Emerging Voices

Decolonial Narratives of Knowledge and Defiance in Brian Friel's *Translations* and Bseiso's *Shimshūn wa Dalīlah*

Nagwa Ebraheem Dawoud*

Introduction

Ireland and Palestine share colonial and anti-colonial struggles that have their origins in long histories of colonial settlement under British and Israeli enterprise of settler colonialism. Comparisons have been drawn between Ireland and Palestine in connection with the origins of settler colonialism, racist ideologies, nationalism and identity crises. In his book *Literature, Partition and the Nation State, Culture and Conflict in Ireland, Israel and Palestine* (2002), Joe Cleary addresses parallels between Unionists and Zionists; as he points out that Unionism as an ideology was designed to keep Ireland within the United Kingdom and was strongly pro-imperialist. With regard to Palestine, Zionist settlers, who viewed themselves as an extension of Europe, relied on the British Mandate to secure their place in the country before 1948, claiming that a Jewish state in Palestine would serve the Western imperial enterprise in the region (2002, 7). Echoing the tone of 'the white man's burden,' both Unionists and Zionists considered themselves frontier peoples of the empire. They considered themselves chosen peoples who had already created or who would create a post of civilization in the 'heart of darkness.'

David Lloyd considers past and present interconnections between Ireland and Palestine, which are geographically remote but are bound together by historical and analogical links. Both the land and the culture of Ireland and Palestine are marked by imperialism and settler colonialism and by an enduring resistance to them (2020, 334). Among the Irish and Palestinian connections that Lloyd considers is British imperial rule and its similar tactics in both countries. Palestine's relatively late subjection to British colonial rule from 1917 meant that it entered an imperial system with a well-established mode of government, policing and bureaucracy, together with a long history of counter-insurgency against anti-colonial movements. One of the direct connections linking the British Mandate regime in Palestine to the Empire's

* PhD candidate at the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University.

Cairo Studies in English – 2024(2): 151–194. https://cse.journals.ekb.eg/
DOI: 10.21608/cse.2024.318655.1186

Irish experience was the strong similarity between the police forces Britain established in Ireland and Palestine. Winston Churchill established the British Gendarmerie in Palestine, forming it almost entirely of former members of the Royal Irish Constabulary and its auxiliary force, the Black and Tans, under the command of the Irish Police Chief during the War of Independence, General Hugh Tudor (2020, 336).

Palestinian historian Rashid Khalidi argues that it is very little that Great Britain committed in Palestine was without a referent to its rich colonial heritage in Ireland. The tactics the British developed in dealing with the Irish, and in particular the rhetorical styles and patterns of derogatory discourse they deployed such as the utilization of the term 'terrorist,' or in an earlier era 'criminal,' were prototypes for their efforts to control, diminish, and denigrate Palestinians and disrupt their national resistance. Khalidi observes that among the similar strategies that Israel inherited from Britain and deployed was the effort to fragment the Palestinian population among Christian, Muslim, Druze, Bedouin, and so forth. This was predicated on a worldview that "almost invariably perceived colonized societies in religious and communitarian rather than in national terms and as profoundly divided internally rather than as potentially unified" (quoted in Llyod 2020, 336).

Among the Irish and Palestinian interconnections that Lloyd also considers is the experience of estrangement, exile, and dislocation that both have endured. When it comes to the settler colonial context generally speaking, Palestinian scholar Magid Shihade argues that "in a settler colonial context both war and peace produce similar developments when it comes to the native population: confinement, less mobility, greater estrangement and alienation from their own geography and from one another" (quoted in Lloyd, 332). Lloyd elaborates by saying that the experience of exile and dislocation is temporal; to be displaced or exiled, or to be cut off from the sites of communal memory and ongoing collective life, is as every exile or migrant knows is

> [to] be fragmented across time, lacking the continuities that tie memory and subjectivity to community and place. Who holds for us the continuity of our scattered selves, the record of who and where we have been? Enforced displacement is not only an assault on the spatial integrity of a people and on the fundamental right to freedom of movement; it is also a systematic attack on historical and individual memory, disconnecting the individual and the collective from the particulate grain of location and shared or contested memory. (2020, 332)

He argues that in the Irish and Palestinian contexts, displacement, however, demands not nostalgia, but a deliberate and reflective effort of continual

reconstitution of broken archives, a critical relation to both discontinuity and to fictive claims of belonging and settlement (2020, 333).

Within the academic world, Cleary demonstrates, the association between Ireland and Palestine often takes the form of specialized counter-insurgency discourses on terrorism. Such discourse on terrorism is a typical colonial discourse through which meanings and identities are constructed in the frame of truth. However, not all of the links between the two regions are relegated to negative stereotypes. Republican wall murals in Northern Ireland during the time of the Troubles (1960–1998) showed Irish and Palestinian guerrillas as comrades in arms, attempting to "counter more hostile discourses by representing Irish and Palestinian armed struggles not as kindred 'terrorisms' but as parallel anti-imperialist struggles" (Cleary 2002, 7). The current moment witnesses the tremendous support and solidarity the Irish State shows for Palestinians especially after the Israeli invasion of Gaza after *Toufan Al-Aqsa* (Al-Aqsa Flood) on October 7th, 2023.

Moreover, the Irish cultural renaissance was influenced by comparisons with other nationalist literary movements and in turn became a significant model for postcolonial writers. In his seminal book *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), Said associates a major strand in W. B. Yeats' poetry with the poetry of decolonization and resistance (231). Lines from Yeats's poem " The Second Coming" have been used in many postcolonial works, such as Chinua Achebe's 1958 novel *Things Fall Apart*. Linking the Irish and Palestinian contexts, Said further notes the resemblance between the poetry of Yeats of the early 1920s to the poetry of Mahmoud Darwish: their insistence on a new narrative for their people, their renderings "of the overwhelming suddenness and surprises of historical events, of politics and poetry as opposed to violence and guns" (1993, 232). The political, cultural and literary struggles resulting from British and Israeli settler colonialism illuminate each other. Studying the two experiences in relation to each other will enhance clarification and understanding, especially for the persistent Palestinian anti-colonial issue; wishing to shed more light on the Palestinian cause as an anti-colonial one and to participate in the cultural fight for Palestine.

With due respect to the specificities of each situation, one finds that in the two de-colonial causes literature represents a subversive strategy that the Irish and Palestinians use as a practice of resistance and epistemic disobedience in their attempt to decolonize knowledge produced by colonial discourse and matrix of power in order to open up options for transformation and a decolonized future. Moreover, identity reclaiming is a crucial issue in Irish and Palestinian literary narration. Literary narration is a practice of epistemic disobedience and resistance through which writers produce decolonial knowledge which represents, narrates, and reclaims identities and nations. Working within the paradigms of cultural, memory, and postcolonial and

decolonial studies, this paper aims to conduct a comparative study of selected Irish and Palestinian plays. Throughout their national and cultural struggles, Irish and Palestinian authors have produced subversive literature that defies British and Israeli colonial repressive matrices of power. For Edward Said, narrative is a method which colonized people can use to "assert their own identity and the existence of their own history" (1993, xii). Literature hence is a source of epistemic disobedience; it offers an alternative disruptive version of the hegemonic colonial knowledge. The selected literary works are Brian Friel's play *Translations* (1980) and Muin Bseiso play *Shimshūn wa Dalīlah* [Samson and Delilah] (1971). First, there will be a brief theoretical background for the paper. Afterwards, there will be an analysis of the selected plays to investigate how they produce, conjure, and evoke an archival narrative that represents and reclaims the homeland, the history and the cultural and national identity of Ireland and Palestine in an attempt to open up alternatives of freedom and decolonized future. Finally, there will be a conclusion that demonstrates the findings of the study.

Theoretical Background

Ireland and Palestine are stark examples of European settler colonialism that originated under the British colonial enterprise which aimed to plant an alien entity on native land to serve and secure colonial and neocolonial ends. Lorenzo Veracini elaborates that settler colonialism is a global and genuinely transnational phenomenon. Settlers, who are founders of political orders and carry their sovereignty with them, hide behind the metropolitan colonizer, behind the activity of settlers elsewhere,

> behind the persecuted, the migrant, even the refugee (the settler has suffered elsewhere and 'is seeking refuge in a new land'). The settler hides behind his labor and hardship (the settler does not dispossess anyone; he 'wrestles with the land to sustain his family'). Most importantly, the peaceful settler hides behind the ethnic cleanser (colonization is an inherently non-violent activity; the settler enters a 'new, empty land to start a new life;' indigenous people naturally and inevitably 'vanish;' it is not settlers that displace them). Settler colonialism obscures the conditions of its own production. (2010, 14)

Patrick Wolfe elucidates that the question of genocide is never far from discussions of settler colonialism. Land is life, so contests for land are contests for life. Wolfe explores the relationship between genocide and the settler-colonial tendency that he terms the logic of elimination (2006, 387). Wolfe points out that the structural complexity of settler colonialism could sustain

libraries of elaboration. He embarks by emphasizing that settler colonialism was foundational to modernity. He further clarifies that the primary motive for elimination is not race (or religion, ethnicity, grade of civilization, etc.) but access to territory. Territoriality is settler colonialism's specific, irreducible element. He points out that settler colonialism destroys to replace; he refers to Theodor Herzl, who once observed, "If I wish to substitute a new building for an old one, I must demolish before I construct" (quoted in Wolfe 2006, 388). One-time deputy-mayor of West Jerusalem Meron Benvenisti recalled a half-century later, "As a member of a pioneering youth movement, I myself 'made the desert bloom' by uprooting the ancient olive trees of al-Bassa to clear the ground for a banana grove, as required by the 'planned farming' principles of my kibbutz, Rosh Haniqra" (quoted in Wolfe 2006,388). Wolfe significantly stresses that renaming is central to "the cadastral effacement/replacement of the Palestinian Arab presence that Benvenisti recounts. Settler society required the practical elimination of the natives in order to establish itself on their territory" (2006, 388).

