

The impact of anthropological research on activating the theory of interpretation in translation

Dr. Kamel Laouer

University of Chlef (Algeria) , Email: Laouer.kamel@yahoo.com

Received: 12.01.2025 ; Accepted:15.07.2025 ; Published: 03.09.2025

Abstract :

Translation often goes beyond the linguistic level to reach the ethnographic dimension, and the anthropological approach has proven, at present, its effectiveness in several fields. Translation also has an impact on the host language, achieving an aspect of social and cultural humanity and its interpretation of a particular society or culture. Can questions be asked about the relationship between translation and anthropology? What are the ways to benefit from this rich area? Can translation then be considered as an anthropological practice?

Keywords: anthropology ; translation ; interpretation; linguistic; Native language.

1. Introduction: Since ancient times , translation has been a creative and communicative human activity that has contributed to strengthening the network of cultural and social relations among people. It has also been a science and an art that has permeated most scientific, intellectual, and literary fields, including anthropology, which has benefited from translation in conveying the essence of extinct nations, given its focus on... Study present Communities far away in In exchange the date that He was studying past Communities The close relationship between anthropology and translation is evident, but the influence of anthropology on translation studies and interpretive practice requires further explanation to uncover this hidden connection. We posit that the field of anthropology, given its diversity and the large number of its practitioners who have studied different peoples, and consequently different languages and cultures, is better equipped to overcome the difficulties of translation and arrive at the appropriate meaning. This meaning often remains elusive for translators who lack an understanding of the other culture and are content with literal translation. Therefore, our research aims to elucidate the impact of anthropological research on the development of interpretive theory in translation, rather than superficial, literal translation.

Which kept the worker in this field always in border Translator The missing as recipe George Monan, who focused on the diachronic historical dimension of language, and from here we will seek in this Context according to Methodology My analysis descriptive to to understand relationship Menu between The two fields with Taking In consideration Preview reality Arabic The translator For the term Anthropologist that create difficulties Jumma For the researcher And the reader Arabic when halt helpless in His approach For topics Anthropology in absence The term The appropriate one .

2. Anthropology: Limits and Paradoxes

If we confine ourselves to anthropology as a branch of scientific knowledge, some might trace its origins back to the European Enlightenment during the 18th century. Some have claimed that anthropology did not emerge as a science until the 1850s, while others have argued that anthropological research, in its current sense, only began after World War I (Nelson, 2013, p. 11). Opinions vary regarding the history of this science's emergence, with some attributing it to the 18th or 19th centuries, while others do not consider it a fully developed science with its own pillars and methodology until the mid-20th century, a time of steadily increasing independence of methodologies and sciences. Scholars have generally considered anthropology to be the study of the present of distant societies; thus, it studies difference in the field, while history is defined as the study of the past of nearby societies (Oge, 2016, p. 7).

Anthropology is concerned with primitive societies, their life rituals, religious rites, and symbols, as reflected in their present through observation among groups, tribes, and sects, based on field observation and live documentary examination. History, on the other hand, deals with past events whose evidence remains only in the form of hidden traces. It deals with the past more than with the present, and with records more than with facts. Hence, anthropology becomes possible and necessary based on a three-part experience: "the experience of pluralism, the experience of difference, and the experience of identity." (Ouji, 2016, p. 75)

If we accept that the concept of pluralism refers to all forms of diversity, not just those that carry a connotation of exoticism, or in the language of an ethnographic scholar, and if we focus our attention on the relationship: difference / identity, and on the fact that thinking about difference always precedes and enables every definition of identity, then it can be concluded that all anthropology is tripolar (its presentation being the thinking about pluralism, identity, and difference together), and that its central, and even sole, subject is what can be called double difference, that is, the perception of others of the other and of others. (Ouge, 2016, p. 77)

