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Abstract

This study deals with the translation into English of the cryptic terms which Palestinian prisoners have nomenclatured in response to the harsh life conditions in the Israeli jails. These terms were collected through interviews with five newly freed Palestinian prisoners who served long terms in the Israeli jails. The terms cover some aspects of daily life in prison, including security, social, military, and food terms. This study identifies the terms in the pragmatic frame of reference for these terms, and then it provides suitable translations by the researcher into English seeking to capture these pragmatic imports. This study found that these terms have drifted from their original semantic usages and acquired new applications prompted by Palestinian prisoners’ needs for socializing, maneuvering, and self- and mate-security concerns. In the majority of cases, the translators are advised to identify the precise intended meaning and then use communicative translation in order to faithfully render the pragmatic meaning in the target language.
Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Introduction:

Translation is a process that helps people of different cultures and languages to communicate with each other; hence, it is the translator’s job to establish mutual understanding between source and target cultures. Translators build bridges between nations. Italo Calvino said, “Without translation, I would be limited to the borders of my own country. The translator is my most important ally. He introduces me to the world” (as cited in MacShane, 1983, p.1).

Translators labor diligently in order to reproduce the effect and implicit meaning of the source language (SL) text in the target language (TL); that is, the communicative, pragmatic, and semiotic properties should be preserved through translation to convey the full intended meaning. Nida (1964) argues that translation must be concerned with the receptor’s response. Therefore, the translator should attempt to translate the meaning of the original text bearing in mind that this translation should have the same impact on the receptors.

This study is concerned with the daily use of language by the Palestinian prisoners; its translation therefore will need to reflect this specific context of use where speakers create their own language community using terms that are specific to their environment. Palestinian
prisoners use their terms to express facts, ideas or events that are communicable because they refer to a shared knowledge about the prison culture.

Kramsch (1998) argues that language expresses cultural reality; that is, language is not a culture-free code, distinct from the way people think and behave. Words that reflect their users’ attitudes, beliefs, and their point of view, will be a part of shared history and traditions which consists of the group’s identity and play a great role in the perpetuation of the culture they circulate within. Eventually, in a mutual relationship, culture which is the product of socially and historically situated discourse communities, will be created and shaped by language. (pp. 3-10).

Palestinian prisoners’ culture has been neglected in studies despite the fact that it represents a unique phenomenon, specifically in the language area. In most cases, even though the prisoners’ terms have drifted away from their original semantic meanings in this context, they continue to have a connection with the original literal meaning. Thus, the researchers intend to highlight the intentional pragmatic ambiguities created by vagueness in prisoners’ terms in order to create a repository of prison terminology.

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, this is the first study which examines the translation of Palestinian prisoners’ terms into English. The present study sheds light on the origin of these terms and their acquired connotations which, of course, are not listed in standard dictionaries.
1.2 Study Context:

At the outset, it is important to provide a brief historical background which explains the context in which thousands of Palestinian prisoners were sentenced to jail in Israeli prisons. Such background is important in order to understand the context in which these terms were created.

On May 14th, 1948, only one day before ending the British mandate over Palestine, the Independent State of Israel was declared. Since then, the Israeli occupation army has maintained control over Palestinian lands and populations. The Israelis controlled all of the prisons previously built by the Turkish and British governments which they used to detain Palestinians. The army acquired many documents from the British authorities including the names of Palestinian activists and other members of the Palestinian resistance movements.

The story of resistance and imprisonment unfolded and many Palestinians ended up serving imprisonment periods in Israeli jails. Al-Haj, the manager of Abu-Jihad Museum for the Prisoners Movement Affairs, made it clear that at the time of this research, 7,200 Palestinians are detained in Israeli Jails. He himself served more than ten years in Israeli jails from 1978-1985, 1988-1989, 1989-1991.

Al-Haj described the conditions in the jails: “The prisoners are summoned for roll call three times a day in the prison rooms. When they arrive at the cells, which are used for investigation before being moved to
jails, prisoners are held up in crowded rooms and are subjected to various kinds of physical and psychological violence for 18-90 days. Moreover, they are offered very poor food, not permitted to see daylight for more than half an hour each day, and prohibited from performing acts of worship as well. These prisoners live in dark jail rooms and continue to fight for their freedom.” (Al-Haj, 2016, p.26, author’s translation).

One of the means that Palestinian prisoners use to demand their rights are food strikes. These strikes are held to demand very simple rights such as having access to books, notebooks, pens, more blankets, or food. The first stage of the prisoners’ organization movement came between 1967-1976. At that stage, the Israelis tried several punishment measures to prevent the prisoners from uniting by spreading rumors among them and by using physical violence to suppress any attempts to organize. As a result, prisoners launched two hunger strikes in 1969: one at the prison in Al-Ramla that lasted 11 days and another at Asqalan Prison that lasted for 7 days and resulted in the death of Abd Al-Qader Abu Al-Fahem. A year later, the prisoners grew more courageous and started to make other protests, including setting fires in the prison and throwing clothes outside their rooms. However, no serious rights were achieved at this stage (Al-Haj, 2014, pp. 60-68, author’s translation).

The second more successful attempt at organizing prison movement covers 1976-1987. The prisoners at Asqalan Prison sustained a hunger strike for more than 45 days, broke the strike for a week, and then
continued for 20 days more. This resulted in a mature attempt by the prisoners to organize themselves by holding elections for the various Palestinian factions inside the jail to choose their representatives. The representatives were chosen to communicate the prisoners’ demands to the jailors (Al-Haj, 2014, pp. 69-74, author’s translation).

The third stage of the prisoners’ struggle (1987-1993) was during the First Intifada which resulted in the incarceration of thousands of Palestinians. The prisons at that time were held in miserable jail conditions in An-naqab (name of a desert) prison as snakes and scorpions filled the jails, the prisoners’ hands and feet were tied under the burning sun, and jailors used to violently attack the prisoners. Moreover, the jailors broke the agreements which they had made with the prisoners during the second stage. As a result, Palestinian prisoners went on strike again in 1992. This new strike included sixteen prisons and thirteen thousand prisoners and was considered the largest and most organized strike conducted by the prisoners’ movement. Before they ended this strike, the prisoners achieved many of their demands including better food, increased time of visits, and lengthening breaks from half an hour into an hour. (Al-Haj, 2014, pp. 75-80, author’s translation).

Clearly, the Palestinian prisoners have demonstrated that organizing themselves is one crucial step towards creating one political representing body which is responsible for defending their rights. Language is one tool they use for organizing themselves. They use language to document their
daily realities in jail. A range of terms were created as a result of these harsh, intimidating and often life-threatening circumstances in Israeli jails.

1.3 Statement of the Problem:

Palestinian prisoners’ terms are one that are specific to the prison culture, and thus they should initially be classified as prison cultural-specific items (PCSIs). It is important to consider how these PCSIs could be translated. A specific prison experience is encoded in the term which should be decoded by the translator. Translators like ourselves are often researchers who are not familiar with the prison’s life or prison conditions. Therefore, one major problem in dealing with these terms would be the translator access to the exact conditions which lead to the creation of the term in the first place. Without adequate cultural and pragmatic competence regarding these prisoners’ terms, the TT will distort the intended messages.

Another problem related to translation practice has to do with the most often used equivalent type which is literal translation. The literal meaning of these terms will result in a distorted and nonsensical translation. The translator must in fact immerse him/her self enough in the prison context; only when s/he has done this that s/he could cater for the target audience’s lack of familiarity with the source context. Accordingly, the communicative translation method becomes necessary to carry the pragmatic import inherent within the original term.
This leads to the third problematic issue which considers the audience of translation. That is, whether translating for researcher and critics or the Israeli authorities, for example. Whereas the translator aims to clarity and document prisoners’ experiences the way it is and the way Palestinian prisoners aim to in the first case, s/he would maintain the ambiguity of these terms when rendering it to Israeli authorities for security purposes. Thus, If the target audience is Israeli authorities of prisoners’ affairs, literal translation is helpful. However, the literal meaning of these terms when translating to researcher and critics will result in a distorted and nonsensical translation.

1.4 Questions of the Study:

This research seeks to answer the following questions in order to address the three major challenges which may arise when translating coded prison language:

1. How does a translator into English deal with terms that have emerge as a result of a certain condition within a certain context and gain new meanings for specific purposes?

2. How feasible is it to transfer all the pragmatic meanings of these terms into a new culture where the receivers are not aware of prisoners’ experiences? And when it is not feasible, to what extent would the translator compromise the full ST meaning when rendering these terms into English?
3. To what extent would other translators of interviews, autobiographies, or any other literary works by prisoners benefit from the outcomes of this study?

1.5 Purpose of the Study:

This study is meant to examine and analyze Palestinian prisoners’ terms from a translational perspective by investigating the pragmatic problems like indirect speech acts and the contextual use of terms which translators may encounter in this area. This study also investigated the communicative purposes behind the terms in order to suggest the best possible translation. The proposed translations aim to convey the pragmatic imports into the target culture with minimal loss of meaning and effect.

This thesis produces a list of the terms and their translations for the benefit of researchers, critics, and translators of prisoner interviews, autobiographies, diaries, novels, plays and other prison literature. By and large, it aims to make the terms available for those who are interested in the prison literature, literary critics, translators, scholars, or even ordinary Arabic readers who are interested in studying the various aspects of prison experience. What is more, the manager of Abu-Jihad Museum for Prisoners’ Affairs encouraged turning this study into a published book sponsored by their center as many foreigners usually ask for English works that show the experience of the prisoners’ movement.
1.6 Significance of the Study:

The thesis offers suitable translations after identifying the problems in translating these terms by examining concepts such as pragmatic and metaphorical usage of language, CSIs, and the context of utterances. After that, these terms are documented along with their definitions and translations in order to create a corpus for future studies to those who are interested in prisoners’ culture in the new edition of the *Encyclopedia of Palestinian and Arab Detainees Experience* published by the Abu Jihad Museum for the Prisoners Movement Affairs. This encyclopedia includes stories about prisoners’ experiences, investigations, arrest, and terms related to these experiences. As it aims to spread a national knowledge about the prisoners’ case, every edition aims to offer a more insightful look inside the prison’s walls. The translated terms of this study will be part of the third edition aimed to be published in (2017). Finally, the thesis suggests solutions to these problems for similar terms and speech communities.

1.7 Methodology:

This research is qualitative and depends for collecting data on three main sources. Firstly, personal interviews were conducted with five freed male Palestinian prisoners who served a life sentence in different Israeli jails in order to collect qualitative data related to the prisoners’ intentions behind using the coded terms. Serving a long sentence was an important requirement in selecting the informants since these prisoners will more
likely have precise knowledge of the prison culture and the daily activities. Their prison periods varied from 1970s until 2010. Some of them served their sentences over intermittent periods of time, where they would be released and then recaptured and sentenced back to prison. The five prisoners appeared to be more educated than the average prisoners which facilitated the process of gathering and discussing Palestinian prisoners’ terms. The second source is the *Encyclopedia of Palestinian and Arab Detainees Experience* (2015) published by the Abu Jihad Museum for the Prisoners Movement Affairs. The final source is the diaries and literary works published by Palestinian prisoners.

