The Faculty of Arts

Annals of the Faculty of Arts Volume 52 (January-March 2024)
http://www.aafu.journals.ekb.eg
(A Refereed Scientific periodica)

Ain shams university

Reimagining Jewish Egyptian Experience: A Study of Moatz Fteha's The Last Jews of Alexandria

Muhammad Jalal Khalifa Assaedy*

Egypt, Zagazig University, Faculty of Arts, Dept. of English
drmuhammadjalal@yahoo.com

Abstract:

One of the facts about Darwin's ideas is that they were 'radically transformed in the process of translating them into different languages and cultural backgrounds in each region around the world. Darwin's *Origin* has been translated into many languages and cultures like French, Chinese, German, Spanish, and Italian. These versions were not completely faithful to the original as they were coloured by other concepts. In other words, in these translated versions of *the origin*, some translators explained their points of view, and others linked Darwinism to other philosophical approaches that may not be mentioned in the book. Accordingly, the result of each translation was not "a true core of the book". The mentioned translations, especially the Chinese, French and German, are known to be very important because Darwin himself wanted his book to be translated into French and German. Accordingly, there was direct supervision and commentary by Darwin on the translated versions as it happened with Royer's French translation and also the letters he exchanged with Bronn regarding his German translation. This paper reviews three influential translations in three different countries; China, France, and Germany by Ma Junwu, Royer, and Bronn. The common observation among the three translations is that translators struggled to find scientific equivalents, linked the theory of evolution to other philosophical theories, and contributed to the spreading misconceptions now linked to Darwin's *Origin of Species*.

Keywords: Darwin – Origin- Translation- Science- Philosophy

Received: 19/08/2023
Accepted: 30/09/2023
Available online: 30/03/2024

Introduction

This paper attempts to prove that translated texts cannot be separated from these interrelated aspects as translation proved to be more than just rendering a group of words from one language to another. These aspects revealed some other issues like the role and presence of the translators, and how their backgrounds can interfere with the texts they are translating which can result in changing and coloring their translations. The interaction that takes place between languages through translation enables themto go through evolution. Furthermore, when a language is used in modern fields such as science it will go through a phase of enrichment specially for its scientific terms and ideas. This paper also attempts to prove the crucial role played by translation in changing the position of nations as it can be used as a tool for resistance and for strengthening a nation's sense of identity.

1.Darwin's Translation in China

Darwin's revolutionary ideas first appeared in China in 1870 and his ideas were spread by the Chinese ambassadors, literati, and overseas students. The earliest information the Chinese people knew about evolution was provided by the "foreign advisers" and the American board of commissioners. Although they were not interested in enlightening the Chinese people with Darwin's ideas they were interested in "critique transformism and to rebut secular theories of human origin" (Jin 5). The very first reference to Darwin was between 1867 and 1871 in the translation department at the Kiangnan Arsenal where technical and military works were rendered to the Chinese language. The introduction of the famous argument of "Man's ape ancestry" was originally made by John Fryer the Anglican missionary and the supervisor of the translation department of the Kiangnan Arsenal between 1839 and 1928. Fryer was not interested in the concept of the origin of man as he said: 'The origin of man is unimportant to us … It is more economical to devote research to man's destiny than to waste time on his origin' (5). Similarly, William Martin, one of the American Presbyterian missionaries also declared that "Tracking man's origin through animals and plants is no more than studying the vestige of Creation" (6). Furthermore, many of the provocative ideas mentioned by Darwin in his book were omitted and they only focused on the ideas that would serve their missions and highlighted them. Accordingly, this created a false and inaccurate version that aimed to direct the Chinese people in a certain manner. After that there was a sense of "dichotomy" and they were left to choose between "divine action or the secular causes" that were favoured by the missionaries (6).