While many anthropologists in the early postwar years, particularly in Britain, rejected attempts to transform anthropology into an exact science, others went in the opposite direction. This was not only the case with American cultural ecologists and British proponents of methodological

individualism, but also, surprisingly, with those working within the broad framework of American linguistic anthropology (Nelson, 2013, p. 151). One of the most prominent topics addressed by anthropology is the religious sphere. Studying religion as an experience temporarily removes its sacred character, as this would prevent the researcher from critiquing manifestations and practices and verifying all observations. Religious emotion hinders the proper practice of anthropological research. Those studying a group must not be swayed by the influence of the environment or the authority of the group, but must always maintain their objectivity. Hence, anthropologists have repeatedly stated: to know the world is to contribute to its creation. This is how any anthropologist understands fieldwork: "We take a sample, we formulate and interpret reality as we go." This process, which Kant... The first to recognize it clearly (Nelson, 2013, p. 29);

anthropological research has begun to lose some of its secret of existence if those topics that it was interested in disappear from the present moment. Therefore, we can imagine that as long as anthropology devotes itself to studying timeless or historical forms, it will indeed become a historical anthropology that inherits from its past a special readiness to define and approach social phenomena that fabricated books allow to be compared in their various manifestations (giving, sacrifice, myth, etc.) (Ouge, 2016, p. 65). There are calls from within the field to move beyond the old, worn-out topics and to revolutionize fieldwork with current and contemporary issues instead of feeding on the topics of history, which mortgages the entire work and makes it repetitive and recycled. For some scholars, the different anthropological schools share a disregard for modernizing their subject.

Adding to the confusion is the view of this science as an agent of cultural imperialism (Nelson, 2013, p. 28); meaning that it is at the service of dubious cultural apparatuses or an influential shield for neo-colonialism. In some parts of Europe, the new science spread with an ethnocentric bias when talking about others, and with nationalist aspirations when searching for the popular culture of the one that prevailed in Europe for decades after the 1930s. It was and still is difficult for anthropologists who have learned for generations to be skeptical of ethnocentric notions of social development to swallow the idea of development. Lévi-Strauss considers himself an advocate of the Fourth World, in opposition to the idea of the Third World, meaning that he defends small, fragile, and unique peoples against the onslaught of Westernization. However, he also stands against the development plans of Third World governments. In this way, he spoke on behalf of a large part, and perhaps the majority, of the anthropological community in the 1970s. Quoting a famous Marx comment about Asians to illustrate his point, Edward Said said: "They cannot represent themselves, therefore they need to be represented." Edward Said pointed out that Western studies of Asians, including anthropological works, created an essentialist or embodied conception of their way of life based on a simplistic and misleading binary between "us" and "them," where the West is represented by science

and rationality, and the East by its opposite (Nelson, 2013, p. 214). For example, the American Anthropological Association opposed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1947 for flimsy reasons. Then, as a result of criticism of Orientalism, anthropologists in many Third World countries became increasingly unpopular with their countries and with local intellectuals. They were seen as hunters of all that is strange and as part of the problem rather than part of the solution for peoples struggling to survive day after day.

However, anthropology did not develop into a pseudo-racist science. All leading figures in anthropology supported the principle of the psychological unity of humankind. Humans, wherever they lived, were generally born with the same inherent potential, and inherited differences were considered trivial and insignificant. In fact, evolutionary theories presupposed this principle, arguing that if racial differences were considered essential, the cultural comparisons upon which these theories are based would be unnecessary. Anthropologists, in general, were not driven by racial extremism; rather, they were motivated by a scientific spirit to explore other selves. They believed in the unity of humankind, that is, in a single nature, and inherited differences had little impact. Hence, many of the founders of anthropology emphasized that cultural traits could not be studied in isolation, and rituals could not be relegated to separate remnants of a supposed past. Instead, they must be viewed in relation to the whole of society. Anthropology, after all, is a holistic science, and its goal is to describe societies or cultures as a unified whole. (Nelson, 2013, p. 81)

Among the new topics that the present era has introduced, which prompts anthropology to delve into them, is the individual, knowing that this field was concerned with groups and races in the past, and with the new religious phenomena resulting from the colonial phenomenon. Its concern was great with ancient religions and ancient religious practices among the primitives, and inherited among the tribes, in addition to the city whose events, symbols and rituals have become intertwined and have become stranger than the rituals of the ancients?

In studying the new urban world or the world surrounding the urban world, the anthropologist and ethnologist should use the best of their methodology and renew it at the same time. Accordingly, they can only work with small groups and unique interlocutors, but far from considering their interlocutors as an indistinguishable expression of a particular culture, they are obliged today to take into account the presence of each one of them at the intersection of diverse worlds and lives (local life, family life, professional life, etc.) (Oge, 2016, p. 146).