The researcher collected about twenty three terms. The reason behind examining these terms in particular is that these terms have deviated from their original meanings and developed a new set of conventions within the prison context. Moreover, they are found in a large group of Arabic prisoners’ literature and many other works and diaries or smuggled messages. Some of these literary works are as clarified in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Literary work</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Thaqafa Mafquda</em> (Missed-Culture) (author’s translation)</td>
<td>Mahmoud Talahma</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>An-Nafaq</em> play (The tunnel) (author’s translation)</td>
<td>Walid Al-Hudali</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Aumahat fi Madafin Al-Ahya</em>’ (Mothers in the cemeteries above Ground) (author’s translation)</td>
<td>Walid Al-Hudali</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Khams Nujoom Tahta Al-Sifr</em> (Five Stars below the Zero point) (author’s translation)</td>
<td>Hatim Al-Shunnar</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Wamadat min Khalf Al-Qudban</em> (Flashes from behind the Bars) (author’s translation)</td>
<td>Ahmed Abu Al-Suood</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Min Adab Al-Sujoon/Intifadat Al-Joo’</em> (From the Prison Literature/ Hunger’s Uprising) (author’s translation)</td>
<td>Tayseer Nasrallah</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Basamat I’lamyyah fi Alsahafa Al I’tiqalyya</em> (Media’s Fingerprints in the Detainees’ Journalism) (author’s translation)</td>
<td>Ameen Abu-Wardeh</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These terms’ origins and implications were subsequently elaborated in the interviews with the five informants. This step aimed to clarify these terms’ vagueness as it could be resulted in the distortion of the message that prisoners intend to convey at the first hand. In other words, terms that have deviated from their original meanings and developed a new set conventions within the prison context. These prison specific meanings were then compared with the literal significance of the words as used in everyday Arabic. Such comparisons allowed the researcher to identify the pragmatic import for these terms. The implicit meanings of these terms guide the translator’s choice in identifying the translation most appropriate
for the intended receivers’ background of those who are interested of approaching the prison experience and study the prison culture in general.

Then, the gathered terms were classified into four categories (i.e. security, social, military, and food) based on Newmarks’ (1988) categories of culture (i.e. material culture, social culture, organizations and customs) (pp. 94-102). The security terms were duly classified as metaphorical terms, while the social, military, and food terms were deemed non-metaphorical (except Il-bursh, see p. 54, 55 which is a synecdoche but has no security purposes beyond its use). Still whether the term has metaphorical connotations or is void of such connotations, it had certain prison-culture implications which do not exist outside the prison context. A twofold analysis was then conducted: the SL terms (see Appendix A) were examined and analyzed first, and then the target translation (TT) were analyzed in order to justify the researcher’s translational choice of certain translation strategies.

Finally, the researcher pinpoints the difficulties translators will encounter when transferring the pragmatic meaning of these terms from Arabic into English. The researcher also offers strategies to deal with such difficulties and suggests equivalent translations and determines the degree of acceptability of these equivalents based on the extent to which they violate and distort the message conveyed in order to reach suitable translations for these terms.
1.8 Structure of the Study:

This thesis is divided into four chapters:

Chapter One is the introductory section. It introduces the main problem of the study. It also shows what the study aims to achieve, states its significance, and introduces the research questions. Finally, it includes the corpus of the study and the methods of data analysis.

Chapter Two presents the previous studies relevant to the topic. It discusses communicative translation as a translational approach. This chapter also focuses on issues like translatability, metaphor, CSIs, and pragmatics.

Chapter Three is the analysis of data and discussion. It analyzes the prisoners’ terms pragmatically. The points of analysis in this part are the metaphorical and cultural references of Palestinian prisoners’ terms. An attempt has been made to provide some suggested translations for these terms.

Chapter Four gives the findings of the study. It also offers a number of recommendations for translating prisoners’ terms.

1.9 Theoretical Framework:

The theoretical framework of the present research is based on the functional approach which considers translation to be a communicative action carried out by experts in intercultural communication. Nord (1997a)
explains, “The translator plays the role of text producer aiming at some communicative purposes” (p. 151). Using a functional approach in translating prisoners’ terms offers a theoretical framework to describe particular translation strategies which can avoid producing a meaningless literal translation.

Nord (2005) defined two basic types of translation methods: documentary translations and instrumental translations. A documentary translation “serves as a document of an SC communication between the author and the ST [source translation] receiver” (p. 80). In other words, such translation preserves the various levels of significance in the original text. Alternatively, instrumental translation is viewed “as an independent message-transmitting instrument in a new communicative action in the target culture” (p. 81). This translation is used “to fulfill its communicative purpose without the receiver being aware of reading or hearing a text which, in a different form, was used before in a different communicative action” (p. 81).

As the Skopos and client are important, the target audience should be kept into mind. If the translator is Palestinian and the target audience is Israeli authorities of prisoners’ affairs, instrumental translation would be useful to keep the ambiguity and eventually the security purposes as it is intended to achieve a function that is different from that of the ST. However, documentary translation is helpful if the audience are those who are interested in studying the prison culture and works, for instance, as it offers a documentation of prisoners’ experience as in Diagram 1:
Diagram (1): Nords’ Methods of Translation.

The current study adopts the documentary translation method as the communicative function will be realized by informing the target addressees about a SC author intentions or point of view. Since we aim to revive the original context of use, the reader will be made aware of the original context of use. The researcher also believes that literal translation method cannot serve as the appropriate means to effectively translate terms which have drifted from their formal or literal senses. This certainly creates problems for any translator who tries to render these terms for an intended audience with no background knowledge about these terms.
Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

2.1 Introduction:

This chapter explains how terms emerge, acquire their meanings, and circulate among language users. The review will also examine theoretical models which outline the concept of CSIs, strategies for translating CSIs, CSIs as metaphors, the (un)translatability of CSIs, problems with the equivalent and functional approaches, and pragmatics and translation. An investigation of these studies and their theoretical findings are important to offer needed framing for the topic.

To begin with, the word “term” is defined in *Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* as “a word or expression that has a precise meaning in some uses or is peculiar to a science, art, profession, or subject” (1994, p. 2358). The terms within this study either were invented or acquired new meanings in order to reflect the environment in which the language users live and operate, namely in Israeli prisons. Choi (2006) uses the phrase “social neologisms” (p. 194) in talking about such terms which are related to a specific society. Choi describes how languages grow their terminology stock by coining or borrowing specialized words for specific environments:

All languages will continue to grow and develop in order to express new situations and new concepts. Thus, 1) new words and phrases will be created, 2) new loan words will be brought
in from foreign languages, and 3) new meanings will be given to existing words. (p. 189)

This thesis examines the three mentioned processes which resulted in CSIs that are idiomatic; their new meanings are only recognizable to the prison community. What is more, these terms acquire new meanings or lose old meanings according to the practice of the speech community within which they circulate. According to White (1984), terms usually acquire their “richness” and “complexity” step by step, as the gradual effect of many uses by many speakers and writers (p. 11). Gradually, simple words and empty clichés develop new significance and richness. For example, among the Palestinian prisoners’ community, the term *asfur* (lit: bird) has evolved to mean a “collaborator“ or a “spy”, referring to a Palestinian prisoner who collects information about other prisoners on behalf of the Israelis. In most cases, the newly-coined meaning has a connection to the literal or previous meaning. For example, *asfur*’s new meaning is derived from the prison environment and compares a bird which leaves its nest to a traitor who leaves his own people and joins the Israelis once he is exposed.

Such special uses of language are referred to by translation scholars as “culture-specific concepts” (Baker, 1992, p. 21), “cultural words” (Newmark, 2010, p. 173), “cultureme” (Nord, 1997a, p. 34), or “realia and culture-bound phenomena” (Robinson, 1997, p. 35). It is also to be notices that the thesis proposal of these terms differ from the previous researchers’ proposal of CSIs as PCSIs refer to the prison harsh environment and
derived from it. Thus, even ordinary Palestinians or Arabic researchers of the prison culture need these translations in order to figure them out.

2.2 CSIs’ Categories:

To understand these terms in the light of translation theory, the concept of “culture” must first be adequately identified. Newmark (1988) defines culture as “the way of life and its manifestations that are particular to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression” (p. 94). He categorizes CSTs as follows: ecology, material culture, social culture, organizations and customs, gestures and habits (p. 95). He adds that culture contains “objects, processes, institutions, customs, ideas peculiar to one group people” (p. 282). According to Baker (1992), these categories include both abstract and concrete items, such as religious beliefs, social customs, and even types of food.

Accordingly, PCSIs refer to lexical units circulated within a specific community inside a specific prison culture and have acquired additional connotative meanings in the context of everyday prison life. Additionally, these terms are classified according to the following categories: security, military, social, and food terms. The security terms are used to deliver hidden messages and deceive the jailer. The military are used to describe the provocation procedures jailors oblige Palestinian prisoners to go through. The social terms are used to express the restriction on prisoners’ gathering. Finally, food terms are used to describe the shortage of the food ingredients and supplies on the prison context.
2.2.1 Strategies for Translating CSIs:

To begin with, as previously mentioned, dictionaries do not include all terms, and even when they include a term, they may not list all of the possible connotations of that term. Moreover, even if these terms have equivalent or corresponding lexical items in the TL, the corresponding items may not carry the exact connotation required in each instance. In order to find the best possible translation, the translator must go beyond the dictionary and closely examine the implied meanings and the pragmatic aspects of the term. Ashtiany (1993) warned against overreliance upon a dictionary:

The dictionary is of limited use in translation. When translating out of Arabic, look first at a word’s context, and refer to your knowledge of recently fashionable English words and phrases to narrow down its meaning. When translating into Arabic, take the vocabulary you need from recently-published Arabic news reports on appropriate topics, rather than from a dictionary. (p. 54)

According to Newmark (1981), “Translation is a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language” (p. 7). However, in this case, knowledge of Palestinian Arabic in general is not sufficient to accurately translate these terms because they are specific to Palestinian prisoners’ culture and the environment inside the jail.
Therefore, Newmark (2010) contends that “culture [is] the greatest obstacle to translation at least to the achievement of an accurate and decent translation” (pp. 172-173). Similarly, Baker (1992) places CSIs as one of the most common problems in translation (p. 21). Additionally, she argues that CSIs are highly dependent upon the context in which they occur because the source culture assigns them a specific connotation which may not transfer easily into the target culture. Accordingly, Nord argues that CSIs causes pragmatic translation problems that result from “the contrast between the two communicative situations” (Nord quoted in Shäffner and Wieserman 2001: 24). Schäffner and Wieseman (2001) says that CSIs are problematic, and indeed “in more traditional approaches [CSIs] were often characterized as untranslatable” (p. 32) because of the TT readers’ unfamiliarity with ST concepts.

In “cultural translation”, the message is not “linguistically implicit” in the original form of the ST (Nida & Taber, 1982, p. 199). Therefore, difficulties arise because cultural differences are considered the most problematic issue in translation and create the most misunderstandings among the TC. The more the SC differs from the TC, the more difficult it is to understand a suitable literal translation.

Therefore, Davies argues that the translator acts as a “mediator” in order to make these cultural items accessible to the target readers (Davies, 2003, p. 68). He (2003) notes:

Discussion of alternative treatments for CSIs often invokes
the distinction between two basic goals of translation: that of preserving the characteristics of the [ST] as far as possible, even where this yields an exotic or strange effect and that of adapting it to produce a [TT] which seems normal, familiar and accessible to the target audience. (p. 69)

Translation scholars have documented several strategies that are used to deal with this problematic area in translation. Venuti (1995) offers two main strategies for translating CSIs: “foreignization” and “domestication”. According to him, the former refers to “an ethno deviant pressure on those (cultural) values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad”, while the latter is “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bring the author back home”. (p. 20).

