Zionist and British colonial) interventions. This is not to argue that Haddad’s translation should be seen as part of the ‘national movement’ in a purposive sense. Rather, I suggest that he is putting forward a version of Palestinian identity that was common in daily discourse, taking European Enlightenment ideas drawn from his German-influenced upbringing and blending them with his view of the Levantine social environment and Palestinian history and values to create a coherent whole.

As Mona Elshakry says of late nineteenth century translations and discussions of Darwin in the Arabic-speaking world:

If we understand translation to be a creative act, or a complex process of textual arbitrage, then we can no longer assume that the original text is the only source of meaning. If we want to understand how knowledge production is “socially embedded,” then we need only view the same text read in different contexts.131

Gotthold Lessing’s eighteenth-century play was intended to display Jewish virtue and monotheistic brotherhood, and thus to promote tolerance towards Jews in pre-emancipation Europe. Shifting its context to 1930s Palestine and re-orientalising the play and its characters, Haddad’s version conveys a new set of meanings, projecting values of tolerance not specifically towards a marginalised Jewish population but instead demanding equality for Arabs being pushed aside by both the Mandate authorities and Zionist immigrants. Whilst Elias Haddad may to some extent be urging toleration towards Jewish incomers on the part of his Arab brethren, the re-

131 Elshakry, Darwin in Arabic, 18.
orientalisation of Recha to Rayhana, and its Quranic echoes, especially when set alongside the positive portrayal of Salah al-Din, highlights the narrative of Christian and Jewish well-being under Islamic rule – a central theme of much Arab nationalism of the era.

When read in tandem, these two examples highlight the usefulness of ideas of domestication and foreignisation in understanding the trajectory of a work of translation, and the purposes and impacts which might be embodied in it. If Stephan’s scholarship on Palestinian folksongs and their Biblical parallels proposed an inclusive version of “Palestinian” identity and a cultural continuity which asserted the diverse influences which had created that identity, Mathers’ domesticated versions in English lose much of that message. Their generic Orientalism lacks contextual relevance to the cultural and historical debates of Stephan’s environment. In re-orientalising Nathan the Wise, however, Haddad achieves the reverse, taking a play which used a Jerusalem setting to make a point to eighteenth-century German audiences, rendering it instead relevant to his own environment. But Haddad’s act of orientalisation is not a foreignisation but an act of ultimate domestication, bringing the imagined Jerusalem of Lessing’s original back home to the realities of its setting, and using it to both reclaim and urge a spirit of autochthonous Palestinian Enlightenment.
7 Conclusion

The purpose with which this thesis began was an exploration of the lives and works of three Arab scholars, resident in Jerusalem in the closing years of the Ottoman Empire and through the period of British Mandate rule in Palestine. Elias Nasrallah Haddad and Stephan Hanna Stephan are little-studied figures, whilst the ethnographic writings of their comrade, Tawfiq Canaan, have been more widely examined. A consideration of their non-ethnographic books, articles and pamphlets, however, reveals new aspects to the trajectories of Palestinian intellectual life and scholarship in this key period in the region’s history, and highlights the complexities of interactions between the cultural and political spheres, and between colonised and coloniser in the Levantine intellectual field.

In order to understand the dynamics of Haddad, Stephan and Canaan’s cultural, intellectual, and political lives, the concepts of networked and entangled people and ideas, rarely used in the Palestinian history of this period, are illuminating. These concepts permit an acknowledgement of relations, contacts and influences across lines of imperial and colonial power in ways which do not inherently apply judgements about right and wrong, resistance and collaboration, through which the history of Palestine is often viewed. They allow an appreciation of the agency of people such as Canaan, Haddad and Stephan, existing within colonial settings, often working with intellectual paradigms associated with colonialism, but also making what I have argued to be active, tactical or strategic decisions and choices about who they work with and the ideas they use. Studies of cultural and intellectual fields such as archaeology, anthropology, religion and translation often foreground the destructive, oppressive aspects of their roles in colonial power relations. This study does not deny this side to their disciplinary histories. But it instead focuses on the microhistorical level, in which indigenous scholars such as my subjects did exercise some agency over the ideas and concepts they adopted or discarded, and sometimes used the resources provided through colonial institutions to resistant ends.