This raises partition as pertinent to the issue of settler colonialism in the context of the paper. The history of partition in the twentieth century is one steeped in controversy and violence. Joe Cleary relates the Palestinian and the Irish traumatic experience of partition; two regions where the trauma of partition continues to shape political events to this day. Delineating the social and cultural legacies of state division in Ireland and Palestine, Cleary refers to similar events of "massacre and rape, the exodus of terrorized population across state borders, the creation of new national majorities and minorities by ethnic cleansing, the tented cities of refugees that were the inevitable by-product of the drive to create homogeneous national states" (2002, 3). He demonstrates that in Ireland and Palestine, partition took place when the moment came for the imperial power to depart and transfer power to new elite, the settlers. Hence partition in the two cases was colonial political partition (2002, 3).

Cleary clarifies that the topic of partition might seem a matter for historians or political scientists, an issue that has little to do with literature and culture, but he argues that nation and state building entail the construction of national literature and involve cultural struggles to define how the national societies understand themselves and their place in the wider world system. Furthermore, in the case of partitioned societies, cultural narratives play a number of significant functions. They represent one of the media through which the trauma of partition is subsequently memorialized and understood by the people involved; they can also help either to ratify the state division produced by partition or to contest the partitionist mentalities generated by such divisions (2002, 2). The creation of national Irish and Palestinian literature after the trauma of partition helped to create a sense of shared

cultural inheritance and a sense of a common destiny. Significantly, Cleary explains that in the Irish situation state division resulted in the creation of two rival states, whereas in colonial Palestine partition resulted in the creation of an Israeli state which lacked a Palestinian counterpart. Therefore, the Palestinian situation offers "an intriguing example of the ways in which national literature is constructed in recent times by a people- many of whom live outside of the national territory they claim as a homeland- without access to its own state apparatus" (2002, 79). Cleary points out that it is precisely the lack of a common political home which made the construction of a national literature so important to contemporary Palestinians. In the absence of an available nation-state, the development of a national literature has enabled Palestinians to reinforce their sense of themselves as a distinct people (2002, 86). Cleary also stresses that in both the Irish and the Palestinian case, "the institutionalization of national literature by divided states is part of a wider network of meaning-generating systems" (2002, 93).

Thus, a major consequence of British and Israeli settler colonialism in Ireland and Palestine and the subsequent partition of the two regions has been the flowering of literature by native authors presenting the story of colonialism and its consequences from their perspective in a way that defies and delinks from the colonial matrix of power through the production of decolonial knowledge. Seamus Deane, in relation to Ireland, highlights that Irish national independence was from the beginning closely involved with the production and recovery of national literature (1995, 363). The same could be said about Palestinian literature which is integrally involved in the Palestinian resistance and struggle for independence. For Said literature is a source of identity; a battleground on which causes expose themselves to the light of day and contend with one another. Narrative for him is at the heart of history and the world of empire: "stories are at the heart of what explorers and novelists say about strange regions of the world; they also become the method colonized people use *to assert their own identity and the existence of their own history*" (1993, xii; my italics). In a similar connection, history, says Paul Ricoeur, begins and ends with the reciting of a tale, he believes that narrative is a redefining of what is already defined, a reinterpretation of what is already interpreted, he significantly adds that the future is "guaranteed *by the ability to possess a narrative identity, to collect the past in historical or fictive form*" (1995, 224; my italics).

The study works within the paradigms of cultural studies, memory studies, postcolonial and decolonial studies. Stuart Hall defines cultural studies as a discursive formation that is connected to matters of power and politics, "to the need for change and to representations of and 'for' marginalized social groups, particularly those of class, gender and race" (1992, 278). Cultural studies for Chris Barker is "a body of theory generated by thinkers who regard

the production of theoretical knowledge as a political practice. *Here knowledge is never neutral or objective phenomenon but a matter of positionality, of the place from which one speaks, to whom, and for what purposes*" (2000, 5; my italics). Hall emphasizes that questions of culture are thought of through metaphors of language, textuality, intertextuality of texts, of *texts as sources of meaning and power, multiplicity of meanings*, of textuality as a site of representation and the cultural power of representation, of textuality as resistance, *of the symbolic as a source of identity* (1992, 284; my italics).

Identity is a key term for the paper. For Barker, identities are "*discursive constructions, the product of discourses or regulated ways of speaking about the world. . . Identities are constituted, made rather than found, by representation, notably language*" (2000, 11; my italics). Hall follows a similar line in his article "Who Needs Identity" where he writes

> [i]dentities are constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions. . . *Identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture* in the process of becoming rather than being: not 'who we are' or 'where we came from', so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves. *Identities are therefore constituted within, not outside representation. They arise from the narrativization of the self*. (1996, 4; my italics)

As for memory studies**,** Micheal Rossington and Anne Whitehead showcase that memory studies permeates literature in cultural and historical discourses; they also refer to the link between the rise of memory studies and identity politics (2007, 2). Memory, with its significant role in defining subjectivities, is also vital for nation building and here it is noteworthy to refer to the intersection of individual and collective memory in identity and nation building. Rossington hypothesizes that collective memory proposes that "practices of remembrance are shaped and reinforced by the societies and cultures in which they occur" (2007, 135). He affirms that collective memory plays an important functioning role, distinct from history, in conceiving a society's past (2007, 135). Moreover, memory is central for postcolonialism as it centers around studying the effects of colonialism on the past and present of colonized people. It is central to postcolonialism because of the ways in which personal and cultural memory can be used to analyze and undermine the structures of empire. Memory can subvert the hegemony of history by offering alternative versions of established hegemonic archives; memory

serves as a "therapeutic alternative to historical discourse" (Rossington et al. 2007, 10).

Postcolonialism, according to Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, involves discussion about experiences of various kinds: migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference, race, gender, place, and "responses to the influential master discourses of imperial Europe such as history, philosophy, and linguistics, and the fundamental experiences of speaking and writing by which all these come into being" (1989, 3). In the field of postcolonialism, Joseph Massad is concerned with how colonial and post-colonial terms are used to designate a historical trajectory of the beginning and end of the process of colonialism and the ushering of a new era. However, this diachronic presentation of the history of colonialism has ignored the potential if not the actual synchronicity of these two eras in different contexts. Massad rightly elaborates how settler colonialism presents different "spatialities and temporalities as regard a diachronic schema of colonialism-then- post-colonialism" (2006, 12). He gives examples of the formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910, the American Revolution in 1776, and the declaration of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, which are examples where settler colonists declared themselves "independent while maintaining colonial privileges for themselves over the conquered populations. The conquered peoples of these territories continue to inhabit these spaces as colonial spaces, and to live in eras that are thoroughly colonial" (2006, 14).

As for decolonial studies, the enduring presence of transnational colonialism in the modern globalized world triggers calls for decolonial thinking and practices against the Western hegemonic colonial matrix of power. Among these calls is the call for epistemic disobedience through the production of decolonial knowledge. In his ground-breaking book *The Darker Side of Western Modernity (2011)*, Walter Mignolo argues that coloniality is modernity's dark side. For Mignolo, decolonial thinking is "nothing more than a relentless analytic effort to understand, in order to overcome, the logic of coloniality underneath the rhetoric of modernity" (2011, 10). The colonial matrix of power is the hidden power structure within Western civilization that manages and controls the economy, knowledge production, and political authority. Mignolo affirms that the colonial matrix of power is the very foundational structure of Western civilization. He elaborates on the colonial matrix of power saying that it is a racial system of social classification that invented Occidentalism, and created the conditions for Orientalism; distinguished the South of Europe from its center and, on that long history, remapped the world as first, second, and third during the Cold War (2009, 161).