Newmark (2010) offers many strategies for dealing with CSIs including transference where CSIs are adopted into TL, cultural equivalent where CSIs are translated into an approximate TL CSI, descriptive equivalent where CSIs are translated by its components, componential analysis where CSIs are split into general components, and transonym which deals with converting names (pp. 176-177). In addition to these strategies, Newmark (2010) suggests that CSIs can also be dealt with by means of literal translation, synonymy, modulation, paraphrase, and cultural footnotes (p. 178).

In this study, translation is not just between two languages but of
contexts that are very much source context bound. Often source readers find it hard to recover the connotations of prisoners terms if they have never been jailed themselves in Israeli prisons. Obviously, translation here is not a mere craft as much as it is a way to bring a whole new world to life along with its stories and culture. The process of transfer must use all strategies which will allow for recovering the context of use and the entanglements of the prison life like coding messages, gathering, head count, and eating.

2.2.2 CSIs as Metaphors:

Newmark (1988) defines metaphors as “The personification of an abstraction; the application of a word or collocation to what it does not literally denote i.e. to describe one thing in terms of another” (p. 104). He considers translating metaphors as the most problematic issue in translation (p. 104). Moreover, Dickins et al. (2002) outline two types of metaphors. Lexicalized (conventionalized) metaphors are clearly recognized as metaphors since their meaning is relatively fixed in a particular language (p. 147). On the other hand, non-lexicalized (non-conventionalized) metaphors are not given in dictionaries but “draw on either cultural or linguistic conventions” (p. 149). The metaphors in this study are representative of the second type because they are only conventionalized among Palestinian prisoners’.
2.2.3 The (Un)translatability of CSIs:

Hatim and Munday (2004) describe (un)translatability as a “relative notion” which “has to do with the extent to which, despite obvious differences in linguistic structure (grammar, vocabulary, etc.), meaning can still be adequately expressed across languages” (p. 15). Therefore, in order to avoid untranslatability and achieve an adequate translation, the translator should consider certain conditions when dealing with the ST: “meaning has to be understood not only in terms of what the ST contains, but also an equally significantly, in terms of such factors as communicative purpose, target audience and purpose of translation” (Hatim & Munday, 2004, p. 15). They (2004) contend that any given translation should be suitable for the “receivers’ particular competence” (p. 12). In order to recognize these hidden aspects, the translator must have “a perfect command of both the [SC] and [TC] (including language)” (p. 12).

2.3 Functional Approach and Skopos Theory:

The functional approach to translation was first introduced by Reiss (1989). This functional approach replaced equivalent-based criteria in evaluating translations with a model where the TT may actually differ from the ST. This led to the “skopos” rule where the intended purpose of the TT, rather than the ST, decides the translation methods and strategies. Skopos theory is a more functional and sociocultural approach to translation (Vermeer, 1989). The word skopos is a technical term derived from Greek which refers to the purpose of translation, as translation is a human action
and every action has a purpose.

In addition to a purpose, every action also has a “result”; in the same way, “translational action” results in a “translatum”, a target text (Vermeer, 2004, p. 227). Any translation is identified by a “statement of commission” – the purpose of translation – which in this case is to render PCSIs for those who are interested in the prison experience by a translator whose role is based on “the purpose, the skopos of the translation in a given situation” (p. 228) and the client. As a result, skopos theory considers the translator as “the expert in translation action” as the translator is responsible for performing the commission of translation and creating the “final translatum” (p. 228). Therefore, the theory has expanded the possibilities of translation, increased the range of translation strategies, released the translator from enforced literalness, and enlarged the translators’ accountability (p. 237).

Nord (1997a) also suggests replacing the equivalent approach with a functional approach (pp. 92-93). Nord (2005) also offers a methodological distinction between a text producer, who originally creates a text, and a sender, who merely transmits the message. The moment intercultural text transfer is initiated, the translator becomes the actual receiver of the ST and simultaneously the producer of the TT. Nord (2005) says that “the translator’s reception (i.e. the way s/he receives the text) is determined by the communicative needs of the initiator or the TT addressees” (p. 12). Nord contends that “the translator is not the sender of the ST message but a
text-producer in the target culture who adopts somebody else’s intention in order to produce a communicative instrument for the TC, or a target-culture document of a SC communication” (Nord, 2005, p. 13).

Hatim and Munday (2004) identified commission (i.e. the purpose and goal) as another important factor in translation which impacts the translator’s methodological choices. Nord (2005) incorporates this reality as she divides the process of translation into four main steps. The first step is to analyze the translation’s purpose. The second step is the analysis of the ST. While it may be tempting to skip this step, the advantage of this step is that the translator can early identify the problems which are likely to arise later on in the translation process. In the third step of the model, the translator adapts the relevant ST elements and determines the appropriate TL elements for them. The final step is the actual production of the TT. At this step, translations can vary from extremely literal renderings (ST orientation) to extremely liberal translations (TT orientation), but the translator should be able to justify his choice (pp. 36-38).

To sum up, if the translator is able to determine the precise communicative situations, purpose, and environment of the Palestinian prisoners’ terms, then the translator will be better equipped to document the prisoners’ experience and offer a corpus and make these terms available to international readers who are interested in studying the various aspects of prison experience.
2.4 Pragmatics and Translation:

Over time Palestinian prisoners developed their own unique speech community complete with their own culture and language. Morris (1971) was the first to expand the field of linguistics to include the study of such phenomenon. Before Morris, language was viewed merely in terms of linguistic signs and their meanings. Morris, however, redefined language as a tool used by a group of people and affected by their usage of it. Later researchers built upon Morris’ theories, and the discipline of pragmatics has developed out of them. Levinson (1983) says that pragmatics concerns the meaning in context. It studies how utterances are interpreted, taking special note of the situation(s) surrounding such utterances. He asserts that “it is a branch of study concerned with the ability of language users to pair sentences with the context in which they would be appropriate” (p. 24).

Dealing with the metaphorical security and deceit terms, J.L. Austin (1962) identified certain statements as “performatives” because the very act of saying such statements performs the desired task. In order to make these performative actions valid, the context must be appropriate. Austin noticed that ordinary language often uses sentences to do things rather than to merely describe states of affairs. His theory of speech acts was based upon the assumption that human languages combine sound and meanings to accomplish specific actions.

Therefore, translators need to render the full effect and implicit meaning of the SL text in the TL text. Newmark (1981) states that “we do
not translate isolated words; we translate words all more or less (and sometimes less rather than more, but never not at all) bound by their syntactic, collocational, situational, cultural and individual idiolectical contexts” (p. 73). Similarly, Hatim and Mason (1990) argue that communicative, pragmatic, and semiotic sign properties should be preserved through translation to convey the additional intended meaning. The meaning of an utterance has to do with what the utterance is intended to achieve, rather than merely the sense of the individual words (p. 37).

Kitis (2009) states that the meaning is not necessarily encoded in the text, but sometimes it is encrypted and extends beyond the sense of the lexical meaning. Thus, the translator has to consider “not just what the text refers to or what the object world of the text is, but rather, what sort of object world the text constructs” (p. 82). The translator has to reproduce the same pragmatic meaning in the TT as this is the most important aspect of communication, and the “unarticulated” aspects of meanings need to be transferred into the TT.

Triki (2013) mentions that translators who do not give any importance to the pragmatic aspects in a certain text always face a translational failure. Most of the time, fourth year translation students (the sample of her study) translated the original utterances literally without taking into account the context in which the utterances occurred. The lack of pragmatic knowledge among translation students was the main reason for the mistranslations.
Alawneh (2007), who studied neologisms of the First and Second Intifadas, states that the translator must have sufficient background information about the cultural, linguistic, and political differences between the SL and the TL in order to understand the concepts embodied within the neologisms and thus to translate them properly.

2.5 Conclusion:

Terms gradually acquire meanings to suit language users’ needs in certain situations. The new meanings in most cases have a connection with the literal or original meaning. In the prison context, terms became PCSIs by acquiring new or additional meanings specific for the prison context; thus, these meanings are not listed in dictionaries. The translator who does not pay attention to the pragmatic aspect of such an utterance may face a translational failure. Therefore, the knowledge of the two languages is not enough when dealing with these CSIs as culture is considered the greatest obstacle in translation according to many researchers. To facilitate translating these CSIs, they have been divided into different categories by different researchers. Moreover, different strategies have been offered to deal with these CSIs where the translator’s role is to mediate and clarify them for the target audience. This demands a communicative and functional approach that focuses on the communicative situation and the purpose of the translation. The translator can document the prisoner experience and avoid producing a meaningless literal translation by using strategies like domestication (Venuti, 2001), substitution (Schäffner &
Wiesemann, 2001), cultural transposition (Dickins et al., 2002), and cultural equivalent (Newmark, 2010).
Chapter Three

The Translation of PCSIs from a Pragmatic Perspective

3.1 Introduction:

In this study, the analysis is derived from the view that language is a system of signs, and these signs establish their meanings through relationships with each other. The sign’s function and its relationship with other signs inside or outside the system determine its meanings (De Saussure, 1983). In Translation, Bassnett (1980) stresses that “translation involves the transfer of ‘meaning’ contained in one set of language signs into another set of language signs” (p. 13). Thus, translating PCSIs from a pragmatic perspective aims to render the intended meanings of these signs into the English language.

To start with, the relationships between signs created two major aspects of meaning: denotative meaning and connotative meaning. The former refers to “that kind of meaning which is fully supported by ordinary semantic conventions” (Dickins, Hervey, & Higgins, 2002, p. 52). The latter, however, refers to the collective “associations which, over and above the denotative meaning of an expression, form part of its overall meaning” (Dickins et al., 2002, p. 66). In translation, Newmark (1988) clarifies as when dealing with denotative meaning, there is rarely a translation problem, since the words can be transferred, have approximate one-to-one translation or can be functionally defined. This contrasts with the
connotative difficulties as the new associations differ between cultures which creates a translation problems (p.98). The translation of PCSIs into English is a challenging task due to the peculiarities of each term as translation from the ST to the TT involves not just two languages but also two cultures. Capturing all of the associations, connotations, and attitudes of each term requires the use of a more dynamic form in order to offer the most suitable translations and fulfill the purpose of the study of documenting the prisoners’ experience.

In this chapter, the researcher first explains the denotative, literal meaning of each of PCSIs and their usage in regular contexts which could be offered if the target audience is Israeli authorities of prisoners’ affairs and the translator is a Palestinian. Then the discussion will move into the skops of this thesis which treats term’s acquired connotations and pragmatic usage in the prison context for the sake of these terms documentation for research purposes. After that, the researcher examines the connection between the literal and pragmatic meanings of the term if existed. In this way, the researcher will offer a better pragmatic analysis of these terms. Finally, possible translations of these terms are identified both for regular, non-pragmatic contexts and for pragmatic contexts to make PCSIs available for those who are interested in the prison culture for a closer understanding.