3. Translation between the linguistic and anthropological approaches:

Eugene considers translation studies (*traductologie*) to be closely related to contemporary developments in the fields of linguistics, anthropology, and psychology. Western anthropologists have also made significant contributions to the field of translation, whether their approach to this field

was social, cultural, or even philosophical. In Europe, the work of the German philosopher Wilhelm van Humboldt (1767-1835), with his insistence on the existence of deep psychological and philosophical relationships between language on the one hand, and thought and culture on the other, is considered the first important work to address the anthropological semantics of words. However, most researchers believe that the most important influence in Europe on the development of the theory of meaning was the influence exerted by Ferdinand de Saussure, whose basic concepts related to linguistic structures became the basis for constructing problems of word semantics. (Nida, 1964, p. 24)

Humboldt points out that the character and structure of a language expresses the inner life and knowledge of its speakers, and languages must differ from each other in some way to the same degree as the speakers of languages. Indeed, a single language system creates for us endless uses of finite means. He was the first European to say that human language is a system supported by laws, not just words and sentences with meanings, or that it is merely signs that reflect and express the world, since the world precedes it.

Humboldt sensed the anthropological function of languages through the concept of worldview. It is a system that involves the experiences of previous generations and is transmitted to subsequent generations. Every language draws a circle around the nation that speaks it, from which one cannot leave except to enter a circle drawn by another language (Balbouleh, 2017, p. 40). He always reiterated in his books that the distribution of the human race into peoples and ethnic groups is closely related to the diversity of languages and dialects (Humboldt, p. 173).

In the United States, as a reaction against this kind of all-encompassing mentality, many linguists set aside for a time the problems of word semantics, considering them to be outside the realm of linguistics in its narrow sense. Edward Sapir made many important initial contributions, while Benjamin Lee Whorf formulated additional and provocative concepts in which he sought to explain certain intellectual constructs related to thinking, and many features of culture, as essentially a reflection of the basic linguistic families of the languages of the peoples he studied. These studies were followed by important contributions from a number of linguists with an anthropological orientation, such as Harry Horjor, along with Floyd Lonsbury and Zellig Harris . (Nida, 1964, p. 28)

Edward Sapir considered the world's languages to be manifested within linguistic patterns, thus distancing himself from the theses of both Chomsky and de Saussure. Language is an independent system that is dealt with without regard to the social space. In anthropology, according to him, it is very difficult to differentiate between linguistics as a separate discipline and the study of language and culture. Many scholars point out that Sapir, the linguist and anthropologist, along with his student Benjamin Whorf, introduced to the field of language and thought studies at the beginning of the

twentieth century their hypothesis known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis or what is termed linguistic relativism, which means that the language spoken by an individual governs the way he perceives and comprehends the world. These linguistic habits of a social group are what make translation a difficult and profound task at the same time. His student added to this by considering the linguistic system as a framework for our view of the world, and not merely a mechanism for reproducing and expressing ideas. "Speech differs in its systems from one human group to another because it contains a purely historical heritage specific to each group. Understanding any word in any language is linked to understanding its history and heritage in that language, because it is the product of long and continuous social use. Translating a text means deconstructing and reproducing it" (Nasser, 2022).

It is not unlikely that the development of translation studies owes its existence to these mature perspectives hinted at by Sapir and his student Whorf in their call to pay attention to the functional aspect of language within the framework of what is termed the anthropological approach. This is because there is a connection between language, race, and ethics, and this is what contemporary studies have settled upon and emphasized in considering translation as "a reformulation of the thought of a particular author in the words of another language, which means that the translator absorbs this thought until it becomes part of his thinking apparatus... so he becomes connected to this apparatus, and not just a linguistic apparatus." (Yeveng, 2017, p. 9). If the original text is colored by the translator's thinking, the new text becomes a mixture of the source text and the intellectual and linguistic veneer of the translator, "then the translated text reveals the work of two writers." (Yeveng, 2017, p. 10)

Whorff and Sapir's theory of linguistic relativity changed translators' perspective on language, as the difference in grammar between two languages became not merely a formal, inconsequential difference, but necessarily led to a difference in the perception and understanding of the world for each linguistic group. This idea is similar to the ideas of the Paris School, which rejected technical and linguistic approaches in favor of adopting the interpretive theory of translation. One of the pioneers of this school, the French Sorbonne theorist Marianne Lederard, says: "Meaning is based on linguistic signs, but it does not stop at them, but rather it is specific to the whole of the text, which gradually unfolds during reading. This is what makes it possible to understand the author's intention, that is, the progression from understanding to explanation to interpretation. Hence, every translator becomes an interpreter." (Ricoeur, 2008, p. 12)