He demonstrates that one of the defining features of decolonial strategies is the analytic of the construction of racism and patriarchy that created the conditions to build and control a structure of knowledge. Knowledge-construction that made it possible to eliminate or marginalize what did not belong. Mignolo further demonstrates that inclusion is 'a one-way street':

> [i]n a world governed by the colonial matrix of power, he who includes and she who is welcomed to be included stand in codified power relations. The locus of enunciation from which inclusion is established is always a locus holding the control of knowledge and the power of decision across gender and racial lines, across political orientations and economic regulations. The decolonial option starts from the analytic assumption that such hierarchies are constructed in the process of building the idea of Western civilization and modernity (Westernization). The decolonial option proceeds from the prospective assumption that locus of enunciation shall be decentered from its modern/ colonial configurations and limited to its regional scope. Decoloniality shall dispel the myth of universality grounded on theo- and ego-politics of knowledge. (2011, xv)

Mignolo clarifies that geo-politics of knowledge goes hand in hand with geo-politics of knowing. Who and when, why and where is knowledge generated? Asking these questions means to shift the attention from the enunciated to the enunciation, "decolonial thinking and doing focus on the enunciation, engaging in epistemic disobedience and delinking from the colonial matrix in order to open up decolonial options - a vision of life and society that requires decolonial subjects, decolonial knowledges, and decolonial institutions." (2011, 9). Elaborating on epistemic disobedience, Mignolo points out that it means to delink from the illusion of 'zero point' epistemology which is a detached and neutral point of observation from which the knowing subject maps the world and its problems, classifies people and projects into what is good for them (2009, 160). He claims that geo and body politics of knowledge have been hidden from the self-serving interests of Western epistemology and that a task of decolonial thinking and practices is the unveiling of epistemic silences of Western epistemology and affirming the epistemic rights of the racially devalued, to allow the silences to build arguments to confront those who take 'originality' as the ultimate criterion for the final judgment (2009, 162). The decolonial option in general means for Mignolo to engage in epistemic disobedience and the task of decolonial thinking in the 21st century starts from epistemic de-linking: from acts of epistemic disobedience and knowledge-making (2009, 174). The following

sections of the paper will make use of what has been mentioned above and will examine how Friel and Bseiso in their selected plays engage in epistemic disobedience in their attempt to de-link from the British and Israeli colonial matrices of power through knowledge production. Friel's *Translations* will be considered first.

Epistemic Disobedience in Friel's *Translations*

Friel's *Translations* was the inaugurating production of the Field Day Theatre Company. A three-act play set in a hedge-school in the town of Baile Beag, an Irish-speaking community in county Donegal in 19th century Ireland. In this play, considered by many critics Friel's best play, Friel tackles language as a marker of identity. According to Anthony Roche, Friel was preoccupied with the issue of language as a co-founder of the Field Day Theatre. Roche demonstrates that in the political vacuum that was Northern Ireland in the 1980s, Field Day wished to make the same kind of cultural intervention as the founders of the Irish Literary Revival had a century earlier. Like the first theatre movement, "they engaged with the issue of language. Friel's *Translations* approached the subject philosophically by drawing on George Steiner's *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* and historically by looking at the period in nineteenth-century Ireland when the English language began to establish its hegemony" (2007, 509). However, for many critics there is a wide range of issues tackled in the play, most importantly among them is of course language, but there are also other issues such as land, history, and cultural colonialism. The paper addresses these issues to investigate how Friel utilizes them as subversive tools to produce, conjure and evoke an archival narrative that represents and reclaims the homeland, i.e., the history and the cultural and national identity of Ireland.

The question of land comprises a matter of great importance for Irish nationalism. The land issue is of intrinsic value for Irish authors and nationalists. Seamus Deane significantly points out that the two Celtic Revivals in Ireland (one beginning in the late eighteenth and one in the late nineteenth) took the form of a concentration on certain issues which had political resonance. Deane talks about language, history, and land (1987, 13). In a similar vein, Said refers to Irish Nationalism as marked by internecine struggles involving the land question, the Church, and the nature of parties and leaders. Said points out that it was the land question which was dominating the movement in their attempt to regain control of the land, he further quotes the 1916 proclamation that founded the Irish Republic, "the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, [is] to be sovereign and indefeasible" (quoted in Said 1993, 236). From all this we realize the intrinsic value of the land issue for the Irish people. This was reflected in literature and in Friel's *Translations*

in particular as it reveals Friel's preoccupation with the British Ordnance Survey of Ireland that represented the British colonial matrix of power that Friel defies and epistemically disobeys.

Disturbed by the Irish Troubles in the 1960s and 1970s, Friel chose to reflect on such troubling events in Northern Ireland through his play. Declan Kiberd maintains that like Seamus Heaney, Friel "was a canny northerner who chose a remote historical event to throw an oblique light on the present" (1996, 614). Ciaran Deane rightly notes that *Translations* was not merely the chronological starting point of Field Day's quest for cultural redefinition in Ireland; it also contained within it the core message of the group's subsequent creative endeavors, a message derived from *a postcolonial interpretation of Irish history* (2008, 8; my italics). Seamus Deane also believes that Field Day's analysis of the northern situation derives from the conviction that it is, above all, a colonial one. Commenting on most of the Field Day production, Seamus Deane showcases that there is an evident preoccupation with naming in the first three pamphlets by Tom Paulin, Seamus Heaney, and myself and "evident too in the plays by Brian Friel ... The naming or renaming of a place, the naming or renaming of a race, a region, a person, is, like all acts of primordial nomination, an act of possession" (quoted in Ciaran Deane 2008, 8). Tom Paulin argues that "the history of language is often a story of possession and dispossession, territorial struggle and the establishment or imposition of a culture" (quoted in Pine 1990, 145). Language and place are intrinsically related; Richard Pine expounds that in looking at the language question, Friel unites the sense of place with the function of place. This encompasses "both the affection which is inherent in affiliation, and the exercise of will (or freedom) which makes a place live. Language itself is the factor which unifies these two aspects of the human spirit- its sense of being, and its method of being- or it may be the factor which segregates them, displaces and anaesthetizes meaning and paralyses purpose" (1990, 145). Language which is affiliated to a place provides a sense of identity and belonging to such a place. It is also a method of practicing that identity and when natives are deprived of that sense of belonging to a place that is represented in language; this leads to linguistic segregation which leads to identity erasure.

The remote historical event that Friel uses in order to reflect on the Northern Ireland Troubles is the British Ordnance Survey during the 1830s. He draws on Irish history through retelling an actual event in 1833 in Ireland when the British government attempted to make a new map for Ireland by translating the local Gaelic place names of the Irish towns and cities into English. Kiberd explains that throughout the later 19th century, Ireland functioned as a sort of political and social laboratory in which the English could test "their most new-fangled ideas- ideas about the proper relation between religion and the state,

about the changing role of the aristocracy, *above all about the holding and use of land*" (1996, 24; my italics). The time of the play's incidents is significant as the events of the play precede the famous Potato Famine of 1840. It is a time of transition, when the Irish-speaking society of Baile Beag was about to be mapped into a different culture. Furthermore, the British government also established 'national schools' to replace indigenous Irish hedge-schools, an attempt to erase Irish cultural identity. These state-sponsored schools provided education in English for free while at the hedge-schools students paid to get education in Irish. The play hence demonstrates Friel's preoccupation, as Ciaran Deane indicates, with the idea of language as a medium that "actively shapes rather than passively records human experience; with how the power of language to shape things is rooted in the process of naming, and how naming is an intrinsic part of private and public self-definition" (2008, 8).

In his "Yeats and Decolonization," Said maintains that more than any other of its colonies, Britain's Ireland was subjected to innumerable metamorphoses through repeated settling projects and, "in culmination, its virtual incorporation in 1801 through the Act of Union. Thereafter an Ordnance Survey whose goal was to Anglicize the names, redraw the land boundaries to permit valuation of property (and further expropriation of land in favor of English and "seigniorial" families), and permanently subjugate the population" (1993, 226). The survey was carried out by English personnel, which, according to Mary Hamer in her "Putting Ireland on the Map", had "the immediate effect of defining the Irish as incompetent [and] . . . depress[ing] their national achievement. In such a process, the colonized is [supposed to be] passive spoken for, does not control its own representation but is represented in accordance with a hegemonic impulse by which it is constructed as stable and unitary entity" (quoted in Said 1993, 226). This Ordnance Survey is an example of what Said calls imperialism's complex "yet firm geographical *morte main*" (1993, 225). For Said, imperialism is an act of geographical violence through which virtually every space in the world is explored, charted, and finally brought under control. Said continues to elaborate that colonial space must be transformed sufficiently so as no longer to appear foreign to the imperial eye and this is done through series of what he brilliantly calls "innumerable metamorphoses." Being aware of how the history of colonial servitude is inaugurated by loss of the locality to the outsider, natives search for and try to restore and reclaim their geographical identity, but because of the presence of the colonizer outsider, *the land is recoverable at first only through the imagination*. As Said goes on to clarify "if there is anything that radically distinguishes the imagination of anti-imperialism, *it is the primacy of the geographical element*" (1993, 225; my italics).

This primacy of the geographical element is foregrounded in Friel's *Translations*. As one of those natives who are keen to restore and reclaim his people's geographical identity, Friel chose to return imaginatively to a remote historical event before his homeland was appropriated and translated. Said comments on the play arguing that it is one of the most powerful plays that "deals with the shattering effect of the Ordnance Survey on the indigenous inhabitants" (1993, 226). Friel shows the shattering effect Said discusses, but at the same time he reclaims the Gaelic identity of the Irish land by integrating the Gaelic place names in his play, elaborating on the Gaelic land identity usurpation by the British colonial Ordnance Survey. Taking into consideration that the play is written in English (the plot of the play implies that the natives speak in Irish) it is significant to note that the only Irish words heard in the play are the place-names such as *Bunna hAbhann* and *Tobair Vree.*

In the play, the main characters are: Hugh, the hedge-school master, his son Manus who teaches at the school, Owen, Hugh's other son and the school's students: Sarah, Maire, Jimmy Jack Cassie, Doalty and Bridget. This is in addition to the British Captain Lancey and lieutenant Yoland. Constructing the play around Hugh, the hedge-school master is revealing as Friel's maternal grandparent was a hedge-school headmaster. The action begins with Owen returning home after six years away in Dublin. With him are Captain Lancey, a cartographer, and Lieutenant Yolland, both working on the map survey of Ireland for the Ordnance Survey. Owen acts as a translator and a 'go-between' for the English and Irish. Yolland and Máire fall in love. Manus, who had been hoping to marry Máire, learns about such an affair and becomes angry. Yolland goes missing overnight (it is hinted that he has been attacked by the Irish armed resistance).