It is also important to notice that some of these terms are used metaphorically while others are not. To start with the first category,
metaphorical terms are used as code words to conceal methods; thus, they carry a whole message beyond the mere utterance. With these metaphorical terms, the translator should be aware of the pragmatic inference or “implicature” found within these terms (Baker, 1992). This aspect of meaning is over and above the literal, conventional meaning. As a result, Baker suggested that the translator has to minimize differences between the world represented in the ST and the TT in order to accurately translate such implicatures. Etymologically, “to imply” means “to fold something into something else” (from the Latin verb implicare, “to fold”); hence, that which is implied, is “folded in”, and has to be “unfolded” in order to be understood (Mey, 1993, p. 99). Similarly, the translator must figure out the prisoners’ own purposes and then clear the ambiguity in the TT. In contrast to these metaphorical terms, some terms are non-metaphorical. Even though they do not carry any secret messages, they are still loaded with the pragmatic context of the prison society. They have acquired connotative meanings inside the jail which are completely different from those regularly used outside the jail.

Thus, categories like security terms are discussed in light the of their metaphorical implications and connection with the comparison image. Social, military, and food terms are discussed while considering the harshness of prison environment and its restrictions. Awareness of the pragmatic aspects of these terms should enable the translator to choose the best translation strategies in order to create an effective and comprehensible translation which documents the experience. Abu Libdeh
(1991) argued that any translation offered should not only convey the meaning and style of the source text, but it should also be faithful to “what the source text producer intends to say” (as cited in Al-Harrasi, 2001, p. 54).

3.2 Metaphorical and Non-Metaphorical CSIs:

Prisoners use metaphorical and non-metaphorical terms for different purposes. On the one hand, the security terms use metaphors to allow the prisoners to send coded messages to each other in order to avoid the guards’ detection. On the other hand, some PCSI have emerged in the prisoners’ lexicon to record their experiences in the prison context even though they do not have metaphorical references; nonetheless, these terms have acquired certain pragmatic features in the peculiar prison context. Such terms can be found in the social, military, and food categories. In both metaphorical and non-metaphorical cases, the translator faces significant challenges in dealing with the pragmatic meanings these terms carry.

When prisoners use metaphorical terms, they say one thing but actually mean something else entirely. Searle (1969) describes this sort of indirect speech as a situation where “one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another” (p. 60). This indirectness creates a range of freedom for the prisoner to pass certain illocutionary acts. When the utterance means something other than its literal meaning, the hearer may be unable to understand the indirect speech. In other words, comprehension depends on shared background information which over
time developed among prisoners within the prison environment. This gave prisoners the ability to use and understand such indirect terms which would be noncommunicative to those outside that environment. As a result, these acts depend on the shared background knowledge of the actual speakers and not on the semantic meaning of the terms.

On the other hand, even though social, military, and food terms do not have metaphorical references, they represent elements only found in the prison culture. Thus, the conventions of their production and reception are again dependent upon the prison environment and all its specific details.

3.3 Translation of Metaphorical Security Terms:

3.3.1 Introduction:

Metaphors are used in a prison environment for the purpose of security reasons, i.e. to mislead the jailer. For example, Antoni Gramsci, an Italian Marxist theoretician and politician, who was imprisoned by Mussolini’s fascist regime, wrote his famous book *The Prison Notebook* while he was in jail. By using words and expressions to express hidden revolutionary concepts, Gramsci’s words passed beyond the walls of the prison and were published later in his famous book. Gramsci referred to Lenin as “Ilyich”, Marxism as “the philosophy of practice”, and the revolutionary party as “the modern prince”. These terms disguised the true meaning of what he was writing (Harman, 2007).

Similarly, Palestinian prisoners use certain terms that have acquired
new pragmatic applications to evade guards’ surveillance. Dr. Radi Al-Jara’i, the doctor of Political Science at Al-Quds university, who was in prison more than ten years, reported that metaphorical terms are the main linguistic characteristic of Palestinian prisoners’ community in Israeli jails. These terms have circulated in the prison community for many years and so have become part of Palestinian prisoners’ linguistic repertoire. The present section analyzes Palestinian prisoners’ metaphors and their pragmatic impact within the prison culture. The discussion of each term begins with its original meaning and then examines how it gained new meaning inside the prison context. Finally, an analysis of suitable translations is presented taking into consideration the pragmatic implications of the metaphors and the needs of the target audience by providing explanations of the illocutionary force for these terms.

One of the main problems which metaphors pose to translators is when the underlying comparison is not logical to the target audience (Crofts, 1988, p. 48). In such cases, the formal equivalent does not at all reflect the idea of the implicature. In contrast to a formal equivalent, a communicative translation can help render the implied meaning found within these metaphorical terms for research purpose and to reveal certain aspects of the prison everyday life for those who are interested in the prison experience in general and the prisoners’ works in particular; so that, the translation should be explicit.

It is important to mention that these terms would be translated
differently in a way that would not employ the same communicative implications if translating for Israelis. In other words, the SL is vague for a purpose; thus, in that case, literal translation would be more appropriate for the sake of security of the prisoners.

3.3.2 Security Terms:

1. Asfur (lit. ‘bird’):

Originally, asfur is a small, light bird. Ordinarily, the word asfur signifies freedom. For example, the colloquial Arabic phrase طار مثل العصفور (lit. ‘flew like a bird’) is used to signify speed or escape. There is also a very famous proverb in Arabic which refers to the uncertainty of seizing opportunities: عصفور في اليد خير من عشرة على الشجرة. This proverb is similar to the English proverb, “A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush”.

In the prisoners’ usage, asfur is a name given to a spy - one prisoner who is planted by Israeli jailers among Palestinian prisoners inside the cell to spy on them. Radi Al-Jara’i says that person is branded asfur only after he has been discovered. When exposed, asfur is advised to regret his treasury and stop spying for the sake of the Israeli, when refuse, he is either killed by his fellow inmates following an intense interrogation that usually takes place between midnight and dawn; sometimes he escapes by means of break, visit, when he is transferred from his prison into another, pretend to be sick etc. Palestinian prisoners thus created a new function and new
meaning for *asfur*. In other words, the use of this term to describe the exposed spy is compared to the small bird which moves among prisoners and passes important information to the jailers, only to disappear once he is discovered.

If the translator is unaware of the pragmatic import for this term, using a literal translation to render the term *asfur* will result in pragmatic failure. The translator’s unfamiliarity with these particular pragmatic functions will certainly lead to translational failure. In order to offer a proper translation, the source text should be read in light of the language user’s intended meaning. There are different consequences for those called *asfur* inside the jail context. The first one is that the prisoner is considered a traitor and should be shunned by fellow prisoners. The terms warns other prisoners that jailers are using him to gather clandestine information. It also implies that this person is no longer faithful to his people or prison inmates and should sit in *iz-zawye* (lit. ‘the corner’) (see 3) once other prisoners are more certain about his ties to the prison authorities.

Clearly, the pragmatic meaning of the term *asfur* is remarkably different from its semantic origin. Thus, rendering it as “bird” would be unacceptable (unless for the Israeli). One TL expression which can render the same function as that of the SL is “stool pigeon”. This term is used by pigeon hunters to mean that one pigeon is used to lead other pigeons into the trap. Similarly, police often send someone undercover to join a group of criminals in order to spy on them or to help arrest them. Although this
cultural equivalent (Newmark, 2010) seems to be closer to the SL term in the semantic import, it is still inadequate. The prisoners’ intention in using such a metaphorical, indirect speech act is to connote treachery and disloyalty and to cast this asfur out of the prisoners’ community once this treachery is confirmed after interrogation. Words like “traitor”, “spy”, or “informant” are considered as appropriate translations that manifest the pragmatic imports of the original term inside Israeli jails. Moreover, in the British English slang, “do bird” means “to spend time in prison” (Cambridge.org, 2017). Therefore, a “do bird traitor/ spy doing bird” is formally and functionally optimal. In such a translation, the researcher highlights the situation in which bird is used and provide a functional translation.

2. Bidlef (lit. ‘it leaks’):

In colloquial Arabic, usually describes a ceiling which leaks water in winter time. The word implies that the ceiling should be fixed, and the leak should be stopped before it causes further damage. In the prison context, bidlef is a new term in used appeared after the nineties according to Al-Jara’i. Along term liberated prisoner said that this term was invented to describe a prisoner who is suspected to have given in to the jailers’ pressure and is on his way to become a traitor. As a ceiling leaks water, this prisoner “leaks” information and is no longer to be trusted. Therefore, some action is required to protect the prisoners’ secrets. Similar to asfur, it is inappropriate to simply translate the literal meaning, to leak or drain liquid,
because such a translation does not allow the target readers to grasp the intended pragmatic meaning. Thus, a literal translation fails to mark treachery. Moreover, although the term “espionage” is used in military contexts to refer to the practice of spying, typically by governments to obtain political and military secrets as an established term, the term “leaker” which refers to someone who lets people know secret information about others’ lives, is a more formal and functional translation as it indicates that this is the first step to treasury, espionage. In this translation, “a SL form is strictly replaced by an identical TT form” (Hatim & Munday, 2004, p. 50).

3. Iz-Zawye (lit. ‘corner’):

Originally, refers to the corner of the room. Normally, it implies that something is hidden in that place. Also, when one stands in the corner, he is trying to avoid intruders. As a prison term, its pragmatic meaning is derived from the fact that the interrogation process with the asfur takes place in the jail’s corner, adjacent to the jail’s only door, invisible to the guards. When a prisoner says iz-zawye, this carries an implied meaning of a directive speech act of a command and a warning.

It is known that Israeli jailers apply great pressure, including torture, to Palestinian prisoners in order to encourage them to confess to certain resistance acts or to implicate other prisoners in subversive acts. When a prisoner is suspected of giving in to the torture, the prisoner will immediately be shunned from the group and dealt with as a traitor to the
Palestinian cause. A long term prisoner who was a representative of his jail group declared that he has noticed the death of one of these spies and was a member in *iz-zawya* committee. He adds that this committee is headed by two investigators of prisoners who start an interrogation when a leader of a certain affiliation inside the jail declares that this person is no longer trustworthy and must be prevented from getting additional information from and about any prisoner. He insists that this act of warning and command is of curse occurred after and interrogation by designated prisoners and being one hundred percent sure that this person is a traitor and this is the only way to deal with the treasury. He continues that during the interrogation, the detainees sing songs as a diversionary to mask the spy’s screams so that the prison authority will not realize that an interrogation is taking place inside the cell. Sometimes, prisoners insert dirty wet socks inside the suspected *asfur*’s mouth to prevent him from screaming loud; Prisoners use *nizel iz-zawya* (lit, ‘went down to the corner’) and *huto biz-zawye* (lit. ‘put him in the corner’) to describe this act (i.e. the prisoners forcing the informant to sit by the jail’s corner).

Translations such as angle, corner, or nook are insufficient because the term is used to mark the beginning of the interrogation. Therefore, any suggested translation should carry the implied pragmatic import of intensity of investigation and command, like an “intense interrogation” for *iz-zawye* (lit. ‘corner’) and “Pass an interrogation” for *huto bizzawye* (lit. ‘went down the cornet’).
4. **Ghayyamat** (lit. ‘cloudy’)

*Ghayyamat* is originally derived from the Arabic verb *ghayyam* which means “to be overcast”. For example, *ghayyam il-lel* means that the night is falling, and *ghayyam it-ter* means that it is hovering close to you. However, a prisoner gave an example to clarify the use of this term in the prison context as follows: When the prisoner who works in the *nkayoon* (a Hebrew word which means “cleaning”), for example, in the jail corridor says “Ghayyamat!”, he sends an implied message to other prisoners who are having a meeting to disperse and run back to their places to avoid the jailers’ punishment. He clarifies further that this metaphoric expression likens the gathering of clouds before a storm which is used in the colloquial Palestinian Arabic to the moment which precedes a sudden raid by the prison guards.