The actual full translation of the Origin was by Ma Junwu's *Origin* and it took 18 years as he started in 1901 and finished in 1919. In his translation, he dealt with "paleontological, geographical, botanical, and zoological" technical and scientific terms and successfully rendered them into Chinese

(Shen 49). In early 1902 Ma Junwu started to initiate and publish the early versions of the translation of the "Historical Sketch of the Progress of Opinion on the Origin of Species" in instalments. He published the "Historical Sketch" in April, Chapters 3 and 4 entitled "Struggle for Existence" and "Natural Selection" in October 1902. Then, in 1903 he published chapters 1 to 5 and published the entire Origin in 1920. There is a clear difference between the first and second periods of translation because the first occurred in the late Qing Dynasty and the second was during the age of the Republic of China.

1.2 Ma Junwu's Interference in /Transmutation of the original text

According to Jin, Ma Junwu translated the *Origin* and presented a Chinese version that did not purely focus on the original text. He incorporated other "non-Darwinian doctrines" such as that of Lamarck and Spencer (1). He was much affected by the "evolutionary sensations" generated by the Chinese translator Yan Fu. The main impression about Ma Junwu's translation of Darwin's *Origin of Species* is that the translation is "substantial and interwoven with the translator's background, the history of evolutionary thinking, the development of biological sciences, and political history in China" (12). For example, he altered some concepts to fit the progressive framework he had in mind:

In the Chinese trans-lation, the concept of variation was transformed into the description of a progressive process . . . . Ma has evidently transformed Darwin's original text. Variation, for Darwin, refers to individual differences, or, more accurately, 'modifications' in organisms in the process . . . (15).

There is a clear confusion between "variation" with "variety" in Ma's translation. This shows that he included the idea of "progressiveness" in Darwin's concept of "Variation" to serve his personal view and/or objective. Not only this but to keep assimilating both the "Lamarckian and Spencerian" while translating Darwin, Ma omitted any part that does not refer to the "progressive development" which can be found in the Origin's 6th edition. He omitted the part dealing with the progressive development in both "natural selection" and "survival of the fittest". He chose to manipulate the text by not translating these parts and omitting them from the Chinese version (16). Accordingly, this interference and assimilation created confusion especially because Darwin's idea of "progress" is dissimilar to the ones proposed by Spencer and Lamarck. Darwin refused the Lamarckian doctrine concerning "progressiveness", but Ma deliberately removed this part because this contradicts the interpretations of Yan Fu and Spencer. Darwin was aware of the difference between his view and other views as a result he mentioned this in his 6th edition of The Origin of Species:

And it may be asked what advantage, as far as we can see, would it be to an infusorian animal-cule – to an intestinal worm – or even to an earth-worm, to be highly organised. If it were no advantage, these forms would be left, by natural selection, unimproved or but little improved, and might remain for indefinite ages in their present lowly condition. And geology tells us that some of the lowest forms, as the infusoria and rhizopods, have remained for an enormous period in nearly their present state.75 (as cited in Jin 18).

This exact part was translated into Chinese by Ma Junwu as follows:

Tiny organisms, like the infusorian animalcules, intestinal worms, and earthworms, are indeed lowly organized forms. Nonetheless, they are the highest living organisms in their own adapted living environment. Only if occupying the highest position could they survive until today. Otherwise, to suppose they are unfit for their environment, or struggling with more advanced species, they might have already been destroyed by natural selection. [This is why] geology shows some of the lowest forms, such as the infusoria and rhizopods, have remained for an enormous period in nearly their present state. I cannot on that account take this to be a fault of natural selection.76 (cited in Jin 18)

Ma Junwu ignored that Darwin already criticized these Lamarckian concepts of "use and disuse" "spontaneous generations and progressiveness" and "environmental effects" (he did criticize them mildly). In the part of the "Historical Sketch," Darwin declared:

Lamarck seems to have been chiefly led to his conclusion on the gradual change of species, by the difficulty of distinguishing species and varieties, by the almost perfect gradation of forms in certain groups, and by the analogy of domestic productions. With respect to the means of modi-fication, he attributed something to the crossing of already existing forms, and much to use and disuse, that is, to the effects of habit. To this latter agency he seems to attribute all the beautiful adaptations in nature; – such as the long neck of the giraffe for browsing on the branches of trees. But he likewise believed in a law of progressive development; and as all the forms of life thus tend to progress, in order to account for the existence at the present day of simple productions, he maintained that such forms were now spontaneously generated.79 (as cited in Jin 19).