The translator also has his stylistic methods, which the reader perceives intuitively and the scholar knows through research. Some literary texts are linked to the names of their translators as much as they are linked to the names of their creators. "Therefore, ordinary language carries, without the knowledge of most of its users, traditions of thought that determine their view and perception of

the world and their division of reality. This is what prompted anthropologists to find many newly coined expressions in the hope of giving words an approximate meaning of the original language.” (Auge, 2004, p. 86)

In another context, translation is considered a form of communication that conveys a large part of the other's culture, and the reader who responds to the text expands his cognitive background by exploring the other's culture. However, the translator should not hide the forest behind the trees because some interpretations distract the reader from the work and its purpose, which necessarily requires an explanation of the ambiguous cultural facts (Lederer , 1998, pp. 161-171).

From this we understand that texts that carry cultural and ideological particularities are among the most difficult and complex texts, as they emanate from emotional meaning, especially texts related to religion and politics. Likewise, their translation is more difficult and complex. For example, the concept of freedom differs between Islamic societies and secular societies. This makes social cultural particularities, as well as material and environmental cultural particularities, an obstacle to translation that aspires to idealism or aims to bring the distance between the source language and the target language closer. This compels the translator to make changes to adapt the text in an effort to find expressions and structures that will have an effect on understanding the text.

4. Aspects of exchange and interaction :

According to Eugenia Nida, translated material is like aged wine preserved in a new bottle or like a woman dressed as a man. The results can be good and pleasant despite the judgment made by early Italian Renaissance writers, who asserted that translators are like a woman who is unpretentious when she is honest and faithful, and unfaithful and unfaithful when she is charming (Nida, 1964, p. 21).

A translated text can be a valuable addition to a second language in terms of knowledge, inspired meanings, and by placing new words and expressions in linguistic parallels with those of another language, thus granting it breadth and flexibility. In this way, for optimists, a translated text appears as a cognitive leap and a linguistic exercise. As linguists and anthropologists have shown, what unites humankind is far greater than what divides it. Therefore, even for very different languages and cultures, there is a basis for the exchange of ideas, but ultimately, this does not eliminate the astonishing fundamental differences between languages. (Nida, 1964, p. 22)

There are many things common to races and nations, and this at first seems to serve the study of translation because what it offers falls under the commonalities of civilization. However, the cultural particularities of each nation sometimes hinder the entire process, if they do not stand as a barrier to the translator from performing his task with proficiency and efficiency. The matter is not

related to the quality of the language he presents as much as it is related to the need to search for the commonalities of humanity among peoples, and to know how to delve into the cultural particularities.

Why did Max Eastman believe that most translations were bad? Was it because they couldn't express the original text in all its aspects? Or because, no matter how hard a translator tries, their work remains incomplete? What does a translator need to do and take into consideration during translation? Or is it that, no matter how much a translator exerts their talent, focuses on their tools, identifies the source language, and masters the target language, their translation remains a difficult, if not a Caesarean, birth? Among the constraints that a translator faces, preventing them from performing their tasks acceptably, are:

1. Falling under the pressure of reconciling form and content in translation, as striving to preserve the original style sacrifices meaning and vice versa.

2. A dialectic between the literal text and the spirit of the text. Some translated texts, due to the authors' fidelity in adhering to the original, lose their flavor and spirit, and do not come out similar to the original text. They are translated by ordinary people who reward the unique foreign expression with a common, vulgar expression in their native language. Therefore, translation is considered by some to be a customs circle through which smuggled goods of foreign terms pass more than through any other linguistic border if the customs officers are not vigilant (Nida, 1964, p. 23). This expression falls within a framework that condemns the translated text as being an agent against the receiving language because it invades its lexicon with foreign terms that it may be eager to enrich, and which may be beyond its need, thus forming a linguistic surplus that will inevitably lead to an undesirable inflation that violates the authenticity of the language and disturbs its purity.

5. Identification with form at the expense of content, and language is not merely letters as anthropologists say, and contrary to what descriptors say, as it includes the thought and culture of a nation.

6. Searching for the perfect text during translation, despite the translator having many options, and sometimes the translation differs from one era to another for the same book.