When translating this term in its real non-pragmatic context, it is literally rendered as cloudy, hazy, or gloomy. However, in the prison context, the term *ghayyamat* (lit. ‘cloudy’) is used figuratively to denote a sudden raid on the cell by security guards. Therefore, the translator should look for an expression whose illocutionary force will similarly urge the addressees to act fast to avoid being captured and punished for taking part in a secret meeting. In order to render the communicative, rather than literal, and message of this term, the translator can use a conventionalized warning in English such as “Be careful! Hurry up!”. These terms are more acceptable translations as they convey the intended warning while also
expressing the urgency in this context. These communicative terms succeed in conveying a similar illocution though they do not reflect the semantic meaning of the Arabic term.

5. Kabse (lit. ‘a press of a button’):

Originally, Kabse is the name of a popular dish in the Gulf countries made of rice, chicken, tomato sauce, carrots, ginger, garlic, and many other spices. Literally, the word is commonly used to mean “the press of a button” or “one-touch pressing”. In Palestinian prisoners’ terms, kabse is similar to ghayyamat and means a sudden and surprising raid by the prison management on detainees’ cells. It is usually unannounced and done secretly to ensure that the prisoners are not doing any forbidden activities such as having a jalse. The literal and pragmatic meanings of the word kabse are connected. Interviewees have agreed that the literal meaning connotes something done hastily or quickly such as pressing a button to turn on the lights. Similarly, they use the new (pragmatic) meaning to describe the quick surprise raid on them.

Translating kabse literally as an “Arab meal” or a “press of a button” will not reflect Palestinian prisoner use. Within the context of the prison, when a prisoner says “Kabse!”, he intends to offer a warning; it is a cautioning speech act to the other prisoners, similar to ghayyamat. In order to capture the intended illocution of this speech act, a suggested translation is a “Beware of! sudden raid” which implies quickness and surprise within the prison context and may conjure up the action and motion which ensues from such a warning.
6. Adet Kusaye (lit. ‘a bite of zucchini’):

Adet Kusaye literally means “a bite of zucchini”. Zucchini is a vegetable which is soft and easy to bite and chew with one’s teeth. Palestinian prisoners use this term as an act of congratulating another prisoner on a short prison sentence. This pragmatic meaning is derived from the fact that this term connotes how light the sentence is compared to prisoners with long sentences. In this regard, interviewees say that they use it a congratulatory note. A literal translation like “a bite of zucchini” would make no sense to the target audience as the intended impact cannot be transferred to the target text due to the target audience’s unfamiliarity with the prison environment and culture. A suggested translation is “Oh! A light sentence!”

7. Neenja (lit. ‘ninja, Japanese fighter’):

Neenja originally refers to a Japanese warrior – a ninja – who has unique strength and skill. Calling someone a neenja means that he is so strong no one could defeat him. In the Palestinian prisoners’ language, this is relatively a new term prisoners use as a nickname for detainees who clean prison rooms or corridors and take out the garbage. As they do so, these prisoners deliver oral or written messages between other rooms or sections, once the jailor notices that, a hand fight will start. At that moment, interviewees say they call these prisoners Ninja (fighters) for their courage.

According to Levinson (1983), using some speech acts can bring a
change in the “existing state of affairs” (p. 111) if it is in the right context with appropriate conditions. For example, when a Christian pastor says to a newborn baby, “I baptize thee”, in a religious context and under the correct circumstances, this utterance itself brings about a change, namely that the baby is from now on considered part of the community of believers. Similarly, when prisoners call someone a neenja, it’s an honorary title used to show gratitude and appreciation towards them for serving other detainees. As this term is used metaphorically, the translator should understand the appropriate association for it. Any translation should convey the contextual clues for the term. As this term is used to connote the hard work these prisoners do, a suggested translation could be “Cleanliness Laborer who deliver secret messages” to show the effort they do.

8. Ghazal (lit. ‘deer’):

A ghazal (IPA: ɣazaːl; Arabic: غزال) is a deer, an animal known for its speed and ability to disappear when at risk. Deers are also difficult to capture. In the prison context, ghazal is an emerged nickname detainees used for mobile phones which appeared at the beginning of the nineties. Mobile is smuggled in by detainees’ parents or relatives during visits; sometimes it is bought directly from the prison guards at sky rocking prices. Detainees smuggle it from one prison to another using various tricks because it is a prohibited item. Hence, it is compared to the deer for its rapid movement and disappearance when at risk from the hunter’s sight. However, an interviewee says that they were using the term Jahsh (IPA:
dʒaħsh; Arabic: جحش) (lit. ‘donkey’) as a joke in his jail as the donkey has a very loud voice which reaches far places, so they liken the mobile for the donkey’s loud voice. Moreover, Fahd Al-Haj says that this smuggled mobiles are not new in the jail context as prisoners previously used to smuggle radios before the nineties. He clarifies that they were agreed with civilian Israeli prisoners to exchange stuff like cigarettes with radios which are hidden under the ground of the jails during the exchanging of jails. Dealing with Ghazal, a suggested translation which implies speed is “a smuggled phone” to indicate that it is passed on illegally and it vanishes quickly away from the jailor’s detection.

9. Kabsole (lit. ‘capsule’):

Originally, a kabsoːlɛ (IPA transliteration system) is a pill of medicine which encapsulates a treatment dose. kabsoːlɛ is derived from the English word “capsule”. Similar to English, Arabic also uses kabsoːlɛ to refer to a spaceship with no wings to decrease its weight and increase its ability to fly.

In prisoners’ usage, a kabsoːlɛ is a lightweight and soft paper which can be folded many times to make it the size of a drug capsule. On this very tiny folded paper, prisoners write about general or private topics, studies, and research. A trustworthy prisoner with the finest possible handwriting prepares it. Then it is wrapped with multiple layers of light plastic vegetable bags and sealed completely and firmly by a cigarette tip. Prisoners metaphorically describe these folded letters as a capsule which is
swallowed with plenty of water by a freed prisoner. Moreover, prisoners used to smuggle these Capsules-like through the holes within the siege between prisoners and their family visitors during visits before replacing it by a wall and a telephone. One of the interviewees mentioned that some prisoners used to pass these capsules through a kiss with their wives to avoid the jailors’ detection. Once jailors doubt of anything, the wife swallows it and avoid any suspicion. He continues that some prisoners’ even these days publish their books by these Kabsule-like by writing four or five pages of their books on a small paper with a tiny hand writings. Prisoners also defeated the jailor by incredible methods to pass their messages as they use this capsule-like method in ways that could blow your mind. In Abu-Jihad museum walls there is a smuggled message smuggled by writing it in jeans’ pocket!

Figure (2): Capsule-like Smuggled Message (on jeans’ pocket).

A great amount of these letters are swallowed by freed prisoners to deliver certain messages for those who still inside the jail.
Obviously, the prisoners’ usage is related to the original meaning because it is folded into the size of a capsule and then swallowed with water. However, the purpose - communication with family or fellows outside prison- and the painful procedure - painfully swallowed to be later recollected once the freed prisoner reaches his/her family- would make it a special context that is very distinct from the original medicinal sense. Furthermore, if prison guards and Israeli intelligence suspect that the prisoner is carrying capsules, they will keep him until he empties his bowels. At that point, the prisoner must retrieve the capsules, wash, and re-swallow them for fear that the guards would find them.

A TC reader would not be able to understand the metaphor in the same way because it is unknown, non-lexicalized, and non-
conventionalized in the TC. Therefore, the translator retains the message through a communicative translation such as “a capsule-like letter smuggled by swallowing”.

3.3.3 Conclusion:

The translator of metaphorical security prison terms into English needs to give serious attention to the special connotations attached to ordinary words. Translational failure may result from overlooking these connotations which would jeopardize communication situation. The TL reader would take a rather special use for an everyday language communication because it is non-lexicalized and non-conventionalized in the SL. Thus, the choice of translation strategy will depend on how successful a given strategy is in transferring the metaphorical effect together with the implied information. For instance, the first option for a translator is to translate the ST term literally in order to preserve the image of the metaphor and its deceptive intent. However, the intended impact often cannot be transferred for the target recipients due to their unfamiliarity with the prison environment and culture.

The translators’ skills and creativity can be demonstrated in his/her choice of the best translational strategies. And the best strategy is the one which documents prison experience by providing enough contextual clues or explanations of the relations of prisoners to other prisoners, prisoners to jailors, and prisoners own safety.
Having examine and pragmatically analyze prisoners’ terms in order to communicate the full force of their coded uses inside prison, the researchers would offer a list of the terms for use by future translators of prison literature or prison communications. These terms are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Translation of Metaphorical CSIs (Security)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Term</th>
<th>Communicative English Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>عصفور (ʕαsˤfu)</td>
<td>do bird traitor/ spy doing bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بدلف (bdlɛf)</td>
<td>Leaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>النازوية (ʔiz:a:wje)</td>
<td>intense interrogation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حطوا بالنازوية (ħʊtˤo biz:a:wje)</td>
<td>Pass an interrogation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غيّمت (yaj:amat)</td>
<td>Be careful!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كبسه (kabsɛ)</td>
<td>Beware of! sudden raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عصّة كوساية (ʕαdˤet kusajɛ)</td>
<td>A light sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نينجا (niːndʒa)</td>
<td>cleanliness laborer who deliver secret messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غزال (ɣazːal)</td>
<td>a smuggled phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كبسولة (kabsoːle)</td>
<td>a capsule-like letter smuggled by swallowing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Translation of Non-Metaphorical CSIs (Social, Military, and Food Terms):

3.4.1 Introduction:

According to Newmark (1988), he clears that “where there is cultural focus, there is a translation problem due to the cultural ‘gap’ or ‘distance’ between the source and the target languages.” (p.94). In other words, the more a language becomes for certain phenomena the more it becomes embedded in cultural items and creates translation problems as well. Prisoners have developed a range of non-metaphorical PCSIs in addition to
the metaphorical ones described in the previous section. While these terms are non-metaphorical, they still only find significance within the Palestinian prisoners’ context. Moreover, even if the translator does not need to configure out the metaphorical reference within these terms as in the previous category, s/he still have to highlight the social and material culture in order to translate them effectively for the same documentary purposes. These non-metaphorical items can be further divided into social, military, and food terms. Newmark (1988) says that when the translator deals with cultural words which are embedded in cultural features, transference that offers local colors and allows the readership to identify the referent may also blocks the comprehension. Therefore, the componential analysis offers contextual distinguishing components to the SL and the TL which could be considered as the most accurate translation procedure in the non-metaphorical PCSI to clarify and document the prisoners’ experience away from its ambiguity. (p. 96).

3.4.2 Social Terms:

Hatim and Mason (1990) suggest that “[t]he translator’s motivations are inextricably bound up with the socio-cultural context in which the act of translating takes place” and therefore “it is important to judge translating activity only within a social context” (p. 12). When Newmark (2010) distinguishes between different categories of CSIs, he classified social life with into economy, occupations, social welfare, health, and education (Newmark, 2010, pp. 173-177). The terms in this section have gained new
contextual meanings derived from the environment surrounding the language speakers during their own daily life.