Hedge schools were small informal schools in the 18th and 19th centuries in Ireland. From the word hedge (a suggestion that classes took place outdoors next to a hedgerow, but in most cases classes were held in a house or a barn) it is inferred that Hedge schools represent pastoral Ireland. They provided primary education for those of non-conforming faiths (Catholics and Presbyterians), students learned reading, writing, and math in the Irish language, and in some schools the Irish bardic tradition, Latin, and history were taught. Pine states that the hedge school is sentimentally linked to the notion that 'every Kerry ploughboy has a copy of Homer in his breeches pocket' (1990, 153). As for national schools, Kiberd attains that they had an ambiguous reputation, since they were cited by nationalist historians as having played a major part in the decline of the Irish language (1996, 614). Cheikh Hamidou Kane rightly notes that colonialism's power was not only residing in the cannons, but in what followed the cannon: "therefore behind the cannons was the new school. The new school had the nature of both the

cannon and the magnet . . . The cannon forces the body and the school fascinates the soul" (quoted in Thiang'o 1994, 436). Therefore, it is significant to refer to the importance of the hedge schools in Ireland at that time as a place that represents Irish Gaelic heritage and culture. There is a recurrent mention of them throughout the play as they are a recurrent motif for epistemic disobedience as we feel a kind of antagonism between hedge schools and national schools in the play.

Early in the play, Maire, who is very keen on learning English, urges Manus to apply for a job in the new national school. There is even irony in naming the new English schools, "national" schools. Maire alludes to the fact that national schools, a colonial matrix of power, were for free, which is a smart strategy by English colonizers. In a later scene, Hugh tells his students at the hedge school about his meeting with Mr. Alexander, Justice of the Peace, "we discussed the new national school. Mr. Alexander invited me to take charge of it when it opens. I thanked him and explained that only if I were free to run it as I have this hedge school for the past thirty-five years - filling what our friend Euripides calls 'alestos pithos'- James?" Jimmy (one of the students) translates the Latin phrase saying, "The cask that cannot be filled" (*Trans*. 28). Even Manus by the end of the play leaves and accepts an offer to start a new hedge-school in another town. We feel that the new hedge-school Manus leaves for is a counter strategy; a tool of epistemic disobedience by the locals to defy and compete with new national schools. Natives realized the danger of such national schools to their identity and resisted such an encroachment.

Within the plot of the play, Friel reclaims the Gaelic identity of the land of Ireland by stressing on Gaelic place names and the English re-nomination of them. Naming is the key to identity; it is a battlefield in relation to identity struggle. That is why early in the play Friel highlights the importance of names in affirming identity. In the play, within the remapping project, the process of renaming is applied to people and places. Pine argues that naming for Friel presents a difficulty which typifies the position of the individual in relation to authority, and the problem of communication between two cultures; he further points out that although known as Brian Friel, Friel's birth certificates bear the names Bernard Patrick Friel. At the time of Friel's birth, the Protestant Bureaucracy discouraged the registration of Gaelic names so "the Anglicization 'Bernard' was adopted for the purpose of registration in place of 'Brian.' It is not only Friel's lightheartedness but also a sense of the duality in his background and in his destiny, which makes him offer the suggestion ' perhaps I'm twins.' Self and 'otherness'" (1990, 15). Even Friel's place of birth Derry suffered a similar naming crisis (identity crisis), it was known to the Nationalists as Derry and to the Unionists as Londonderry. In the play we sense Friel's response to the nationalist context of his birth place in west Ulster with its cultural and political history that was inflicted on

Friel's identity (Pine 1990, 15). This is reflected in *Translations* through the character of 'Owen' who is named 'Roland' by the British cartographer Yolland; the two names denote a conflict in the two entities, an entity which is inherited in an Irish native culture and another imposed by an intruding invading culture.

Regarding this connection, the play opens with Manus helping Sarah to pronounce her name in Irish properly and proudly: "Manus: Get your tongue and your lips working. 'My name—'comes on. One more try. ' My name is-- --' Good girl./Sarah: My. . . /Manus: Raise your head. Shout it out" (*Trans*. 7). To be able to say your name, is to be able to assert your identity and your place in the world. As Pine points out, naming is central to the theme of identity (1990,145). It is important to notice how in a later scene, when Owen comes back and asks Sarah "who are you?" after a brief hesitation, she bravely says her full name " Sara Johny Sally" and after that, Owen associates the name with a place saying "of course! From Bun na hAbhann!" and then introduces himself as a name related to a place "I'm Owen- Owen Hugh Mor. From Baile Beag. Good to see you" (*Trans*. 31–32). Names as synonymous with identity are attached to a place.

To many critics, Sarah represents Ireland; Seamus Heaney categorizes her "as if some symbolic figure of Ireland from an eighteen-century vision poem, the one who confidently called herself Cathleen ni Houliham, has been struck dumb by the shock of modernity" (quoted in Baker 2000, 260). For Charles Baker, her position symbolizes victims of imperialism, who lose their language and consequently their identity. Baker rightly adds that Sarah is struggling with her own name as those around her struggle with their concept of themselves (2000, 260). For anyone to speak out and voice his/her name in one's own language which is attached to one's own land is an affirmation of one's own identity; it is a kind of resistance, to be able to emerge from the state of voicelessness imposed by imperialism. Language is intrinsically related and attached to a specific land; language and land are two inseparable issues; one cannot talk about land without considering language.

Ngugi wa Thiang'o in his seminal book *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (1986), delineates the intrinsic relation between language, culture, and a national identity related to a specific land. For Thiang'o, language as culture is the collective memory bank of a people's experience in history. When a community loses its language it loses its culture, direction, and identity. People over time develop a distinctive culture and history; culture embodies moral, ethical and aesthetic values through which people come to view themselves and their place in the world (1994, 441). Therefore, what happens when the language of colonized peoples is dominated and replaced by the colonizer's language? They lose the tie that connects them to their land, culture and history; they lose an integral

component of their identity. Expanding on linguistic colonialism, Thiang'o points out that "the domination of a people's language by the language of the colonizing nations was crucial to the domination of the mental universe of the colonized" (1994, 442). That is why he titled his book 'Decolonizing the Mind;' epistemic disobedience that occurs through decolonization of knowledge is a crucial intrinsic step in the struggle for decolonization and transformation.

The mental universe of the colonized is the most important area of domination; economic, social, political, and land domination can never be complete without mental control. The inauguration of mental control is the control of language: how people perceive themselves, others, and the places where they live, in brief controlling their tools of self-definition in relation to others. This is what is presented in *Translations*. The British implemented their project of mental colonialism by replacing local hedge-schools by state-sponsored national schools providing free education in English for all; accompanied by this, the replacement of Irish place names with English names. It was a standard colonial project of language and hence identity erosion.

Doalty and Bridget are examples of the natives who are troubled by, and in a way aware of, the dangers of the new schools and the British Ordnance Survey. Doalty thinks or wishes that no one gets near the new schools; he even tries to defy them (the sappers) by a simple act of resistance as he says "every time they'd stick one of these sticks into the ground and move across the bog, I'd creep up and shift it twenty or thirty paces to the side," he further tells Maire that this is a gesture "*just to indicate . . . a presence*" (*Trans.* 17; my italics). So Doalty's simple act of resistance is a form of counter attack against the British violation of his native land and *native mind*. In contrast to Doalty, there is Maire who even collaborates with the sappers and allows them to leave their machine in her house. She represents those who are fascinated by the English language and the culture associated with it and she is willing to decline her native language, and her native culture associated with it:

> MAIRE: We should all be learning to speak English. That's what my mother says. That's what I say. That's what Dan O'Connell said last month in Ennis. He said the sooner we all learn to speak English the better.
> HUGH: Does she mean that little Kerry politician?
> MAIRE: I am talking about the liberator Master, as you well know. And what he said was this: ' the old language is a barrier to modern progress.' And he is right. I do not want Greek. I do not want Latin I want English. I want to be able to speak English because I am

> going to America as soon as the harvest's all saved. (*Trans.* 28; my italics)

Kiberd indicates that the matrix of British colonialism associated the Irish language in the popular mind with poverty, backwardness and defeat (1996, 614). Similarly, Thiang'o exposes the devastating effect of self-contempt and colonized people's hate of their own language, "where his [the native] own native languages were associated in his impressionable mind with low status, humiliation, corporate punishment, slow-footed intelligence and stupidity" (1994, 443). Thiang'o significantly refers to the alienation caused by the imposition of colonial language and how it was worse when the colonized was exposed to images of his world as mirrored in the written languages of his colonizer (1994, 443).