Once again Ma Junwu tries to rephrase Darwin's ideas to be consistent with his goal of fusing the "progressive paradigm of evolution" into his Chinese version of the Origin:

We, therefore, have a [Lamarckian] principle that the gradual change of species leads to beauty and perfection. However, the perfect gradation of forms is so delicate that it is hard to be detected. Species gradually become fine and perfect within certain types. All the beautiful adap-tations come naturally through daily evolution. Shapes and colours of species are products of natural adaptation. Such as the

long neck of the African giraffe, which is good for reaching the leaves on tall trees. There are no better explanations other than saying this [the long neck] arises spontaneously [or naturally].80

Thus, there was a clear change in meaning, especially of the corresponding text in the *Origin of Species*. The main reason for this change is that he wanted to strengthen the social development aspect to empower his nation. He ignored the fact that Darwin himself mentioned nothing about Man and society (23). By doing this Ma was trying to apply the concepts of evolution to influence the Chinese mindset and consciousness. For Ma, the theory of evolution was more than biology; it was more of a history change force (24).

1.3 Linguistic features of Ma Junwu's translation

Ma translated the Origin into a concise, poetic, and classical Chinese language, as it was the "Orthodox scholarly medium of communication" back then. He did not use the "vernacular Chinese language" because it was not yet the standard language for science at that time (Jin,15). This classical poetic language was a proper linguistic tool that enhanced the Origin's translation in the best possible way. On the one hand, many generations did not read his translated version because of the use of the classical language. On the other hand, his translation was also semi-modern; free from any complicated grammatical structures. It was also free from redundancy, unneeded metaphors, proverbs, and historical, and literary references. Vincent Shen reports that many scholars praised his translation as it "contributed to the style of scientific writing in China after the 4th of May movement" (57). Although Darwin's revolutionary ideas impacted Chinese scientific discourse, social Darwinism had more effect in changing people's ideologies, especially with concepts like 'competition for survival'. Together with liberalism and the modified translations of Darwin, Chinese society manifested the image of individuals who are competing for survival (59).

2.1 Darwin's Translation in France

Darwin's *Origin of Species* was not much known in France during the few years after its publication. The reason for this is not clear whether it is because of a lack of interest or knowledge. According to recent studies, thirty-four periodicals were dealing with "transformism". Thirteen of them did not mention Darwin's theory, eight referred to it, and ten of them did refer "directly but not exclusively" (Miles 1). It was not translated until the French scholar Clémence Royer took the initiative. She was famous for her translation of Darwin's *Origin* and was referred to as a "femme de science profonde". However, she was accused of ruining any chances Darwin had to be accepted and understood. In his dissertation "French Reactions to Darwin 1859-1882" Robert E. Stebbins states that "Royer was neither known nor was she knowledgeable in the biological sciences." (30). She was also

accused of "intellectual Jesuitism", justifying Lamarck over Darwin and for destroying the authenticity of Darwin willfully and for personal purposes by Yvette Corny in her Introduction "du Darwinism en France au XIXe Siècle":

To produce the proof of Machiavellianism—for all that a multifaceted Machiavellianism—it is necessary to lay bare the treachery against the Darwinian text (31).

Darwin was trying to find a French translator to translate his work. In 1859 he asked his friend, Charles Lyell, the Scottish geologist if he heard before Madame Belloc, who offered to translate the *Origin* into French. At the same time, he contacted his publisher Mr John Murray to stress the fact there must be a man of science to check the translation especially because he was not good at the French language to notice any mistake. Miller mentions that Darwin was not that excited that his book would be translated by Royer and published by Guillaumin. He had to accept that because no other publisher agreed to publish his book. In 1862 he received a copy of the French version. In one of his letters to Asa Gray, the American botanist, who was considered one of his supporters, Darwin expressed that he wished the translator knew more about natural history. Although his translated book did not have much recognition in France, he did not blame Royer's translation for that. He stated, "She must be a clever but singular lady, but I never heard of her till she proposed to translate my book" (33).