10. *Jalse* (lit. ‘manner of sitting’):

Originally, *jalse* is a meeting of a group of people to simply talk or discuss a certain issue. When translated literally, *jalse* could be rendered as “a sitting” which refers to the way you sit. It is also could be translated as a “séance” which means to conjure spirits. It can also refer to certain court hearings. The idea of “gathering” is common among all these literal meanings. In the prison context, a *jalse* is defined as a tradition where detainees gather in circles inside the cells to discuss cultural, political, or internal issues. There are two types of sessions related to the prison context: universal sessions and private factional sessions. The sessions are well-organized and disciplined; participant detainees are very committed to them and hold them regularly at present times despite prohibitions for any kind of learning or amusement inside the prison. Interviewees say that *jalse* is used for learning different subjects, reading books, or discussing certain issues concerning prisoners’ daily life. Some of these meetings result in important decisions, especially during prisoners’ strikes. There is a connection between the term’s original meaning and the prison context which adds an exclusive pragmatic difference related to how the prison environment defines this type of gathering.

Translation-wise, the researcher suggests that *jalse* should be translated in a way that communicates its purpose in the prison context. For
instance, when the term *jalse* refers to a political meeting, “prisoners’ meeting” could be a suggested translation as it communicates the nature and type of environment and decisions resulting from this gathering. However, when referring to a *jalse* which is devoted to educational purposes, the researcher prefers to use the word “prisoners’ seminar sessions” to reflect the educational and knowledge sharing nature of the meeting and to reduce the serious connotation of the word “session”.

11. *Il-Fora* (lit. ‘boiling’):

   Literally, *il-fora* describes the severity of boiling heat. It can also describe a sudden burst of activity. It is derived from the Arabic verb “to boil”. *Il-Fora* also has emotional connotations as it can refer to someone who bursts into passion, flames up with rage, or loses his temper; therefore, prisoners use it to connote that the break is happening quickly and in a loud voice. These connotative meanings could explain how *il-fora* derived its unique meaning in the prison language. In the prison context, *il-fora* is a half hour intermission in the outside prison yard. During *il-fora* the detainees can exercise, walk, or meet with other detainees. As there are a large number of prisoners who all have only half an hour to walk in such a small space, they create a lot of noise as they walk and talk in circles because of the limited space. Interviewees say that increasing *il-fora* time have been always one of their demands especially during strikes. They also mentions that it was the time when they deliver messages between different sections.
Rendering this term using the cultural equivalent “break” would partially render the intended message of the Arabic expression. In English, a break can be any physical activity. For example, if a student spends all evening studying for an exam, s/he can take a break by going for a walk. Similarly, in the prison context, prisoners get a break from the confines of their cell. However, the term would lose the cramping of hundreds of prisoners in a small space for a very short time. An appropriate translation in order to keep the noise and activity could be a “prison intermission stroll” which renders having a pause during an activity or event and also renders the implied situation as it is usually only half an hour break in the whole day.

12. Il-Bursh (lit. ‘mat’):

In the original meaning, is used to refer to a piece of mat. It is like sackcloth that is usually used as a protective material placed on the ground. In the prison context, this term started to circulate among prisoners to refer to this piece of material as prisoners were sleeping on the ground. Al-Jara’i says that, gradually, its meaning became more general as prisoners were
allowed to have beds at 1983; these beds started to be called *burshes* referring to this inherited previous meaning inside the jail. However, certain characteristics distinguish this bed. It is a wooden or metal bed. Wooden beds were a single size which were used previously when the prisoners were held in tents. Nowadays in prison cells, detainees sleep on metal bunk beds. The bunk bed can have either two or three bunks, each with a light foam mattress with a maximum height of 6cm and width of 70 cm. This *bursh* is uncomfortable and is made with rough materials as mentioned before. A prisoner who was at *An-Naqab* (lit. ‘desert’) prison which is known for its bad and cold conditions says that prisoners needed to start a strike to have more blankets as they were provided of few blankets and a bellow of chicken feathers in the past.

![Figure (6): *Il-Bursh*.](image)

Any given translation should convey the harshness and bad conditions within the jail. In fact, translating this term as “mat” is too specific and inaccurate. Moreover, translating it as “bed” fails to document the harsh connotations for the word. The researcher suggests “mattress bed” as an appropriate translation which expresses the harshness of the prison environment.
3.4.3 Military Terms:

According to Newmark (2010), an important category of CSIs is public life, which refers to politics, law, and government (pp. 173-177). Unlike security terms, Palestinian prisoners’ military terms do not have metaphorical references. Military terms, on the other hand, describe the procedures which Israeli guards use inside the jail. The prisoners live under rough circumstances, and prisoners consequently coined new terms to reflect the cruelty of their situation. Guards try everything they can to disturb prisoners, provoke them, and make their lives uncomfortable inside prison walls. Similar to other terms which emerged in the prison environment, these terms describe the miserable and harsh conditions prisoners go through every single day; therefore, careful consideration of the connotative meanings of these terms will help capture the full meaning.

13. *Il-Eks* (lit. ‘the letter X’):

Originally, *il-eks*, which literally refers to the Latin letter “X”, usually refers to something unknown. Also, when something is called *il-eks*, it means that it no longer exists in one’s life. In the prison context, this term is commonly used to refer to a windowless solitary confinement chamber where the detainee can be locked up for a period of 60 days or more. This cell is often 2 square meters or less in size. It also has a long concrete slab for sleeping and a tiny toilet; This toilet is deliberately made small to make it difficult for detainees to use it. The cell’s walls have gloomy features painted with a depressing grey color; it may have a very
bright light bulb to strain the detainee’s eyes, or it may not have any light at all to make it difficult for the detainee to distinguish anything in the darkness. A detainee held in such harsh solitary confinement may be referred to as *il-eks* as if he no longer exists. As can be observed, *il-eks* is used differently among Palestinian prisoners than it is by the Palestinian public. Moreover, this is not a normal jail cell as it is differentiated by miserable conditions and isolation.

![Figure (7): Il-Eks.](image)

*The figure is not real but taken from Abu Jihad Centre.*

In order to have a TT that matches the effect of the ST, the translator suggests using the cultural equivalent “extremely harsh solitary confinement” because it matches the receptor culture and background information and renders the communicative and pragmatic imports of harshness described by the term.

14. *Daqdaqa* (lit. ‘a knock’):

*Daqdaqa* means to strike something with a sharp blow or to make noise by striking something, e.g. knocking the door. In the prison pragmatic context, *daqdaqa* is a search of the cells by bumping on tiles,
walls, or windows with a long stick to detect any attempts to dig an escape route. It is also known that the jails’ walls are made of a very hard concrete to void prisoners’ attempts to escape.

Figure (8): Prisons’ Walls Concrete
(The figure is not real but taken from Abu Jihad Centre)

This is connected to the literal meaning as both meanings imply an intensive operation of beating something with a sharp blow and making noise by striking it. Prisoners use this term as a warning to get prepared for this searching method. Interviewees say that sometimes prisoners hide mobile phones or any prohibited items under the ground or in the wall, as they use or hear this terms, they should change its places or transfer it into another section till it is safe again. Any target translation should have the same effect on the target readers as it does on the prisoners. Therefore, literal translations such as “knock”, “hit”, “crush”, or “beat” could be equivalents to the process of “knocking” on walls or doors, but such a literal translation will not render the implied meaning used in the prisoners’ culture regarding any kind of jailers’ escape route detection behavior. Moreover, a TT functional equivalent like “check”, “search”, or “examination” are not pragmatically powerful enough to express the
warning action. However, the expression “inspection for tunnels” entails the implications of a careful search for security purposes inside jails. Therefore, any suggested rendition should carry the pragmatic import of warning as there is investigation and search. For example, “Be aware! intrusive inspection for tunnels” shows the violence of such process.

15. **Bastara** (lit. ‘putting on boots’):

A *bustar* is a boot. *Bastara* is a term derived from *bustar* which literally means to put on boots. Prisoners use *bastara* among themselves to warn that everyone should wake up and put on their boots and get ready. This operation includes preparing the detainees for the headcount or other purposes. A prisoner who was a member of the rooms’ committee mentions that prisoners use this term among as a command to wear their boots and get ready to attack a prisoner who disobeys the rules of the prisoners’ internal issues. For example, once they had a prisoner who arrived at the jail and refused to obey their rules regarding the food shares. As they wake up and found that he has eaten eight pieces of breakfast cakes, they agreed on the committee that he has to clean the room for the coming five days. When he continue in his refusal, this issue reached the central committee of the jail and declared that he should be punished. The leader of the committee said: “Bastara” and they started to beat him wearing their boots till he surrendered and start obeying all the rules. He mentions that it also used when there is a threaten on the prisoners by the jailors so they wear their boots and get ready to any clashes in order to defend themselves.
Figure (9): Prisoners’ Headcount/in a tent

Pragmatically, it means that the prisoners should be prepared and ready for one of these three processes (i.e. headcount, punishing a disobedient prisoner, confronting jailors in riots). Therefore, any suggested translation should render the illocutionary force of this speech act which communicates a warning and a command to get ready in a short time for the lineup. A suitable translation could be “Hurry up! Get ready! (for the headcount, discipline a disobeying prisoner, confronting jailors in riots)”.

3.4.4 Food Terms:

Food is the third category of non-metaphorical prisoners’ terms. According to Newmark (2010), one of the important categories of CSIs is personal life, which encompasses food, clothing, and housing. (pp. 173-177). He also mentions that “[f]ood is for many the most sensitive and important expression of national culture; food terms are subject to the widest variety of translation procedures” (Newmark, 1988, p. 97).

The terms in this category present additional translational problems. In the prison context, these SL food terms are different from the original food terms used outside prison. This difference came as a result of Israeli
prison authority policy to limit the amount and types of food provided to prisoners. Although prisoners have a right to nutritious meals, the prison service fails to provide the necessary supplies. This leaves Palestinian prisoners with specific kinds of meals which, despite being called by conventional SL terms, are different because of the limited ingredients available. Moreover, some of these terms use negative cultural references to describe the food being served to them. To maintain an equal share for each prisoner, prisoners created a food committee to divide the food fairly. Interviewees who had their sentences lately agreed that food quality and quantity became better recently as prisoners have the opportunity to buy food from the prison authority with their own money.

16. *Kunafe* (lit. ‘kunnafeh, a dessert’):

*Kunafe* is a cheesy pastry soaked in sweet, sugar-based syrup. The crust is made from long, thin noodles or from semolina dough. The pastry is heated in butter and then spread with soft white cheese and topped with more pastry. It is baked until it has a light golden color and then drenched with a thick sugar syrup. It is usually eaten on happy occasions and celebrations to reflect joy.

However, the *kunafe* in the prison is completely different from real *kunafe* as prison *kunafe* is limited by the availability of suitable ingredients. Inside the prison it is made by grinding and frying old bread with oil or butter and topping it with yellow cheese, the only kind of cheese made available for the prisoners. Butter is only offered twice a month and must
be saved until there is enough to make kunafe. Therefore, kunafe is usually only made three times a year. Furthermore, prisoners must use a small electric roaster, a balata (IPA: bαλαːtˤα; Arabic: بلاطة), to bake the kunafe as they do not have a proper cooker. One roaster is placed on the ground with a jar of water on it to create steam to cook the kunafe while a second roaster is hung 15 cm above the kunafe. Interviewees say that there is very little resemblance between the real and the prison kunafe other than the longing to create a joyful atmosphere which reminds prisoners of their life outside prison.