The estrangement and self- alienation resulting from British linguistic colonialism is evident in a scene between Owen and his father when the Irish place names were replaced by English:

> OWEN: Do you know where the priest lives?
> HUGH: At Lisa na Muc, over near…
> OWEN: No he doesn't. lis na Muc, the fort of the pigs, has become Swinefort… And to get to Swinefort you pass through Greencastle and Fair Head and Strandhill and Gort and Whiteplains. And the new school isn't at Poll na gCaorach- it's at the Sheepsrock. Will you be able to find your way? (*Trans.* 50)

Hugh is confused and alienated from the land and the names he knows all his life and he is supposed to familiarize himself with the new imperial geographical matrix. This is part of what Said calls imperialism's geographical violence and geographical *morte main*. Said elaborates on this idea further by making use of Alfred Crosby's *Ecological Imperialism* (1986), where Crosby contends that Europeans immediately began to change the local habitat of the places they colonized; their conscious aim was to transform territories into images of what they had left behind. Crosby elaborates that this process was never-ending, "as a huge number of plants, animals, and crops as well as building methods gradually turned the colony into a new place, complete with new diseases, environmental imbalances, and traumatic dislocations for the overpowered natives" (quoted in Said 1993, 225). The buds of this ecological change are felt in Baile Beag as we have in the above-mentioned extract from the play. Said adds that a changed ecology also introduced a changed political system, *this alienated the people from their authentic tradition, ways of life, and political organization. Imperialism alienated the people and the land* (1993, 225; my italics).

Through the memory of the national and hedge schools and the British colonial map-making matrix, Friel is stressing, as Pine points out, that a society in search of identity must know the "pathways and holy places of the mind as surely as it knows its streets, hedgerows and sheep tracks" (1990, 3). Language is one of the holy places of the mind. The loss of language is a loss of direction; it is a loss of one's perception of his world and his place in that world and this is the objective of colonialism. This is what the play is denouncing, and through this Friel is reflecting on the situation in Northern Ireland at the time of troubles. Kiberd believes that Friel is no nostalgic revivalist, no exponent of the dreamy backward look. Friel believes that "the only merit in looking back is to understand how you are and where you are at the moment" (quoted in Kiberd, 1996, 616). Understanding what happened in the past and how 'colonialism put a knife on the things (among them language) that hold them together and the society falls apart' is of crucial significance for natives to reclaim their national and cultural identity that is manifest in language. So it is important to understand how the British put a knife and split the Irish island and made it an 'island apart.' In a similar connection, Kiberd demonstrates that Friel believes that culture can be 'causative,' can have political outcomes, "so, when he discusses language, he sees it as a specific basis for all politics which might ensue" (1996, 616). Northern Irish writers, Kiberd goes on to say, are more conscious than southern Irish writers of this fact, as they grew up in a state where the speaking of Irish was a political act, "where a person who gave a Gaelic version of name to a policeman might expect a cuff on the ear or worse. Writers were aware of a cultural deprivation from birth and sought to repair it as best as they could" (1996, 616). So, in the play, Friel tries to repair and conjures that period in the Irish history and utilizes it as a subversive maneuver of epistemic disobedience.

Ironically, the one who collaborates with the British in their project of identity erasure is Owen, the son of the hedge school master Hugh. Owen is the translator (the go between) who is employed by the 'Red Coats' to translate the local place-names from Irish to English for the sake of the new British map of Ireland. Introducing Lancey and Yolland to his father Hugh and others at the hedge school, Owen says:

> OWEN: He's the cartographer in charge of this whole area. *Cartographer* -James?
> JIMMY: *A maker of maps.*
> OWEN: Indeed- and the younger man that I travelled with from Dublin, his name is Lieutenant Yolland and he is attached to *the toponymic department* – father?
> HUGH: He *gives names to places*.

> OWEN: Indeed- although he is in fact *an orthographer*- too slow- Manus?
> MANUS: The *correct spelling of those names*. (*Trans*. 31; my italics)

Here it is relevant to refer to the importance of cartography to the matrix of the British empire, Bill Ashcroft believes that apart from the invention of history, there has been no more profound effect on people's understanding of the nature of the world than in its representation in maps (2001, 128). This is clear in the play in the earlier extract when Owen asks his father if he knows where the priest lives, and after explaining to him the translations of names from the Gaelic language that Hughs knows and is familiar with, to the English ones of the colonial scheme, asks him " will you be able to find your way?"(*Trans*. 50), a question which is not answered in the play. It could be inferred that Hugh might be able to find his way to the priest's house after a while when he grows accustomed to the new names (identity), but he may as well lose an identity attached to the Irish land with its Gaelic place names. Baker believes that Friel argues against a romantic point of view that simply presents English imperialists who rob the Irish of the very names of the places they hold dear (2000, 271), but one can disagree with Baker here, one feels that this is the case here with Hugh and the others. This theft results in self-alienation for the natives which Thiang'o considers to be caused by the imposition of colonial language on native's land.

Geography, maps, and mapping significantly impacted our ways of imagining the world than any other discourse. As a particular form of knowledge, "maps were metonymic of power; they not only represented space, they represented the power of the fixed, all-seeing viewpoint; the power to create a universal space"(Ashcroft 2001, 129). Maps represent the European matrix of power and the ability of representing the globe. Joe Rabasa refers to maps as a trace of European expansionism that "continues to exist in the bodies and mind of the rest of the world. They are evidence of the power of European discourse and its construction of the world; they have defined Europe as a privileged source of meaning for the rest of the world" (1995, 358). Friel's choice of the British Ordnance Survey in Ireland is telling, as maps provide an identity for the land and the new British colonial map of Ireland at that time is an identity erosion of the Irish land; hence it is a military operation.

This is displayed in the play in another important scene in which Lancey explains the project to Hugh and his students at the hedge school, "Lancey: (He clears his throat. He speaks as *if he were addressing children*-) you may have seen me-seen me-working in this section-section? – working. We are here- here- in this place—you understand? – to make a map-a map- a map and

–" (*Trans*. 35; my italics) From the stage directions, the imperial patronizing patriarchal attitude is clear; the authoritative colonizing empire is talking to the colonized children, trying to simplify and explain so that the child-like natives might understand the significant issues and the civilizational mission of the all-knowing patriarchal colonizer. The empire is controlling, possessing the right, power, and ability of representation. Owen tells Hugh and his student "*the job is being done by soldiers because they are skilled in this work*" (*Trans*. 35; my italics). The empire has skills and knowledge and from that knowledge stems power. Here, the Foucauldian relation between knowledge and power is clear. The British with their machines and tools know how to make a map, how to re-nominate a native place in their own terms. Once they re-name a place in their own terms, they know it and as a result control and own it; to know how things are done is to own and control. Ashcroft significantly highlights how maps have continued to be a prime means of 'textualizing' the spatial reality of colonized peoples, "*to name place is to announce discursive control over it by the very act of inscription, because through names, location becomes metonymic of those processes of travel, annexation and colonization which effect the dominance of imperial powers over the non-European world*" (2001, 134; my italics).

A significant related point that Baker clarifies is the fact that Friel bases his concept of the power of naming on George Steiner's *After Babel* (1975) who considered naming as "analogous to God's own diction, in which the mere naming of a thing was the necessary and sufficient cause of its leap into reality" (quoted in Baker 2000, 269). It is significant to notice the name the British (Red Coats) gives to the machine they are using in their project, as Maire tells Doalty who was asking Manus about the name of the machine,

> MAIRE: Theodolite.
> JIMMY: Theodolite – what's the etymology of that word, Manus?
> MANUS: No idea.
> JIMMY: theo- theos- something to do with a god. (*Trans*. 17)

The Red Coats attribute to their machine the power of God by giving it the name Theodolite, which, as Jimmy finds out, is derived from God. The God-like machine some divine abilities of actualizing something into existence, accordingly, Ireland will "leap into reality" only when renamed by the British machine. Even Owen is aware of this power and affirms "*we name a thing and- bang!- it leaps into existence!*" (*Trans.* 54; my italics). To give a name is to give an identity, is to give an existence. This brings Walter Mignolo's notion on how theology was the overarching conceptual and cosmo-logical frame of knowledge-making in which social actors engaged and institutions were created. Thus, Western imperial knowledge was cast in Western

imperial languages and was "theo-politically and ego-politically founded" (2009, 166).

Friel, in relation to Ireland, holds similar convictions to Thiang'o who laments the fact that Africa was made to believe that it needed Europe to rescue it from poverty and backwardness, it even produced intellectuals who rationalized this upside down way of looking at Africa. Thiang'o sarcastically inquires "what is the difference between a politician who says Africa cannot do without imperialism and the writer who says Africa cannot do without European language?" (1994, 450). He defiantly boasts that African languages have refused to die, these languages (representing the national and cultural heritage) of Africa were kept alive by the peasantry who saw no contradiction between speaking their own mother tongues and belonging to a larger continental or international geography (1994, 447). In the play, Friel makes a similar point through the character of Owen, who represents what Thiang'o calls "intellectuals who rationalized this upside down way of looking," and other characters, specifically Manus, who represent Irish peasantry who refused the erasure of their national identity through the erasure of Irish place names. Manus is the one who consciously evokes epistemic disobedience in the play. In one of the significant scenes in the play, there is an encounter between (Manus and Owen) the two types of natives that Thiang'o considers. In that encounter, Manus defiantly reproaches Owen defending the Irish place names of his homeland and condemning Owen's mistranslation to the locals of what the arrogant Captain Lancey is saying about the British colonial project. In his translation, he ignores Lancey's reference to military authority and Ireland as part of the empire and how the maps are made for the sake of exploiting the land and imposing taxes on the native owners of the land. Owen in his translation fools the listeners to believe that taxes will be reduced. Infuriated by Owen's mistranslation, Manus angrily asks his brother:

> MANUS: what sort of translation was that, Owen?
> OWEN: Did I make a mess of it?
> MANUS: you weren't saying what Lancey was saying!
> OWEN: 'Uncertainty in meaning is incipient poetry'- who said that?
> MANUS: there was nothing uncertain about what Lancey said: *it's a bloody military operation,* Owen! And Yolland's function? *What's incorrect about the place-names we have here?*
> OWEN: Nothing at all. They're just going to be standardized.
> MANUS: You mean changed into English?
> …
> MANUS: *And they call you Rolland! They both call you Roland.*

> OWEN: Easy, man, easy. Owen- Roland- what the hell. *It's only a name. it's the same me, isn't it? Well, isn't it?* (*Trans.* 38; my italics)

In this encounter, there is 'the native intellectual' Owen, who, using Thiang'o words, believes his country Ireland cannot do without imperial Britain; we also have to the opposite 'the native peasant intellectual' Manus, who believes in and values his native place with its native language "what's incorrect about place-names we have here?" Furthermore, Manus is fully aware that it is a " bloody military operation," he even wonders how Owen accepts Lancey's calling him Roland, and Owen mistakenly thinks that it is not a problem, it is just a name and it is the same him. However, it is not the same; it is identity theft when someone willingly sacrifices his language, names of his homeland's places, his own name, he is willingly sacrificing his identity. Owen (the go between) and Maire represent the rotten potatoes among the Irish people, the catalyst of the risk of their own language and identity erosion.