2.2Royers's refusal to limit herself to the simple role of the translator

Edouard Claparêde, the Swiss scientist who was supervising Royer's translation, sent a letter to Darwin to show him how sorry he was to see his work translated by her. He described her translation as "heavy, difficult to digest, and sometimes improper" (35). Claparêde declared that she refused all the notes he gave her, and she printed many notes without his permission. Besides, she refused to get some editorial help. She introduced some corrections/changes and wrote them on her own responsibility which can be best described as opposing the progress of the natural sciences, for example, changing the term "trihedral pyramid" to "hexagonal pyramid", because, according to her, bees could not complete a "hexagonal prism". She proposed such a modification without taking a look at the honeycomb. Another example is what she wrote that the electric fish descend from one common ancestor which has an electric organ. Her lack of knowledge about zoology made her add many inaccurate ideas which eventually altered the whole description and caused distortion (36).

Moreover, there were instances of mistranslation, stylistic alteration, and infusing different philosophical considerations to the *origin*. According to Miles, although Royer deleted, omitted, and included some parts, there is no major change or alteration in the core of the Darwinian argument. But this opinion did not prove valid points because there are many mistakes like wrong numbers and

references. For instance, the numbers in the printed French versions are written as whole numbers instead of decimals. There is also wrong information in the number of seedlings destroyed mentioned by Darwin, who mentioned 295 while Royer mentioned 255. Also, the number of birds killed by winter mentioned in Darwin is four-fifths but in Royer's five-sixths (40). Another example of another error is when Darwin mentioned "Altogether at least a score of pigeons might be chosen . . ." which is mentioned as "One could assemble a choice of pigeon" in Royer's version (41). The fact that she ignored the prefix in "co-adaptation" and translated it as adaptation is considered serious because it is so related to the theory. Similarly, she was attacked by many especially by Corny because of her lack of understanding which leads her to change "selection" to "election":

according to Littré in the Dictionnaire de la langue française. the somewhat recent word "selection" was a term used primarily in zootechnie (basically animal husbandry),43 and the DictionnaireGénéral de la Langue Française du commencement du XVIIe Siècle jusqu'anosjours referred to it as a neologism which was accepted by the French Academy only in 1878. Secondly, as Conry herself noted, the term "election" was properly and currently used to describe the method of improving domestic animals by choosing the ones to be mated.45 Since Darwin began by building on the concept of artificial selection, it appears only logical that Royer would choose this term (43).

Corny concluded that it is the status of the French language that made Royer choose these terms to use. However, even if this is because of language differences, it still affects and alters the meaning.

There were some differences between Darwin's and French society's philosophies. Many French scientists were against Darwin because they believed his theory to be based on mere observations and speculations, not true science. These philosophical differences made Royer believe that the best way to present Darwinian thought is by eliminating all the parts that will lead to disagreement. She made significant changes like "changing conditional verbs and limiting modifiers to forms which conveyed positive knowledge". Besides, there are several "suppressing words" that express "doubt" and expressed "credulity or non-experimental methodology" (51). She would change words like "conclude" into "established", "cases" into "facts", "perfected" into "progress", and "truth" into "accurate" which in many parts changed the original approach. Miles mentions that "Her attempts to remove doubt, reservations, hesitancies, and other pieces of evidence of lack of certainty demonstrate a philosophical sophistication with which she is usually not credited by historians of science" (55).

2.3 Challenges Royer faced while translating Darwin

Royer faced many challenges while translating Darwin like the translation of untranslatable terms, especially in the French language. She expressed her opinion in the "preface" and mentioned that Darwin's style had disappointed the French readers as he provided a poor table of contents that was only familiar to those who already knew it. She also added that his choice for the topic of the first chapter is not a successful one. Her critics and readers were interested in the "well said" more than the "well thought", and according to this, she translated his book "more literally than the good French style would demand" (34).

2.4 Royer's contributions to the organization of Darwin's French version

Royer was very keen on making the structure, grammar, and logical sequence adaptable to French readers. Darwin's original text lacked consistency as he did not follow the sequence found in each precedent outline within the chapters themselves. She corrected this by adding subtitles, sections, numbers, and titles to the extent that the French version became more straightforward than the English one. Furthermore, Darwin assumed that the readers knew the speciality and nationality of those he used as references; accordingly, he did not provide extra information about them. Royer also corrected this part by adding more information about their nationalities and professions. The same thing happened with the scientific names of organisms and Royer clarified them as well. Thus, these stylistic changes enabled French readers to access and comprehend the text well (49).