Every approach presupposes a specific theory, a general conception of the subject of research, a cultural heritage (literature), and an ethical commitment, which is to understand, not to judge. Texts give ample space to voices other than the researcher's voice, voices that emerge from documents and records, voices of those conversing in the field, voices of philosophers, literary theorists, writers, and every utterance that is related to the context. Therefore, writing must refrain from dissolving this diversity into an abstract unity in an attempt to reach a human truth through what can be exchanged of knowledge to overcome the traps of ethnocentrism (Auge, 2004, p. 88).

Nida pointed out the shortcomings of the old approach to translation, which focused on the form of the message more than its content. Translators focused on stylistic aspects related to weights, equality, and unfamiliar structures. Then, according to him, he moved on to the effect of the message on the receiving or target language. He believes that measuring the efficiency of translation requires comparing its effect on the target language with its effect on the source language. He also believes that the question should be posed to whom this translation is directed? Instead of the traditional question that was asked, which is , is this translation correct? (Awad, 1990, p. 91)

The problem that translators have fallen into is the search for a single correct translation that possesses all the tools for understanding and comprehending the original text. However, what Nida suggests is that there is a set of options in translation that can all be correct depending on the cultural and social level of the users of the translation (Awad, 1990, p. 92).

According to this vision, we stand, for example, before the translation of Suleiman Al-Bustani, who exerted himself in translating Homer's Iliad into poetry, and excelled in terms of the system, but the translation in terms of content, artistic impact, remained pale and did not rise to the original, while when Darini Khashaba translated it in a prose form, the translation was able to be more expressive and masterful; because he did not adhere to the literal translation, nor to the translation that focused on the artistic poetic form, because the translator then expends most of his effort and energy in matching one poetic text to another (Homer, 2017); and although the poetic text, when translated, calls for data that is not called for in the general text, poetry, according to Paul Ricoeur, poses a serious problem that is represented in the inseparable union between meaning and sound and between the signifier and the signified... which makes it difficult to accurately match one language to another .

We also find that the Arabs of old, whether during the Abbasid and Andalusian periods, did not succeed in translating the works of Aristotle, especially his books Poetics and Rhetoric, since the earliest translation by Matta ibn Yunus and his student Yahya ibn Adi. These were weak translations in terms of style and idea, so the true revolutionary impact of his thought on Arabic literature was lost, and on his book Poetics in particular, which was considered the oldest and first critical book in history, even though "with regard to philosophical texts that contain a strict meaning, the contradiction of the translation is clearly revealed, and from here both texts, the starting text and the arriving text, must be measured through a good translation by a third text that does not exist" (Ricourt, 2008, p. 30). Then some Muslim philosophers translated it, such as Al-Farabi, Ibn Sina, Al-Kindi, and then Ibn Rushd, whose translation was considered the best, to the point that Western critics said it was one of the most enlightening and influential books produced by the human mind. So why was Ibn Rushd able to understand Aristotle and not the rest of the translators? Because he was closer than

them to the Western source, and he was able to grasp the culture of the other and digest his thought smoothly, which positively affected his translation.

For example, the translation by Professor Misbah Al-Samad of Pierre Bonte 's Dictionary of Ethnology and Anthropology from French to Arabic was noted for not benefiting from the terms that some Arab translators and scholars had worked hard on in the field of anthropology, linguistics, literary criticism, structuralism, and semiotics, even though they are ready-made and used terms that have proven their cognitive and linguistic effectiveness, and have acquired an authentic cognitive presence and resonance (Saidi, 2016-2017, page 178). The failure of translators to invest in Arabic translations and studies that have created and developed a number of terms, by creating other terms that may be alien to the spirit of usage, increases the alienation of the text and distances it from the local culture, which prevents the economy of effort and the protection and preservation of Arabic culture in general from contradiction, repetition or tedious digression. The translator justifies this matter by the complexity of the issue when the translation is related to terms such as anthropology and ethnology, because the appropriate Arabic word is more difficult to obtain or more difficult to understand or lacks scientific or conceptual accuracy, which, according to him, necessitates thinking and scrutinizing the adopted terms by subjecting them to more discussion and reflection before their final adoption (Bonnet, 2011, p. 7).