However, not all the characters are like Owen and Maire or even the fossilized Jimmy. Friel is keen to show that Manus is aware of what is happening, it is 'a bloody military operation,' he trusts the Irish names of the places, by asking such a rhetorical question what's wrong about the place names they have? Friel bestows pride on his Irish people and reclaims their place identity through the simple act of inserting the Irish place-names back in his play. If the British project was to claim Irish land as belonging to England, Friel's project in the play is to reclaim the land back as belonging to the Irish people. Furthermore, through the simple hint to the fact that the Irish could speak Greek, Latin, Irish and some can speak English as well; this renders them more civilized and cultured than their British oppressors who stereotype them in derogatory misrepresentations of barbarism and primitivism. Hugh exclaims how Captain Lancey does not know Greek or Irish: "he explained that he does not know Irish. Latin? I asked none Greek. He speaks–on his own admission-only English" (*Trans*. 26). For Pine this is part of Friel's subversion in the play denying English Sappers a capacity to "discourse in Latin, to suggest that the otherwise inferior society of Ballybeg might have some cultural values unavailable to colonists" (1990, 154). This is a subversive maneuver of knowledge decolonization and epistemic disobedience.

In this connection, it is significant to notice that by the end of the play, Friel reclaims the Irish identity of the places through Owen (the go between) himself, who we feel undergoes a change by the end of the play. Lancey threatens the natives that if Yolland does not appear, the British soldiers will evict and level every house in some town lands. Lancey starts reading the names of the threatened places that Owen translated into English and Owen

translates the now English place- name back into Irish so that the natives can recognize them, "(Lancey reads from his list) Lancey: Swinefort./Owen: Lisa na Muc./Lancey: Burnfoot./Owen: Bun na hAbhann./Lancey: Dromduff./Owen: Druim Dubh" (*Trans*. 74). Heaney in his "Review of *Translations*" believes that this moment at the end when the place names Owen translated are read out by Captain Lancey and Owen is translating them back into Irish is a reversal of naming in which national identity is being restored (1991,5 58). Symbolically, near the end of the paly, in the scene between Owen and his father, Owen (as his father was reading in the catalogue of the new translated place names) significantly says: "I'll take that. (in apology) it's only a catalogue of names/ Hugh: I know what it is/ Owen: A mistake – my mistake – nothing to do with us. I hope that's strong enough. (Tea.) (he throws the book on the table and crosses over to Jimmy.) Jimmy. Wake up, Jimmy. Wake up man." (*Trans*. 81). When Hugh says 'I know what it is' this means that he is well-aware of what is happening and the meaning of such erosion of names and identities as he later one tells Owen as he looks at Jimmy, "it is not the literal past, the 'facts' of history, that shape us, but images of the past embodied in language," hence the change of the language of the place-names is a change (a metamorphosis) an erosion of historical identity attached to these place names. Owen as it was mentioned earlier seems to finally realize the threat of the new 'catalogue of names' and throws it away as he tries to awaken Jimmy from his sleep (fossilization) while saying 'my mistake.'

Thus, the play succeeds in alerting the audience to the importance of names and the dangers of colonial renaming of people and place. By the end of the play, Owen himself and the audience realize that "it is not the same me" if someone's or a place's name is renamed in purpose or by mistake, this is identity erosion, so it is not "only a name", it is not only a person's name or a place's name; it is a proof of existence, a proof of a national identity. This examination and realization of the self and the place where a person belongs are part of the legacy and part of the impact and success of *Translations*. Ciaran Deane comments that *Translations* suggested to its audience that it should experiment with new modes of self-definition, and to question how existing "forms of self-definition had created the situation that existed in 1980: economic and cultural stagnation in the South; complete societal breakdown in the North" (2008, 47).

Moving to the Palestinian text in which its author uses memory as a subversive maneuver of epistemic disobedience, the paper will next consider a Palestinian discourse maker and subversive knowledge producer, Muin Bseiso, and his play *Shimshūn wa Dalīlah* (1971) in which he similarly to Friel decolonizes colonial knowledge through epistemic disobedience. Just like the Irish people, land or 'landhood' represents a core issue for

Palestinians as reflected in their literature. Fawaz Turki demonstrates that land or *ard* in Arabic is the core of Palestinian identity, he adds that the land, as a real entity and a metaphor, is the most dominating presence in Palestinian literature; "Land hood," as he coins it, "is the *raison d'être* of Palestinian being and consciousness" (1981, 373).

Epistemic Disobedience in Bseiso's *Shimshūn wa Dalīlah*

> It is the horrific *story of the ethnic cleansing of Palestine*, a crime against humanity that Israel has wanted to deny and cause the world to forget. Retrieving it from oblivion is incumbent upon us . . . it is, as I see it, a moral decision. I am convinced that such *a painful journey into the past is the only way forward if we want to create a better future*.
> —Ilan Pappé 2006 (my italics)

Muin Bseiso (1926–1984) is a Palestinian poet and dramatist; an author, using Pappe's words, who took the painful journey into the past, to narrate its contradictory message and save it from oblivion in the face of the false hegemonic colonial Israeli matrix of knowledge. Similar to Friel's voyage who says "the more we learn about our ancestors, the more we discover about ourselves…a thrilling voyage in self-discovery" (quoted in Pine 1990, 24). This section focuses on how Bseiso uses historical memory in his play *Shimshūn wa Dalīlah* (1971) in his journey of self- discovery and self – reclaiming of his people's national and cultural identity attached to the land of Palestine. Bseiso was a prominent Palestinian playwright, with six plays to his credit. According to Ismail Khalidi and Naomi Wallace, "Palestinian dramatists do not so much write against the grain, though many do, but write against the odds. And the odds are stacked against them: their work is culturally delegitimized, derailed and delimited by the Israeli-Palestinian "conflict" wherein the Israeli perspective is always/already privileged."(xi). Nathali Handal elaborates that Palestinian theatre has existed long before the establishment of the State of Israel and has endured since their expulsion and the subsequent episodes of dispossession and violence (2015, xvii). Khalidi and Wallace argue that Palestinian theatre fits into the long struggle of Palestinians and other oppressed and marginalized people who insist that they do not need permission to narrate their own stories, their own history and their vision of a future. Palestinians possess the inalienable right and in fact have always exercised it despite the heavy odds against them. Palestinian theater is a testimony not only to the existence of Palestinians, but also the vibrancy, the diversity and the perseverance of Palestinian culture and identity and all that it has to offer to the theatre and to world literature (xii). Their stories represent an archive that preserves Palestinians' history and memories of the

land which is an essential part in the fight to reclaim Palestinian national and cultural identity; and this is what Bseiso accomplishes in his *Shimshūn wa Dalīlah*, where he archives Palestinian existence and the perseverance of their culture and identity.

Shimshūn wa Dalīlah was performed at the Tawfiq Al-Hakim Theater in Cairo in 1971. In the play, Bseiso recalls the myth of Samson as a symbolic frame for his play. The myth revolves around Samson, one of the judges of the Jews, who, in the Old Testament, is the son of Menawah, one of the Jews' prophets after Moses. This is a tale of the religious mythology which has been employed by Israelis to ground their claims in Palestine. Bseiso uses the strategy of re-narrating history and mythology from a Palestinian perspective. In Hebrew Samson means "sun," a popular folk hero who had unusual physical abilities and strength that enabled him to fight and kill thousands of Palestinians at that time. The myth of Samson revolves around misrepresenting Palestinians as evil, aggressive, and deceitful while the Israelis are represented as defensive, brave, and benevolent; for instance, the Israeli Army is called the Israeli Defense Army as a way of producing and selling themselves as a peaceful entity defending themselves against the aggression of the evil Palestinians and Arabs. This brings to mind what Abdelwahab El-Messiri refers to as he elaborates on how Zionists represent Arabs as 'barbarians' who kill the peaceful settlers and hence "the result turns into a cause and Zionism is thus presented not as a settler colonialist movement but as an achievement of the Jewish dream of returning to the promised land while resistance is presented as unjustified terrorism and the Israeli attacks are presented as self-defense and the Israeli army is presented as the Israeli defense army (2003, 42). According to that myth the salvation of Israelis resides in the killing of Palestinians.