This is not to overstate and over-idealise these spaces and forms of agency. Certainly, the colonised can attempt to represent themselves to the coloniser but in the end the latter possesses structural power, and the ability to accept or reject any practical
repercussions that representation might have. But in the fields in which Stephan, Haddad and Canaan operated – ethnography, translation, education of formal and informal kinds – there is still a scope, and even a necessity, to regard the works these men produced as narratives and texts which bear within them an assertion of important ideas. We might read some of them as resistances; to the Zionist settlement project, or at times to hegemonic forms of Palestinian Arab nationalism. Elias Haddad’s Arabic version of Nathan der Weise might, in its quiet way, be the most drastic example of this, reminding Muslims of their history of tolerance towards Jews and Christians, showing Jews that the Muslims of Palestine should be their brothers and not their enemies, warning Eastern Christians of the dangers of trusting overmuch in their pugnacious Western co-religionists, but also pointing out to Western readers the long history of autochthonous tolerance in Bilad al-Sham. These ideas and messages may have been sidelined in the aftermath of the Nakba and the struggle for the recognition of Palestinian rights, but their existence prior to 1948 is an important corrective to many of the stereotypes and binaries with which the Arab-Jewish relationship is viewed.

My route through these questions has been a blend of the historical and textual. Piecing together biographical information on Stephan, Haddad and Canaan, and on two of the key institutions which linked them, the Syrische Waisenhaus and the Palestine Oriental Society, highlights the extent to which the story of middle-class, intellectual Jerusalem in this period is one of entangled and interlinked people and ideas. As the lives and works of these men and the broader history around them show, the vibrant and productive meshing of Arab, European, Jewish, colonial, Christian, Muslim and other categories in the Late Ottoman period unravelled under the weight of British colonialism and Zionist territorial aims, when identities became increasingly more rigid, and took on ever more hostile political meanings. This is not a “what-if” narrative of idealised Arab-Jewish relations in the Ottoman context, but an acknowledgement that the political categories by which the history and society of Palestine is now popularly understood are contingent, the results of choices made over decades, at international, colonial, military, political, regional and local levels.

Building on my biographical research into Canaan, Stephan and Haddad’s lives, my analyses of a selection of their writings and translations provided the individual cases
through which these networks of intellectual and social connection, and dynamics of power and agency, could be explored in finer detail. The language manuals considered in the first of these cases, authored and published by Elias Haddad, with various collaborators, between 1909 and 1955, and by Stephan Stephan in 1935, show how a trajectory which began with Haddad and Spoer’s positive East-West co-operation, responding to both Anglophone pedagogical needs and Arabic cultural debates, shifted during the Mandate period. In this new environment, more clear-cut colonial implications became apparent in the project of teaching colloquial Palestinian Arabic. Haddad’s joint enterprise with W.F. Albright fell victim to the latter’s growing sympathy for the Zionist political project, whilst Stephan’s foray into language textbooks with the Jewish company Steimatzyk’s quickly reached a dead end in the shape of the 1936-39 Uprising and the shrinking possibility of Arab-Jewish co-operative projects.

The subsequent chapter continued this study of the trio’s Anglophone works, examining Tawfiq Canaan’s 1936 nationalist pamphlets, published in support of the General Strike and the cause of Arab Palestinian rights, in juxtaposition with Stephan Stephan’s WWII-era English-language tourist guides. I read both of these as attempts by educated Palestinian Arabs, who considered themselves as part of a regional modernity influenced but not dominated by Western learning, to appeal to Anglophone audiences in a declining political situation. With increasing levels of Jewish immigration, hardening lines between Arab and Jewish communities, and more defined nationalist positions on both sides, the scope for projects carried out with Jewish or colonial colleagues was declining. But political and historical contingencies still shaped the kinds of texts which these men produced at different times. In 1936, in the context of the Uprising, political pamphlets making a direct appeal must have seemed, to Canaan and his comrades in the Arab Higher Committee, a vital way to reach out to British people who might be persuaded to support Palestinian Arab demands. By quoting British politicians, officials and academics back at this readership, and by deploying language and examples which emphasised Arab claims to modernity and Western-defined civilisation, Canaan hoped to sway his readers away from stereotypes of exoticism and savagery.