The translator notes that when he compared these definitions with the terms "ethnology," "racial science," and "anthropology," he found no compatibility. Rather, they are linked to outdated definitions of the three sciences or to misconceptions about them. Furthermore, the first two are open to a similar discussion to what we have already done. As for the term "anthropology," he observes that the Arabic language generally uses the pattern "fa'ala" to denote manual professions (weaving, sewing, blacksmithing, carpentry, pottery, etc.). If an intellectual, mental, or imaginative activity, such as medicine or divination, falls under the same pattern, it indicates a practical application, not a science in itself. Medicine is one thing, and medicine is another. He calls upon translators, linguists, and specialists to fulfill their duty to the reader, knowledge, and language, to activate the internal dynamism of language and the movement of perceptions and knowledge. (Bonnet, 2011, p. 9)

Signe also appears in a number of explanatory paragraphs in the dictionary, as evidenced, for example, by its statement:

«< l'étude des signs relève deux distinctes traditions. Appelée « semiologie >> in Europe, elle y a son of origin in the travaux linguistiques of F. de Saussure (1916) This part, Russian formalists and central Europe (Tododrov, 1965), this part; This covers the structural anthropological aspects of C. Lévi Strauss (1958) and the travaux sur la theorie littéraire of R. Barthes (1964). In North America,

on the par of “<semiotique”> , the signs come from their origin in the bathroom and a notation is shown by the traffic of T. Sebeok aux Etats-Unis (666) and the U.Eco in Italy. »>

Misbah al-Samad translated this passage as follows: "The study of signs stems from two traditions." They are different. In Europe , it is called "semantics," and its origins can be traced back to the works of F. de Saussure. Linguistics (1916), on the one hand, and the works of the Formalists in Russia and Central Europe (T. Todorov, 1965), on the other, fall within this current. The semantic aspects of anthropological structuralism in K. Lévi-Strauss (1958), and especially the works surrounding R. Barthes's literary theory (1964), are also included. In North America, where the term "semiotics" is used, the study of signs finds its source in the works of Peirce, which found particular application in the works of T. Seebock in the United States and in the works of Eco in Italy. (p. 92)

It has been translated as "the study of signs " (l'étude des signes), while all Arabic linguistic, critical, and anthropological studies have translated it as "the study of signs." Similarly, the term semiotics has been translated as "the science of meaning" (ilm al-dalālah), while the science of meaning (ilm al-dalālah) is... It is a translation of : semantics (Saidi, 2016-2017, page 172)

Therefore, Paul Ricoeur seeks to approach translation from an interpretive perspective. Translation, however technical, is ultimately an act of interpretation. Hence, it is necessary to distinguish between two fundamental concepts: understanding and interpretation. The latter cannot be achieved without the former. He sees the realm of understanding as signs and meaning, the sum of laws relating to dynamic systems, structural formations, and operational order. This implies that we must understand relationships in order to interpret events. According to the Algerian translator Hussein Khamri, these two concepts correspond to the concepts of surface structure and deep structure in generative grammar, the procedure adopted by translation processes since ancient times, where the transition is from the part to the whole in order to give the text a kind of coherence and harmony. (Ricoeur, 2008, p. 11)

Paul Ricoeur also raised another issue that manifests itself in the relationship of the self to the subject, and the ego to the other. This is a real dilemma that is presented to the translator, who finds himself facing two choices with no third option: either to bring the author closer to the reader, thus carrying out a process of attaching and integrating the work and thus eliminating its particularity, or to bring the reader closer to the author, thus resorting to alienating him. This is the idea that Schleiermacher raised sharply in more than one place in his research. From here it becomes clear that the relationship between the ego and the other is a relationship based on opposition and competition, which means that the translator must respect the cultural distance and not turn the translation into a commentary or criticism (Ricoeur, 2008, p. 12).

Peter Newmark, in highlighting the relationship between translation and culture, distinguishes between three types of language. The first type presents no obstacles for the translator because it is common among peoples and its meanings are shared across languages—these are the global languages. The other two types, termed cultural language and personal language, differ between languages. The first is linked to the specificity of a particular nation's language. If there is no overlap between two languages, translation becomes difficult, and the meaning is lost between the two. The second type is more specific because it is linked to psychological expression, and we find this particularly among writers. Among the methods he suggests to overcome the difficulties of cultural words is the use of transliteration or borrowing. When borrowing is not possible, the translator can resort to functional synonyms, that is, using explanatory phrases alongside the cultural synonym by searching in the target culture for its equivalent terminology in the source culture. In addition, the translator is careful to employ other techniques to overcome the predicament created by the source language, such as omitting redundant, metaphorical, or emphatic words, or translating other vocabulary literally. (NEWMARK, 1988 p. 100)