3.1 The Origin of Species in Germany

Heinrich Georg Bronn is the first German translator of Darwin's *Origin* as he translated it as soon as it was published in 1860. He is known for his efforts to bridge the old and the new science of biology because of his oriented knowledge of palaeontology and geology (Weber 618). When Gilboff and Richards started to investigate the earlier accounts of Darwin in Germany they both concluded that Bronn's translation of Darwin's *Origin* which appeared in 1860 contributed to the misunderstanding throughout the past century. Certain aspects in Darwin's original text were indeed so challenging to Bronn because translating Darwin from English to German involved much more than just using mechanical substitutions. Bronn and Darwin never met each other, but they exchanged letters between the years 1859 and 1862 (Meyer12). Darwin was aware of how difficult the process of translating his book into German was. Accordingly, he suggested that he supervise and edit the translated version once it was finished (2). Bronn was a naturalist and had his theory as well. However, his theory was different from Darwin's as it was more evolutionary in that it dealt with the Earth's evolving concept which is progressive and gradual. In other words, his theory was not "a steady-state model" like the

one in which Darwin was inspired by Lyell (12). Still, Bronn provided German readers with reviews, translations, and critiques of Darwin's theory.

3.2 Linguistic problems that faced Bronn while translating the Origin

Indeed, many allusions and connotations were lost in Bronn's translation as usually happens in any other translation. Bronn had to find German equivalents to numerous meanings and terms mentioned by Darwin. He had to understand the deeper meaning and what exactly he meant when saying that the species "improved", "perfected" and "progressed", as Darwin liberally used them to "mean what he wanted them to mean" (14). Gliboff declared that Bronn had to use the old terminology as it was the only neutral language to communicate Darwin's meanings. He added that both Darwin and Bronn worked together to redefine the two concepts of progress and perfection. The first problem Bronn faced in translating *The Origin* started from the title, where he had to make many word choices to render the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection and also in translating "the struggle for existence" as he translates it as "fight for existence or life" (1) which Darwin was not entirely convinced with. Besides his struggle with finding similar concepts in German, he struggled more because of his unfamiliarity with the species and/or breed names like "hunting dogs and fancy pigeons" (124). The difficulty in this issue is that even if Bronn was able to find the right German breeds or species names, he and his readers did not ever see them so they will not be able to appreciate the point discussed (14):

Consider Darwin's simple statement that "The trumpeter and laugher, as their names express, utter a very different coo from the other breeds."2 In German, der Trompeter seemed like the obvious equivalent for the former breed, but that turned out to be a false cognate. For "laugher" Bronn would have liked to use the philologically similar Lachtaube (laugh pigeon), but zoologically the German word referred to the ringneck dove, a completely different species from all the others in Darwin's exposition (Columba risoria instead of C.livia), as Bronn had to explain in a footnote (134).

Once again Bronn decided to change not only the meaning but the whole message when he changed "psychology" to "physiology" in Darwin's last chapter. It was well known that Darwin deliberately avoided going into human biology and in this part, he was only tackling or predicting that in the future there would be more opportunities for important research that would enhance new foundations for psychology and mental powers which were not presented as such in Bronn's version. This change was not clear as Bronn shifted the meaning and presented a different scientific discipline, as one studies the mind and the other studies the body (124).

3.3 Bronn as a non-passive conveyor

Bronn ``never claimed to be a passive conveyor of Darwin's ideas" (125). On the contrary, he stated his authorship whenever he got a chance because he regarded himself as a better scientist and author so he wanted to present Darwin's theory in his way. This authorship is reflected in how he added, changed, omitted, and rejected many of Darwin's ideas and how he addressed the readers. First, he addressed the readers in the second person asking them directly and familiarly about how they feel after reading "this wonderful book". He also offered to help them by providing an account of his views concerning the theory of evolution itself. His tone showed friendliness and identified him with Darwin. Then he introduced his theory showing the gaps which Darwin was supposed to fill, as the idea of natural selection. Bronn stated that Darwin avoided explaining what improved quality or gave an advantage to one creature over the other "in the struggle of life" (138).