A similar message permeates Stephan’s tourist guides, which highlight new Arab neighbourhoods, technological proficiency and cultural values in a fashion designed to
foster Anglo-Arab rapprochement. But in 1942, with the revolt crushed and Stephan’s German-educated colleagues Canaan and Haddad under suspicion from the British authorities, political pamphlets were no longer the format of choice. Instead, tourist guides aimed at British and Commonwealth troops on leave from the North African front were a means to reach out to British opinion, and offer a view of Palestinian Arab life and culture at odds with orientalist stereotypes and pro-Zionist propaganda.

Chapters 5 and 6 shift from the issues of power and agency embedded in the decision of the colonised intellectual to write in a colonial language, and turn instead to the way in which these dynamics run through projects of translation. My explorations of Haddad’s work on the poetry of the Bedouin warrior Nimr Ibn ’Adwan, the images projected by these translations and exegeses, and the dynamics of Haddad and Spoer’s working relationship, is juxtaposed with the example of Stephan’s shorter-lived co-operation with the Galician-Jewish orientalist scholar Leo Mayer. This comparison highlights the way in which the historical conditions under which each piece of work unfolded impacted on whether, and how, Arab-Jewish partnerships could operate. In the case of Stephan and Mayer’s work on the Palestine section of Evliya Çelebi’s Seyahatnâme, a temporal perspective on the project reveals the point at which an intellectual fascination with Islamicate material culture and a sympathetic attitude to Arab-Jewish coexistence ceased to be enough to hold together the co-operation between the two scholars under the pressures of the 1936-39 Uprising. In this instance, we witness the limits political conditions impose on even the most intellectual, discursive explorations of co-existence.

My final pair of texts engages with the place of orientalism and orientalist discourses in thinking about translation in Mandate Palestine. Here, the texts juxtaposed enabled me to consider the appropriation of Palestinian literature by British versioners and publishers, and the effects of this on the depictions of Palestine and the East presented to the reader. Stephan’s collection, transliteration and translation of Palestinian folksongs, and comparison of them with Biblical and Classical Arabic examples, represents a first stage of appropriation in the sequence of texts. But in this case, I argue that we can see a certain unity of purpose between Stephan and his sources, in that his publication of them is intended both to preserve the songs, but also to use them to assert
the value and validity of a Palestinian Arab culture, under conditions in which the peasant singers of the collection were those most vulnerable to dispossession by immigrant Zionists. However, in the second stage of the sequence, the poems derived from the songs by the British orientalist versifier E. Powys Mathers represent a more complete appropriation of the folksongs. Mathers removed from them words and phrases specific to time and place, rendering them into generically “Oriental” works, distant from their Palestinian origins, linked instead to a vaguely exotic, vaguely Biblical image of a “Lebanon” detached politically and culturally from the songs’ starting-points. As such, this latter work highlights the limitations of translation as a method of cultural communication, and as a means of resistance.

Elias Haddad’s translation of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s German Enlightenment play *Nathan der Weise* from German to Arabic, however, represents a reversal of this process. Lessing located his parable of tolerance and co-existence between Jews, Christians and Muslims in a Jerusalem he never visited, but which he researched deeply in the best traditions of orientalist scholarship. The resulting script and characters hold little that, in the eyes of eighteenth-century Germans, would have seemed particularly Eastern; this was as Lessing intended, since his principal aim was not to present an exotic scene, but to convince his audiences of his moral and social message about Jewish emancipation.