Bseiso does not confine himself in the play to the actual time and place of the myth, but he uses a modern form that suits the reality of the Palestinian situation after the 1967 defeat to connect and re-narrate the myth according to the Palestinian perspective. The incidents take place around a non-moving car surrounded by red lights as a warning not to get close. The *mise en scène* symbolizes and reflects the static Palestinian state of imprisonment and siege after their expulsion from their homes and enforcement into a deadlock: a non –changing state of waiting, a non-changing state of diaspora. The story revolves around a Palestinian family in a refugee camp, symbolically represented in the static car attached to pipes that suck the blood of passengers as fuel, a father, mother, two sons: Assem and Mazen, the daughter Reem, the driver and the conductor of the car, and near the end of the play appear Israeli officers: Samson and Raheel.

The play begins with Reem, now presented as 'The woman', who is introduced by a man referred to in the play as "the man with the white

bandage": " Horror was selling its tickets in the black market… /Jaffa was departing… /Throwing its final possessions in the face of the invader…/Throwing its gloves…/Throwing the skin of her hands/Throwing her fingers/And a woman from Jaffa was departing…/Carrying a baby…/The woman got tired, got afraid/She wanted to throw her bundle…/But because of the atrocious black horror, she threw the baby… (*SD* 212; my translation). Bseiso starts the play with the Jaffa exodus, one of the painful sites of memory and one of the haunting traumatic images in the consciousness of Palestinians, their painful expulsion from their home country by Zionist settler colonialism. This scene crystalizes what Rashid Khalidi stresses in his book *Palestinian Identity* (1997) how Haifa and Jaffa in the early part of the 20th century were the fastest growing cities, and were the commercial and economic foci of the country, as well as the centers of cultural and intellectual life and press activity. By 1948, they had the largest Arab population in any of the cities in the country- larger even than Jerusalem. Khalidi affirms that Jaffa and Haifa were dynamic in multiple spheres that "significantly affected the shaping of Palestinian identity" (1997, 36). For Palestinians, those dear cherished cities were political, social, economic and cultural beacons. That is why they were among the primary targets of the Zionist colonization of Palestine. It is logical to find Haifa and Jaffa, along with Jerusalem, among the recurrent motifs in Palestinian literature: 'the burning of Jaffa,' 'the expulsion from Haifa,' and 'explosions in Jerusalem' are among the common scenes in Palestinian literature. This painful memory of Jaffa expulsion brings to mind Saffiyya in Ghassan Kanafani's *Returning to Haifa*, it is the same black horror that haunted the Palestinians at that time to the extent that shocked terrified mothers were not aware had they left their babies in cradles (as Saffiyya) or had they thrown their babies instead of bundles(as Reem) it was an extreme atrocious unbearable misery.

Reem, the heartbroken mother who lost her baby during the exodus, is a symbol and representative of all Palestinian women who experienced that painful exodus; the name could be Reem or Saffiyya, it does not matter, if they then say: "He was just born few days ago…/He was never crying…/He was never smiling and never left his eyes off mine… /But he held my hand…/He was about to talk…/I was scared from the miracle, and I was afraid that he talks…/I was not Mary (Mariam)…/A mother of a prophet…/I am one of your women Jaffa…/Like all your women… Oh Jaffa…" (SD 213). Bseiso is stressing the painful memory of the exodus as a collective memory which significance lies in what Maurice Halbwachs indicates that collective memory differs from history in two respects: first, it is a current of real continuous thought, for it retains from the past only what still lives or is capable of living in the consciousness of the groups keeping the memory alive (2007, 143). The Haifa and Jaffa exodus are typical examples of a collective memory which

still lives and is capable of living in the consciousness of Palestinians. Despite the pain of the memory, it is crucial as a tool of epistemic disobedience.

Collective memory is used throughout the paly. In an expressive exchange with Assem, the politically conscious father, without a specific name to symbolize all conscious Palestinian fathers, comments on their condition and the horrible exodus saying: "I know what has been said and what will be said… /They will say terrorism…/And I say yes…/They will say their massacres and bombs…And I say yes…/They will say *corrupted weapons*… and *General Glubb*/And I say yes…"(*SD* 225; my italics). The father brings the memory of General Glubb and the other incidents related to the *nakba*: how Zionist atrocities, brutality and terrorism succeeded in intimidating peaceful Palestinians, but the mention of Glubb here is significant as it is among the hidden silenced historical incidents of these terrible times. General Glubb, known as Glubb Pasha was a British commander who led and trained Trans-Jordan's Arab Legion between 1939 and 1956. According to Avi Shalaim, one of the Israeli New Historians, King Abd-Allah I of Jordan was prepared to compromise the Arab claim to the whole of Palestine as long as he could acquire part of Palestine for himself. Abdullah had secret meetings with the Jewish Agency, with Golda Meir among the delegates, that reached an agreement of Jewish non-interference with Jordanian annexation of the West Bank and Abd-Allah promised the British that he would not attack the Jewish State and ordered all armed bodies operating in the areas and controlled by the Arab Legion to be disbanded. Glubb Pasha who manipulated the decision carried out the order ruthlessly and efficiently (96). Unearthing and revealing buried historical details is crucial to the Palestinian cause, not only as a counter discourse to colonial Israeli discourse, but at the same time significant for young Arab and Palestinian generation who are misled by colonial Israeli discourse claiming that Palestinians sold their land and left seeking material profit elsewhere.

Glubb Pasha, King Abd-Allah I, and the Jordanian treason are part of the collective memory of Palestinians. These historical facts are essential in subverting the claim that Palestinian and Arabs did not fight, as they fought but there was a malicious global conspiracy against them. Narrating hidden history is needed for the struggle over the land. Bseiso's insertion of such important historical events and historical figures is of great importance as it subverts the Israeli colonial knowledge that distorts and destroys the Palestinian past. For Frantz Fanon, the struggle against colonialism involves claiming back the history of the colonized people away from the negative and non-existent version of it produced by the colonizer. He notes that colonialism moves to the past of the colonized people to distort and destroy it. That is why he calls for "*a passionate research… directed by the secret hope of discovering beyond the misery of today, beyond self-contempt*. . , some very

beautiful and splendid era whose existence rehabilitates us both in regard to ourselves and in regard to others" (1994, 37; my italics). Stuart Hall agrees and affirms that such 'passionate research' for *'hidden histories'* is a practice that entails " *the production of identity*…. We should not, for a moment, underestimate or neglect the importance of the act of the imaginative rediscovery which this conception of a rediscovered, essential identity entails." (1994, 393; my italics). It could be said that Bseiso, as knowledge and meaning producer, is passionately searching and digging deep in Palestinians' past to display the hidden history of his homeland in order to rehabilitate and reclaim Palestinian identity and offer a different version of the distorted version offered by the Israeli matrix of colonial knowledge.

The memory of such a painful traumatic day (exodus) is vivid in the mind and soul of all Palestinians; it is part of their collective memory, Assem's father says: "I *do remember* that day…/We were leaving…/*Jaffa was the mother, was the father, was the son*… /And *Jaffa, the love of the twenties*…/The tea was being prepared on fire…/And your mother's hand in soap and water… (*SD* 226; my italics). It is all about 'remembering'; what is remembered lives and what is forgotten dies, these are the claims of memory that prevent the erasure of the history of Palestinians and their land. Jaffa lives in the memory of Palestinians as it used to be "the bride of the sea' or as Kanfani refers to as 'land of the sad oranges' as he titles one of his heartbreaking short stories. These words recall Khalidi's ideas in relation to Haifa and Jaffa and how they "significantly affected the shaping of Palestinian identity" (1997, 36). Just like Kanafani in *Returning to Haifa,* Bseiso stresses the suddenness and abruptness of the horrible events of the Jaffa and Haifa exodus, Palestinians naively did not believe that an event this horrible could be possible, "tea prepared on fire" mothers were just busy with usual household chores "your mother's hand in water and soap." The Palestinian battle is a battle against oblivion and forgetfulness, to forget is to cease to exist, to remember is to exist; remembrance is a form of epistemic disobedience: pioneers of Zionism such as Golda Meir predicted that "the old will die and the young will forget," but this prophecy never comes true, thanks to memory and narration of such memory in literary works; memory is a land and a people that refuse annihilation.

The memory of Jaffa (Yafo in Hebrew and now part of Tel Aviv-Yafo, Israel) is a case in point of how Zionists changed the topography of the Palestinian land and the names that were attached to the places; it goes without saying that naming and identity are crucially connected. Reflecting on the names and borders of Palestine, Gudrum Kramer maintains that in the context of the Jewish-Arab conflict over Palestine, places and place-names have acquired a great significance to efforts trying to legitimize historical rights to the land. To be able to establish the names of things is an indicator

of political and cultural power. The various terms utilized to designate the land of Palestine reflect prevailing power relations. Regarding Palestine, the dominant perspective has been informed by biblical associations, "on the basis of which even the borders of the British Mandate were drawn after World War I" (Kramer 2008, 2). The Jewish claim to Palestine as the land of Israel (Eretz Yisrael) bases itself on biblical narratives and affirms the uninterrupted presence of the Jewish people in this land. Kramer views this perspective as both distorted and distorting, as it affects the presentation of the land, its people and its history: " it places the Jews at the center, pushing all other population groups (even if and when they formed a majority) into the background, if it considers them at all". As a result, Kramer further states, "Palestine or Eretz Israel, offers a textbook case of *the territorialization of history*, in which *political claims are anchored in historical geography*" (2008, 3; my italics). This recalls Friel's *Translations* and the same colonial tactics by the British and the Zionists of usurping the land by changing indigenous names attached to the stolen native lands.