Communicatively, kunafe is similar to a cheese Danish. However, this does not reflect the pragmatic context, including the lack of ingredients, in which this prisoners’ term is used, and the memories of happy days with family and friends. Since there is no equivalent term that matches this food in the TL, the translator should define the term with items familiar to the target audience to describe the SC element and clarify what it means (Ivir, 1987, p. 39). The definition provides enough familiarity while also communicating something of the prison culture. Thus, a suitable translation could be “old bread crust with yellow cheese saved by months and sugar syrup”.

17. Id-Dyeta (lit: ‘diet’):

Originally, id-dyeta is a borrowing of the English word “diet”. A diet is carefully observing food intake for medical or weight loss reasons. In the prison culture, prisoners use this term to refer to the special food offered to
prisoners who need to follow a certain diet, such as diabetics and those with stomachache. This meal usually consists of a carrot, a zucchini, a cup of yogurt, a tomato, a cucumber, and a potato. As this term is similar to the English word “diet”, the researcher suggests that a literal translation is the best strategy as it already carries the communicative meaning of this prisoners’ term.

18. Il-Hameem (lit. ‘boiling water’):

Il-Hameem is originally used to describe a friend or a familiar and very intimate person. Additionally, this word is mentioned many times to describe scalding or boiling water given as a drink to the damned. For example, “But those who reject Him will have draughts of boiling fluids, And a penalty of grievous, Because they did reject Him” (Surat Yunus, Verse 4). Within the prison culture, il-hameem is the food given to the prisoners on Saturday. As it is forbidden to light fire on Saturdays according to the Jewish religion, this affects the way these meals are prepared. Interviewees say that Israeli authorities within the jail used to offer them verminous grain like bees with tomato juice and some eggs cooked on a toaster (as fire is forbidden) which remains on that toaster from Friday till Saturday morning. Thus, they refer to the original meaning because the food it refers to is fluid and very disgusting, and prisoners eat it reluctantly.

Therefore, words like “familiar”, “intimate”, or “boiling, scalding water” fail to maintain the same culture-specific image and pragmatic
import. Contextually, this kind of food that the term *il-hameem* refers to is similar to nutraloaf (also called “prison loaf”) which is served in United States prisons to misbehaving prisoners. The previous days’ meals consisting of vegetables, fruit, bread, and meat are all mixed together. Because it is given as a punishment, it is also called “disciplinary loaf”. Thus, the researcher suggests that in order to render a communicative translation of *il-hameem*, it is fitting to combine this cultural equivalent with an explanation strategy. Thus, a cultural equivalent, “fluid bees and eggs prison meal similar to ‘prison loaf’” would carry the pragmatic implication of this meal.

19. *Il-Athman* (lit: ‘eighths’):

   Literally, *ith-thumun* refers to a portion which equals the eighth of anything. *Il-Athman* is the plural, i.e., “eighths”. In the prison culture, prisoners use *ith-thumun* as a new invented term to refer to chicken. Prison administration cuts the chicken into eight parts so one chicken would serve eight prisoners, which is certainly not enough as a meal. Prisoners use this term as an indication for the shortage of their food shares inside the jail. The researcher suggests that using a definition strategy to supply additional information is suitable here. A definition strategy turns the implicit intention of the prisoners into explicit textual information by using familiar words in TL to communicate the same message within the TC. Thus, the descriptive equivalent (Newmark, 2010) like “small chicken meal” would be sufficient.
20. Mahayat (lit. ‘erasers’):

Mahayat is originally the plural “erasers”. Similar to il-athman, mahayat is a new invented term and used to mock the low quality of the food provided. Mahayat refers to the tiny size of the chicken patties as this meal is not enough to satisfy the prisoners’ hunger. Similar to the definition strategy used for il-athman, “small chicken patty” would communicate the small portion of this meal and describe its ingredient at the same time.

21. Il-Kanteena (lit. ‘shop’):

Il-kanteena is an English term in origin, borrowed into Arabic and Hebrew. Prisoners seem to have learned this term from Hebrew rather than English referring to a school cafeteria where a certain type of food and drinks are sold. This place is usually small, and in some places it only exists in the corner of a room with a limited selection of products. In prison context, the Ministry of Prisoners in the Palestinian National Authority gives a specified amount of money to each prisoner for personal use to buy things inside the prison. However, the prices in the jail shop are very expensive. Obviously, the use of this term in the prisoners’ language derived from the same connotations of il-kanteena as the products are limited, and prisoners have no other choices, so they are forced to buy from it at whatever price is being asked. Equivalents like a “shop” or a “store” would not reflect the pragmatic context inside the jail and its limited resources. Moreover, “cafeteria” would also be an exaggeration as the kanteena inside the jail does not offer the same services that a cafeteria
offers. An acceptable translation relying on both the context and the target audience culture would be “canteen” as it carries a military connotation and is used by soldiers eating and drinking along with their kitchen utensils.

22. *Sikeen* (lit. ‘knife’):

*Sikeen* is simply the Palestinian colloquial term for “knife”. As knives are banned inside the prison, the detainees use any available pieces of metal to make sharp objects. Thus, a *sikeen* in the prison culture is any piece of metal, such as an empty can of food, with a long sharp edge which can be used as a cutting tool. As the literal meaning is unattainable, the researcher suggests a communicative translation for this term as there is a specific word in American English for an improvised prison knife which is called a “shank”.

3.5 Conclusion:

As the present study has shown, Palestinian prisoners’ terms have been greatly influenced by the prison context. The present study has also reflected how Palestinian prisoners have been able to face the harsh environment they are living in, and the lexicon they came up with to record their experiences inside the jail. The study has presented a number of terms that address security, social, military, and food items circulated among Palestinian prisoners.

Thus, in order to suitably translate the pragmatic import of terms which have deviated from their original meaning and acquired new
meanings in the prison culture, the translator must first identify how the cultural reference functions in the source settings within the prison culture. Therefore, this study divided the data into four different categories. The first category includes security terms which use specific metaphorical references to mislead the guards and therefore have gained new pragmatic meanings which have drifted from the original semantic ones. The other three categories include social, military, and food terms which, although they are not used metaphorically, are still loaded with meanings particular to the prison environment. Thus, the translator should give the same level of concern to the semantic and pragmatic import of social, military, and food terms as he does to security terms. These terms are summarized in Table 3.
Table 3: Translation of Non-Metaphorical CSIs (Social, Military, and Food)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Term</th>
<th>Communicative English Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جلسة (dʒalsɛ)</td>
<td>prisoners’ meeting / prisoners’ seminar sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الفورة (ʔɪlfɔrɑ)</td>
<td>prison intermission stroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>البرش (ʔɪlborsh)</td>
<td>mattress bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإكس (ʔɪlɛks)</td>
<td>extremely harsh solitary confinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دقفة (dαqdαqa)</td>
<td>Be aware! intrusive inspection for tunnels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بسطرة (bɑsˤtˤarɑ)</td>
<td>Hurry up! Get ready! (for the headcount, discipline a disobeying prisoner, confronting jailors in riots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كنافة (kʊnafɛ)</td>
<td>old bread crust with yellow cheese saved by months and sugar syrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الدبـتة (ʔɪdːjeta)</td>
<td>Diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحميم (ʔɪlhamim)</td>
<td>fluid bees and eggs prison meal similar to prison loaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الأثمان (ʔɪlaθmaːn)</td>
<td>small chicken meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>محاليت (mah:ajaːt)</td>
<td>small chicken patty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الكنتينا (ʔɪlkantina)</td>
<td>Canteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سكين (sikiːn)</td>
<td>Shank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Four

Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion:

Having analyzed different categories of prisoners’ terms in Chapter Three of this study, the researcher has made the following conclusions regarding their translation:

1. Literal translation does not work in rendering these terms as it results in an inaccurate translation which distorts the intended meaning of the prisoners’ terms and provides an opaque and unintelligible translation.

2. The translator’s choice of translation strategy should be a strategy that caters to the practical force of an utterance. This can be done by examining these terms’ meanings within the prison context in order to render its contextual or “user” meaning with all of its associations.

3. Terms with indirect illocutionary speech acts which utilize metaphors require the translator to understand both the metaphorical references in the SL and conventionalized speech acts in the TL. Even though the translations provided in this study fail to transfer the level of indirectness which all the security terms intend to achieve, it is justified in order to capture the intended illocution of the speech act and transfer it communicatively into the TC.
4. The translator should have a good knowledge of both the SC and the TC in order to figure out the PCSIs’ specific meanings and render them into the TT. Although social, military, and food categories are not used metaphorically, these terms require full knowledge of the prison conditions and circumstances. The restrictions on prisoners gathering, the harsh militant conditions, and the lack of food resources create new meanings which can only be examined through a pragmatic analysis of each term individually.

5. It is important to choose a translational strategy in the light of the target audience’s lack of knowledge of the prison cultural context.

6. Lastly, the analysis has shown that a communicative translation is the most common and appropriate strategy which the translator is advised to employ in translating Palestinian prisoners’ terms in order to communicate their “in use” meanings within the prison context into English.

**4.2 Recommendations:**

This study recommends the following in the area of translating terms which have gained new pragmatic applications derived from new contexts for certain purposes, especially translating Palestinian Arabic prisoners’ terms into English:

1. This study supports the use of a functional approach when translating terms which have acquired new pragmatic applications. This
approach, however, poses serious challenges for translators with inadequate cultural knowledge. The origins of these terms should be taken into consideration as language users usually build their new use upon previous semantic specifications. Translation into English culture accordingly would be done better after considering the pragmatic context in which the term is circulated and used. Translators should consult language users who have adequate information concerning the new applications when translating any works which include such specific terms.

2. Considering the nature of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, new terms will continue to emerge and old terms will gain new meanings in order to describe the phenomena of daily life in this context. This will create new terms that need to be studied and added to the terms of this study.

3. The researcher recommends that these terms should find their way into dictionaries of Palestinian Arabic for the reference of future studies.

4. Future studies on translating Palestinian special terms, in general, and prisoners’ terms, in particular, are recommended as there is not enough research done in this field.

5. More research needs to be done on the question of what is specific in translating terms with new pragmatic applications.
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Appendix A

Palestinian Prisoners’ Terms in Arabic

Based on the interviews the researcher conducted with the liberated Palestinian prisoners and the *Encyclopedia of Palestinian and Arab Detainees Experience*, the researcher can define Palestinian prisoners’ terms as follows:

**Security Terms**

- **غصفور**: يطلق على الأسير الذي يستسلم للمخابرات الإسرائيلية أثناء التحقيق معه أو حتى قبل دخوله للسجن لينقل للجانب الإسرائيلي معلومات مهماً وسرياً عن الأسرى داخل الفلسطينيين داخل السجن.

- **بِدلف**: مصطلح يطلق على حالة الأسير الذي بدأ بالوقوع في شباق المخابرات ونقل معلومات سرية عن الأسرى للجانب الإسرائيلي.

- **الزاوية**: عملية التحقيق مع”الغصفور" عندما يفضح أمره أمام الأسرى الآخرين، ويتم التحقيق عبر وضع الغصفور في زاوية السجن والبدء بالتحقيق معه باستخدام أساليب شديدة أدت في بعض الأحيان لموت بعض الجواسيس أثناء التحقيق معهم، وعندها يقال عن العصفور "نزل زاوية".