Moreover, in his summary of Darwin's theory, Bronn did not follow the same order set in the original book. He started with a big picture of "organic history, Darwin's narrative of the creator breathing life into one or just a few original forms . . ." and other concepts like 'struggle and selection' appeared later (126). When he paraphrased the concept of natural selection he did so in his own terms which made it appear as necessary for perfection and diversity (128). In addition, there were some mistranslations resulting from Bronn's inaccessibility and unfamiliarity with the examples Darwin wished to make and obscured the subtle argument (135). Gliboff suggested that Bronn wanted to use Darwin's theory and concepts to link "fitness to his own conception of progress" to include his scientific findings and present them within the German version of the Origin:

The subtitle of the German Origin was perfect for announcing this as Darwin's potential contribution to Bronn's theory. It also provided a form of insurance against the possible success of Darwin's theory. Under Darwinism, Bronn could still save the phenomena of progress that he spent so many years documenting and analyzing, by correlating morphological perfection with survival value (140).

Hence, the presented German version of the Origin of Species was not purely Darwin's. It included a lot of Bronn's contributions in terms of style, meaning, and even scientific information. In addition to that, Bronn had many objections concerning many points presented by Darwin even if he sometimes lacked definite grounds for such rejections. For instance, he rejected his method in providing several hypothetical historical narratives to show the result of using the terms "improved" and "favoured" to refer to different kinds of "qualities in different situations". Another fundamental objection was to the "justifiability of rejecting a Creator" for all these progressive species. Bronn believed that Darwin

made a mistake when he ignored the creative forces that made the first species exist in the first place (129).

3.4 Bronn's contributions to the book format

In his article, Charles Darwin's Reception in Germany and What Followed Meyer mentions that Bronn's translation was liberal and it changed the direct meanings of the Victorian English words to "a contemporaneous German sensibility" (2). Bronn added many footnotes that Gliboff mentioned before as "not very long or frequent" as they reflected the parallel knowledge of Bronn to that of Darwin. These notes were vital because they provided the reader with information about zoology and Paleontology. In addition, Bronn used them to explain many word choices and to refer to his work (Gliboff 123). He also added the final chapter "15" and several notes including a summary of his assessment, criticism, comments, and conclusions in 26 pages. He provided the German readers with an outline of the ideas Darwin wanted to say with interpretations and criticism. It is said that Darwin himself welcomed these discussions and developed certain areas in his theory based on this feedback as they both exchanged 18 letters:

. . . I have been delighted to see a final chapter of criticisms by yourself. I have read the first few paragraphs and final paragraph, and am perfectly contented, indeed more than contented, with the generous and candid spirit with which you have considered my views. You speak with too much praise of my work. I shall, of course, carefully read the whole chapter; but though I can read descriptive books like Gaertner's pretty easily when any reasoning comes in, I find German excessively difficult to understand. At some future time, I should very much like to hear how my book has been received in Germany… I ought to apologise for troubling you, but I have at last carefully read your excellent criticisms on my book.—1 agree with much of them, & wholly with your final sentence. The objections & difficulties, which may be urged against my view, are indeed heavy enough almost to break my back; but it is not yet broken! (Darwin et al. 287).

Finally, Bronn's understanding of Darwin was "inevitably coloured" by several factors. These factors resulted from linguistic ambiguities in translating the scientific conceptions from English to German, the different scientific experiences and backgrounds of Darwin and Bronn, and that feeling of "rivalry between an established theorist and a newcomer to the field", as Gliboff put it. Besides, Bronn had the goal of informing German readers with the translation and his scientific contribution, criticism, and commentary.