In Elias Haddad’s hands, however, the play is re-orientalised. This partly takes place within the translation itself, with the character of Recha becoming Rayhana, a name more familiar to Arabic-speaking audiences. But Haddad’s main act of reappropriation takes place in his paratextual materials to the 1932 published edition of *Nathan al-Hakim*. In these, he picks up the threads of Lessing’s message and directs it, not at eighteenth-century Germans, but at the various communities of his own era, be they Palestinian Germans looking to the rise of fascism back home, the British authorities fostering religious divisions, or Jews and Arabs in Palestine itself. This is not a concession by Haddad that these values of tolerance and co-existence originate with the European Enlightenment and need to be brought to Palestine. Rather, his choice of *Nathan der Weise* as a play and the discourses employed in his paratextuals assert them as Levantine virtues. In this reading, it was Lessing who needed to look to the Orient for his examples.
of toleration and respect between faith communities. Haddad is simply bringing a work of literature back to its origins in order to reinvigorate a conversation about its ethical positions. These two examples highlight the complexities of power relations and politics in translation, in which indigeneity does not guarantee an innocent position within translational transactions, and conventional understandings of colonial power structures can be undermined by acts of re-appropriation and reclamation.

This thesis not only foregrounds the ideas of Stephan, Haddad and Canaan in the sense of showing the diversity of thought in their time and place; on a methodological level, it also highlights the usefulness of using networks and the ‘strength of weak ties’ to think about life in Late Ottoman and Mandate Palestine, and particularly Jerusalem. This was a place of rapid changes in population, politics, culture and socio-technical environment, and a place to and from which foreign researchers, religious and civil servants came and went. Considering how information, ideas and values might have been discussed and disseminated therefore gives us scope for understanding how native scholars might have encountered and processed different schools of thought and sources of information and knowledge. Without glorifying the colonial environment (it is certainly possible to think of ways in which these exchanges might happen without occupation and imperialism), ideas of network and entanglement gives us space to understand how Palestinian Arabs writers and educationalists might have taken ideas and cultural influences, triaged them, and reshaped them through their own experiences and comprehensions.

In this model, ideas from colonial countries are not necessarily always seen as imposed; the colonised is credited with agency and understanding, and the ability to analyse and unpick as they see fit. This is still a relationship tainted by power, in which the coloniser is able to enforce material and cultural values which distort the colonised culture. But to see colonial power relations and distortions as inevitable and unidirectional is to deprive the colonised of their agency. Networks are, from the examples of this study, one way of thinking through this impasse.

Overall, one of the main lessons to be drawn from these examples is that there was no inevitable, predestined downward trajectory to Arab-Jewish relations in Palestine. They show that on both the discursive and practical levels, trends of Arab-Jewish
interaction and co-operation ran throughout society and its intellectual products. The bloody and traumatic outcomes of 1948 were the historically contingent result of decades of interplay between colonialism, Zionism, and nationalism. But conversely, these cases also highlight the strength of the downward slide, when we read them as a whole and in context. Despite the robust will to tolerance we witness in the various collaborations and ideas of Canaan, Haddad and Stephan’s writings and working lives, there is also a constant overshadowing by colonial and hierarchical priorities. And, as we see in the historical trajectories of these working relationships and written works, external events made this malevolent presence stronger and stronger over the Mandate years.

One final point: much of the significance which I have argued for Stephan, Haddad and Canaan’s work has been in the realms of identity and representation, ‘showing’ Palestine to the Other through language manuals, translations and guidebooks. But another implication of this piece of research is, I believe, the contribution its use of unstudied texts makes to the ongoing reclamation of Palestinian ethnography and historiography, and putting Arab scholars and writers centre stage in this history. This is, of course, a project already in process, as the literature review in the Introduction to this thesis showed. But the study of the Palestinian Arab place in the archaeology and anthropology of Palestine has, as yet, nothing on the scale of Donald Malcolm Reid and Elliott Colla’s documentation of the place of native scholars in Egyptian histories and museums, or Elena Corbett’s study of colonialism and archaeology in Jordan, and the examples of Yusif Kana’an and Dschirius Jusif are a reminder that there is much more yet to discover.

With the additional threat that Zionist and Israeli colonialism has posed to Palestinian history, archaeology, archives and heritage (including the personal library of Tawfiq Canaan himself), this endeavour becomes all the more necessary. The current plans (backed by Israeli courts) to relocate the Rockefeller Museum library, where Stephan Hanna Stephan spent most of his professional life, from Austen Harrison’s East Jerusalem building to the under-construction Schottenstein National Campus for the

---

Archaeology of Israel, only adds new emphasis to the urgency of this project.²
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