- **غيمرت**: تحذير للأسرى بأن دورية مفاجئة وأن الضباط في طريقهم للزنزانة.

- **كبسة**: تفتيش مفاجئ للزنزانة.

- **عضبة كوساية**: حكم مخفيف.

- **نينجا**: لقب يطلق كنكرمي للأسرى الذين يقومون بالتحتوي من القمامة من السجن تقديراً لمجهودهم في خدمة بقية الأسرى، وعادة ما يكون هذا العمل بالتناوب.
Guzaal: A name given to the prisoners on the call to move among prisoners or prisoners of war, as it moves quickly from one prisoner to another. Its purpose is to help with the deception for them to be prohibited inside the prison.

Kiswala: It is necessary to inform one of the prisoners by a photograph through a method that contains a letter that contains secret information on a small plastic bag that serves as a prisoner. This method is used to transfer secret information to the outside or inside the prison.

Social Terms

Jeeza: Gathering of prisoners in the form of a meeting or discussion of national and security issues. They can also participate in the educational or group lectures, and there are special jessas for each group and jessas that are held at specific times and have decisions at times that must be taken by the prisoners.

Furra: In the language of the Arabs, فورة النهر فوراً أي في أوله. And رُفُّ الْحَرْ: شدَّتْه. In the report: Kala, that is, فورة النهر فوراً أي في أوله. And رُفُّ الْحَرْ: شدَّتْه. In the report: Kala, that is, فورة النهر فوراً أي في أوله. And رُفُّ الْحَرْ: شدَّتْه. In the report: Kala, that is, فورة النهر فوراً أي في أوله. And رُفُّ الْحَرْ: شدَّتْه. It is customary for the prisoner to spend a short time outside the prison, but it is not more than two meters and a wall of dark gray and black, and there is no light, and there is a bright yellow light that makes the prisoner feel more comfortable.

Military Terms

Eks: A single-person prison cell, which is used by prisoners sometimes and is a long time from the bed. It also contains a toilet that is not used to wash the sewage, more often. It is usually less than two meters and a dark gray color.
دققة: فحص تقوم به إدرة الأسرى بالدق على البلاط أو الحيطان بواسطة عصا طويلة من الخشب لفحص محاولات الهرب إن وجدت.

بسطرة: أن يستعد الأسرى للعد أو للتخفيش.

Food

كنافة: طحن الخبز الجاف وتحميصه ووضع قطع الجبن الصفراء والتي يتم تجميعها لمدة طويلة مع القطر.

الديتا: وجبة تقدَّم للأسرى المرضى وخاصة مرضى السكري وتتكون من حبة بطاطعا وحبة كوسا وحبة بندورة وحبة خيار وعلبة لبن.

الحميم: آكلة تقدَّم للأسرى أيام السبت.

الأثمان: قطع صغيرة من الدجاج حيث تقوم إدارة السجن بقطع الدجاج لثمان قطع صغيرة.

محايات: قطع صغيرة من "الشنتسل".

الكانتينا: هي بقالة السجن حيث تقدَّم وزارة الأسرى الفلسطينية حساب شهري للأسير من أجل شراء احتياجاته الخاصة داخل السجن.

سكين: يقوم الأسرى بتحويل المعلقات لقطع معدنيّة يتم استخدامها كسكين لقطع بما أن السكاكين ممنوعة داخل السجن.
Appendix B

Palestinian Prisoners' Terms in English (Researcher’s translation)

Security Terms

- **عصفور (ọsˤfu) (IPA transliteration system):** *Asfur* is a nickname for a prisoner who spies for the Israeli intelligence services. Usually, he is unknown to the factions, and he may be recruited during interrogations or even prior to his imprisonment. The collaborator or spy deceives the other detainees by asking them about their cases under the pretext of passing the information to the factions’ leaders outside the prison. He also asks them what they know about the factions and resistance. The betrayed detainees are surprised to discover that the intelligence interrogator already knows everything which they told the spy.

- **بِدلف (bɪdlɛf):** *Bidlef* is a verb used to describe a prisoner who is suspected to be collaborating with the Israelis.

- **الزاوية (ʔɪzːaːwje):** *Iz-Zawye* refers to the prisoners’ interrogation of a suspected spy (*asfur*). The prisoners describe this situation by saying that the spy "went down to the corner".

- **غيّمج (ɣajːamat):** *Ghayyamat* means that there are lots of clouds in the sky. It is a nickname for a sudden search of the prison cells to warn other prisoners that the officers are approaching.

- **كبست (kabsɛ):** *Kabse* is a sudden and rapid attack by the prison
management on the detainees' sections and rooms. Usually it occurs silently and unannounced.

- عضلة كوساية (Adet kusaye): Adet kusaye refers to a light sentence.

- نينجا (Neenja): Neenja is a nickname for detainees who take out the garbage. The detainees take turns doing this task. It is an honorary title used to show gratitude towards them for serving other detainees.

- غزال (Aghazal lit: deer): Aghazal is a fast mammal with bony, branched antlers. The detainees use this nickname to refer to mobile phones. Either way, it is smuggled into the prison by detainees' parents during visitations or bought directly from the prison guards. Detainees smuggle them from one prison to another by various tricks because they are prohibited.

- كبسولة (A kabsole): A kabsole is of lightweight, soft paper with specific dimensions that can be folded many times until it is the size of a drug capsule. With plenty of water the capsule is swallowed by a prisoner who is going to be later released or transferred between facilities.

Social Terms

- جلسة (Jalse): Jalse is an authentic tradition in which the detainees gather in circles inside the rooms or cells to discuss cultural or political topics as well internal issues. It resembles a school session or a group lecture. There are two types of sessions: open sessions and private sessions restricted to a specific faction. The session is characterized by
commitment, accuracy, and discipline which are held at appointed times.

- **الفورة (ʔɪlfora):** *Il-Fora* describes the severity of the heat or the start of the day. It is a half hour break in the yard outside. The detainees can exercise, walk, or meet with other detainees from different rooms.

- **البرش (ʔɪlbʊrʃ):** *Il-Bursh* is a mat fabric like sackcloth. Recently, it is used to refer to a wooden or metal bed made with this rough fabric. The wooden bed is a single size bed used in tents. In the cells the detainees sleep on a metal bunk bed. There can be either two or three bunks, each with a light foam mattress with a height of 6cm and width of 70 cm.

### Military Terms

- **الإكس (ʔɪlʔɛks):** *Il-Eks* is a windowless solitary confinement chamber where the detainee can be locked up for a period of 60 days or more. There is a long concrete slab for sleeping and a toilet which is deliberately designed not to flush properly in order to break the detainee's spirit. The room has an air vent in the ceiling, and the walls have rough features painted with a gloomy grey color. It may have a very bright light to strain the detainee's eyes, or it may not have any light at all to make it difficult for the detainee to distinguish anything in the darkness.

- **daqdaqa:** *Daqdaqa* refers to guards searching prisoners' rooms by tapping on tiles, walls, or windows with a long stick in order to detect escape tunnels.
• **بسطرة (basṭˤara):** Bastara refers to preparing the detainees for the head count or other similar purposes. It means that everyone must get ready for counting.

**Food Terms**

• **كئافتا (konafɛ):** Kunafe is old bread ground and fried with oil or butter and then topped with cheese and sugar syrup.

• **الديتا (ʔɪdːjeta):** Id-Dyeta is the food prepared specially for diabetics. Usually it consists of a carrot, a zucchini, a can of yogurt, a tomato, a cucumber, and a potato.

• **الحميم (ʔɪlḥamiːm):** Il-Hameem is a food given to the prisoners on Saturdays.

• **الأثمان (ʔɪlʔaθmaːn):** Il-Athman are chickens cut into eight parts.

• **محايات (mah:ajaːt):** Mahayat is a small piece of chicken patty.

• **الكنتينا (ʔɪlkantina):** Il-Kanteena is the jail shop. The Ministry of Prisoners in the Palestinian National Authority deposits a specified amount of money for each prisoner for personal use and buying supplies inside the prison.

• **سکین (sɪkiːn):** Knives are banned inside the prison, so the detainees create alternatives using any available piece of metal, such as aluminum cans, and use them as knives. These are called *sikeen.*
## Translations of Palestinian Prisoners' Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Term</th>
<th>Communicative English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security and Deceit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عصفور (ʕαsˤfu)</td>
<td>do bird traitor/ spy doing bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بدلف (bdlef)</td>
<td>Leaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الزاوية (ʔɪz:a:wje)</td>
<td>intense interrogation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حطوا زاوية (hotˤo biz:a:wje)</td>
<td>Pass an interrogation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غيّمج (ɣajːamat)</td>
<td>Be careful!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كبسة (kabsɛ)</td>
<td>Beware of! sudden raid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عصّة كوساية (ʕαdˤɛt kusajɛ)</td>
<td>light sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نينجا (ni:ndʒa)</td>
<td>cleanliness laborer who deliver secret messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غزال (ʔɪzaːl)</td>
<td>smuggled phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كبسولة (kabsoːlɛ)</td>
<td>a capsule-like letter smuggled by swallowing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Social Terms** | |
| حلسة (dʒalsɛ) | prisoners’ meeting / prisoners’ seminar sessions |
| الفورة (ʔɪlforα) | prison intermission stroll |
| البرش (ʔɪlbɔrsh) | mattress bed |

| **Military Terms** | |
| الاركس (ʔɪlʔɛks) | extremely harsh solitary confinement |
| دقيقة (daqdaqα) | Be aware! intrusive inspection for tunnels |
| بسطرة (bαsˤtˤarα) | Hurry up! Get ready! (for the headcount, discipline a disobeying prisoner, confronting jailors in riots) |

| **Food Terms** | |
| كنافة (konafɛ) | old bread crust with yellow cheese saved by months and sugar syrup |
| الديتا (ʔɪd:jɛtα) | Diet |
| الحميم (ʔɪlhamiːm) | fluid bees and eggs prison meal similar to prison loaf |
| الأثمان (ʔɪlʔaθmaːn) | small chicken meal |
| محيايات (mah:ajaːt) | small chicken patty |
| الكنتينا (ʔɪlkantina) | Canteen |
| سكين (siki:n) | Shank |
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المملخص

تتناول هذه الدراسة المصطلحات المهمة التي طورها السجناء الفلسطينيين إثر ظروف السجن الصعبة. اعتمدت الدراسة على جمع تلك المصطلحات من خلال مقابلات مع خمسة سجناء محرين أمضوا فترات طويلة داخل السجون الإسرائيلية. تتضمن هذه المصطلحات تضمّ كافّة مجالات حياة السجناء اليومية كالمصطلحات الأمنية والإجتماعية والعسكرية والطعام. تقوم هذه الدراسة بتحليل هذه المصطلحات ضمن إطار براغمائي ومن ثم تقدم ترجمات إنجليزية مناسبة لها تتحمل التأثير البراغمائي المتضمن فيها. توصلت هذه الدراسة إلى أن هذه المصطلحات قد انحرفت عن مجال الاستخدام الأصلي لها واكتسبت تطبيقات جديدة مستنادًا إلى احتياجات السجناء الأمنية والاجتماعية. في أغلب الحالات، يجب على المترجمين أن يحدّدوا المعنى المقصود بشكل خاص ومن ثم استخدام الترجمة التواصلية من أجل نقل المعنى المقصود إلى اللغة الإنجليزية.