Conclusion

To conclude, Darwin's book is always associated with ideological debates and when searching for the reason one can see that the translators have a big role in this. This was fully proved with the cases of translating *The Origin in* France, China and Germany. After investigating these translations, it was found that they were coloured by other concepts and were not faithful to the original. The translators were influenced by other ideologies and that not only influenced but changed *the Origin* as well. In addition, It is proved that the translator's role is as important as the role of the original author and that his or her translation may change and colour the main message of the original book as it happened with the translated versions of Darwin's book. Moreover, the translator should be a cultured person not only on the source and target language level but on the source and target culture as well. This paper highlighted the issue of the sensitivity of translated texts and their role in changing the nation's social structure is another factor.

المستخلص

إعادة تصور لتجربة اليهود المصريين: دراسة لرواية "آخر يهود الإسكندرية" لـــمعتز فتيحه

محمد جلال خليفة الصعيدي

إحدى الحقائق المتعلقة بكتاب داروين أصل الأنواع هي أنه تحول جذريًا أثناء عملية ترجمتهإلى لغات ومن ثم إلى خلفيات ثقافية مختلفة في مختلف بقاع الأرض حول العالم. تمت ترجمة أصل داروين إلى العديد من اللغات والثقافات مثل الفرنسية والصينية والألمانية والإسبانية والإيطالية وغيرها.الجدير بالذكر أن هذه الإصدارات لم تكن مطابقة تمامًا للأصل حيث تم خلطها بمفاهيم أخرى. بمعنى آخر، هذه النسخ المترجمة من أصل الأنواع، شرح بعض المترجمين وجهات نظرهم، والبعض الآخر ربط الداروينية بمناهج فلسفية أخرى لم يتم ذكرها في الكتاب ولم يتبناها داروين من الأساس. وبناء على ذلك، فإن نتيجة كل ترجمة لم تعكس "الجوهر الحقيقي للكتاب". ومن المعروف أن الترجمات المذكورة، وخاصة الصينية والفرنسية والألمانية، لها أهمية كبيرة لأن داروين نفسه أراد أن يترجم كتابه إلى الفرنسية والألمانية. وعليه، كان هناك إشراف وتعليق مباشر من داروين على النسخ المترجمة كما حدث مع ترجمة روبير الفرنسية، وكذلك الرسائل التي تبادلها مع برون بشأن ترجمته الألمانية. يستعرض هذا البحث ثلاث ترجمات مؤثرة في ثلاثة بلدان مختلفة؛ الصين وفرنسا وألمانيا بقلم ما جونوورويز وبرون. الملاحظة المشتركة بين الترجمات الثلاث هي أن المترجمين كافحوا للعثور على معادلات علمية، وربطوا نظرية التطور بالنظريات الفلسفية الأخرى، وساهموا في انتشار المفاهيم الخاطئة المرتبطة الآن بكتاب أصل الأنواع لداروين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: داروين – الأصل – الترجمة – العلوم – الفلسفة

References:

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species*. A Penn State electronic classics series publication, 1859.

Gliboff, Sander. H.G. Bronn, Ernst Haeckel, and the origins of German Darwinism: a study in translation and transformation. Cambridge MIT Press. 259 p

Liu, Lisheng. 2010. "Cultural Turn of Translation Studies and Its Future Development." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol.1. no.1, 2010, pp. 94-96. Academy Publisher, doi:10.4304/jltr.1.1.94-96

Meyer, Axel. "Charles Darwin's Reception in Germany and What Followed." *Plos Biology*, vol.7, no.7. 2009. DOI:10.1371/journal.pbio.1000162

Miles, Sara, Joan. "*Evolution and Natural Law in the Synthetic Science of Clemence Royer*." 1988. The University of Chicago. PhD.

Jin, Xiaoxing. "Translation and transmutation: the Origin of Species in China." *The British Journal for the History of Science* vol.52, no.1, pp.117-141. 2018. Academia https://www.academia.edu/38115796/Translation_and_Transmutation_the_Origin_of_Species_in_China_pdf

Weber, Thomas p. "Sander Gliboff, H.G. Bronn, Ernst Haeckel, and the Origins of German Darwinism: A Study in Translation and Transformation. Cambridge, MA and London". *The British Journal for the History of Science*. 43, 4, 2008, pp. 617-619. *Researchgate, DOI: 10.1017/S0007087410001445*