Hence, critics who benefited from what anthropologists had concluded insisted that it is texts, not sentences or words, that want to translate our texts. Texts, in turn, are part of a cultural group through which we express different visions of the world, which, on the other hand, can exist in a state of confrontation within the same primary system of phonetic, lexical, and syntactic segmentation to the extent that they carry what can be called national culture, which is a network of worldviews in an invisible or open competition. This is what led Paul Ricoeur to say that “the translator’s task is not directed from the word to the sentence to the text and then to the cultural group, but the opposite. The translator, by representing broad readings of the spirit of the culture, descends from the text to the sentence and then to the word” (Ricoeur, 2008, p. 61).

5. Conclusion:

The approach was cancelled Anthropology arrogance Translation Craftsmanship and its tyranny Meaning one And alone For the text origin, and consideration unless something outside the language, Which mirror on Translation negatively before that Return Anthropology the spirit For the lesson The translator .

And just like She said Maryan Ladrayer no maybe The ruling on all Translations According to For the same Standards, Because she Not All of them product from same Perspective, It is possible that coexist Releases Different, The matter that He will be satisfied For reasons different Readers Different, By analogy on that maybe also that coexist peoples different In harmony Don Binary Ghalib And defeated, and dominant And oppressed .

Therefore from Most important Lessons learned from anthropology that it no maybe Dispensing on Distance Cultural language Translation, So whenever He was Translator more Understanding And understanding and reading in language origin, and living and participation that It was possible for him The matter whenever He was Its interpretation And its interpretation more inclusiveness and statement And briefing, like Translations some Orientalists Those Master Arabic Understanding And learning, The camel on end to express Ricor It flies between the people Like butterflies that no maybe Arrest On it .

Alt Translation Contemporary on Her shoulder transfer Studies Anthropology from languages foreign especially French and English to the language Arabic He is what Contributes in re Looking in relationship between ego And the other, And contributes in approximation the East from The West, And paving Bridges Real instead tissues spider flimsy, dismantling vehicles The shortage Backgrounds that I justified it The era Colonialism, And did not It is she has in time globalization Muwatta Present, what from His affair dropping representations Western For Arabs and the Muslims and rulings The arbitrariness that characterized the colonial era.

6. bibliography :

Books:

- Auger , Marc . (2016). Anthropology worlds Contemporary Algeria : son The companion .
- Augé , Marc . (2004). Anthropology , Libya : house The book New United .
- Pont , Pierre . (2011). Dictionary Ethnology Anthropology , Beirut : The Foundation University For studies and publishing and distribution Glory .
- Ricoeur , Paul . (2008). About Translation , Algeria : Publications The difference .
- Awad , Youssef Noor . (1990). Science Text and theory Translation . Mecca : house trust For publication And distribution .
- Nida , Eugene . (1964). Towards science Translation , Republic Iraqi : prints Ministry The media .
- Nelson , Thomas . (2013). History Theory Anthropology , Algeria : Publications The difference .
- Homer . (2017). The Iliad , Kingdom United : Al-Hindawi .
- Yifeng , Wang Ying and Su . (2017). Translation Globalization and giving Character Local , Kingdom United : Al-Hindawi .

References :

- Humboldt, W. (sd). *Introduction to the video on the phone and others such as the comparative linguistic research in his son's report on the different phases of language development*. The tasks of the historian of the duel. (p. Gaussat, Trad.) Paris: Seuil.
- Lederer, M. (1998). *Traduire le culturel la problématique de l'explicitation*. Palimpsestes(11).
- Newmark, P. (1988). *TEXT BOOK OF TRANSLATION*. Prentice Hall.

Theses :

- Saeed Y, M. Nal and Sam . (2016-2017). *The Problem of Translating Pierre Bonté's Dictionary of Ethnology and Anthropology: A Comparative Analytical Study* . Doctoral dissertation in Translation, specializing in Language Teaching and Terminology . Tlemcen .

Magazines and newspapers :

- Bulbulah , M. Mustafa . (2017). *The Philosophy of Language and Linguistics in Contemporary Thought, Following in the Footsteps of Humboldt* . The Academy for Social and Human Studies (13).
supporter , H. Hassan . (2022, 6.9). *Because language is the only means of our expression, translation is a union of two worlds* . Al-Quds Newspaper . Retrieved on 10/10/2024