The Jaffa exodus in the play is a vivid memory for all Palestinians and even a vivid postmemory; a term coined by Mari Anne Hirsch (1997) and refers to the ways in which individuals can be haunted by a past that they have not experienced personally but which has been "somehow transferred to them consciously or unconsciously by family members or friends, this led to a broader model for thinking through the ways people are haunted by the traumas of recent history at a collective or cultural level" (quoted in Rossington et al. 2007,7). Palestinians, generation after generation, narrate and re-narrate to their offspring the events of the atrocious exodus so that they never forget what happened and accordingly never give up being resistant and resilient in fighting for their right of return. Barbra Misztal points out that memory is used "not merely to explain the group past but also transform it into a reliable identity source for the group present" (2011, 3). Palestinians are haunted by their collective past memories. Literary narration gives voice to the suppressed hidden memories of the *nakbah* and safeguards the survival of the Palestinian shattered past on their land. Remembrance is a decolonial tool of epistemic disobedience. Raja Shaheda elaborates in his lecture for Edward Said Memorial Lectures in 2022, "the Palestinian carry that memory of *nakbah* year after year like a duty and a burden, *because forgetting would be tantamount to an abandonment of a right we still struggle to realize*. In contrast, *Israelis* have the luxury of not only forgetting *nakbah*, but also *denying that it had ever happened at all*" (16: 05–16:11; my italics). In the face of such denial, narrating and re-narrating such memories of *nakbah* represent a duty for the Palestinians to save their past from oblivion and utilize them as an urge to resist and fight back in the present.

The father, now aware that their salvation lies in resistance not in waiting for assistance, significantly says "Assem, my son…/It is better for you to cut your fingers with a knife and throw them in fire…/To roast them, to eat them../Better than waiting here and there in exile…/Better than waiting for a table of manna (honey dew) to be thrown…on you…/And a table of salwa (quails)…" Here it is significant to notice the inter-textuality with Jews and Moses in Quraan, in Surah Al- Baqarah, "and We shaded you with clouds and sent down on you Al-Manna and quails" (part 1, verse 57). Through this, Bseiso juxtaposes the experience of Jews in diaspora with the Palestinians,' an issue commonly addressed by many Palestinian writers. Palestinian writers are keen to show that the expulsion and diaspora that Palestinians have suffered is similar and even harder than the diaspora of the Jews and this is one of the subversive tools that they use to decolonize knowledge. The father urges his son and the Palestinians not to wait for help from heaven (Mann and Salwa) or earth; they must act for themselves and earn their salvation through resistance. Through the father and Assem, the play is considered a call for action in the present, through which memory or the presence of the past is a call for action in the present to guarantee the future. Confino highlights how modern societies invent new pasts, which are believed to be immemorial, and the roles of these pasts (2011,46). For Palestinians, they are not inventing their past as it does exist in their memories. What counts here is the role of this past and how the claims of memory will empower them to reclaim their identity on their land, and their right to return to their usurped land. Voicing their past, their memories of all what happened for them prove their existence, and the fact that they did not perish in oblivion. Furthermore, in remembering these sites of memory; the exodus and *nakbah*, Palestinians must not just mourn what happened, they should learn, realize and admit the mistakes of the past to act for the present and future as Said realized in Kanfani's *Returning to Haifa*.

Assem rightly responds to his father, "*we must make another table*…/A table that we do not stand behind as waiters/Even if those *who were invited to the table of nakbah/Came back to gather around the table of conferences*" (*SD* 227; my italics). Assem, the freedom fighter, is well aware of what should happen, he is aware of the past misdeeds "table of nakbah," he means some Arab leaders who had some interest in acquiring part of the cake of Palestine during the time of the *nakbah* or those after 20 years of *nakbah* siting at the table of peace and negotiation conferences with Israel to guarantee their thrones and positions. Then the father tells Assem, "your typewriter is your bag on your back/ who reads your papers from the passengers/believe me son when the disaster is bigger than all the words/it is forbidden for anyone to write, it is forbidden for anyone to read Assem/ everyone should be doing something else. . . I know that you are a scapegoat/ and there is a second

scapegoat/and there is a third/ be whatever you want son/ but be Palestinians all the time son regardless of the colors" (*SD* 228; my translation). This exchange is a clear call for action and unity. Resistance has emerged with young people like Assem. Furthermore, empty words and false slogans are forbidden, only actions are allowed and revered. When the tragedy is as significant as the loss of Palestine, words are useless; only actions matter, this is how the stolen homeland and the stolen identity could be regained and reclaimed.

Reem, previously 'the woman,' is now 'the fortuneteller', "but who predicts for the fortuneteller/ who would tell her where is the lost son/did you lose anything, oh you passengers of the car? /didn't anyone of you lose a river or a cow?/ oh you passengers of the car, *didn't anyone of you lose a homeland?/ and ask why it was lost and who was the reason*?" (*SD* 238; my translation and italics). Reem represents the voice inside each Palestinian, blaming and reproaching them for ignoring their loss and just surviving shamefully, forgetting their tragic loss of everything they cherish in life, particularly, the loss of their homeland. It is another call to remember what they lost, what is remembered survives, what is forgotten dies. It is a call for deserting submission and resorting to resistance. Palestinians have not forgotten. They have been oppressed, forced into submission by treason, manipulation and circumstances that have been forcing them just to think about their daily living. Palestinians' traumatic collective memories of loss should incite them to resist and never submit. This could be interpreted in the light of Wulf Kansteiner's view that there is an interrelation between memory and identity, pointing out that historically the crisis of memory tends to coincide with the crisis of identity; he points out that " memory is valorized where identity is problematized" (2002, 184). Palestinians' memory of losing a home land is a haunting image in the Palestinian collective memory, a valorized painful site of the memory. In 'the car' or the refugee camps Palestinians suffer from an identity crisis after losing their homeland, that is why the memory of loss is valorized by Reem, the fortuneteller, as a call for action and resistance.

The miracle happens and the passengers of the car gather, screaming and smashing the barbed wires and the doors of the prison and the asylum. Only at that time Reem significantly says, "the green earthquake/ the green lightening/ I can see you now/ I can see you now Jonah my son/ I can see your face" (*SD* 274). Upon hearing this, Assem joyfully says "Reem is awake father/ now she is conscious". The politically aware father says, "we have to be aware where we are going/ *to know who we are*/ to *know those who are with us*/ some walked and walks with us just with slogans and propaganda/ . . ./ but *with us also those who walked and will walk with their bomb/which we have to plant as if it were a pumping heart*" (*SD* 279; my translation and italics). Palestinians must know, knowledge is power and control; here the

father stresses the significance of weapons for resistance, as if it is the heart to the body; now they have a voice after many bitter years of being voiceless nonexistent entities, "after our first bullet/ the world now contacts us/ throws its messages in our mail box/ now we have a mail box Assem" (*SD* 281). To resist is to exist, to be recognized by the world, and to possess an identity.

Nevertheless, the fatal mistake occurs again when Palestinians were misled by false catchy words and the bitter announcement of *naksah* (1967) is declared through a voice that says, "oh you passengers of the car/ the car has fallen in our hands/ Sinai has fallen in our hands/ the Syrian heights/the wailing stone is now the joy of stones/Gaza has fallen/we are a stone far from all of your capitals/ closer to your fingers than your rings"(*SD* 288). This voice is the voice of Samson, now the Israeli commander, " from the Israeli Sampson… the governor of this car… move to the court/ who hides anything under the seat, carry it with you" (*SD* 295). Finally, Samson appears only with the outbreak of Palestinian resistance. The Israelis' fear of resistance pushes them to send a Samson, a killing machine, to suppress and extinguish the flames of Palestinian just revolution. Whenever there is a need to subjugate Palestinians (Reem, Assem, and the revolting passengers), a Samson appears.

Assem relates this contemporary modern Samson to the mythical historical Samson, "*so Samson is back again/ and gunpowder ropes are the braids of his hair*" (*SD* 296; my translation and italics). As it had happened before in the Israeli myth, Samson represented salvation for the Jews. In modern times, the killing machine of Israelis is represented in Samson the Israeli commander of the Israeli Army. The name is very telling; this need for an oppressive killing machine has been the doctrine of the culprit Israeli state up to the moment. Arnon Soffer, professor of Geography at Haifa University, wrote in *The Jerusalem Post* in 2004 saying: "*so, if we want to remain alive, we have to kill and kill and kill. All day, every day. If we don't kill, we will cease to exist*" (quoted in Pappe 2006, 248; my italics). Bseiso uses the memory of Samson linked to the name to re-write, re-narrate, and counter Israeli colonial history in which Samson is represented as a victim to the deceit of the Palestinian Delilah. He subverts the myth and decolonizes knowledge: in the play Samson is the oppressor who tortures Reem, or Delilah as Samson prefers to call her, to get information about the rebels, "this is my palm/ between a finger and another finger/ the Nile river, the Gordon river, and Tigris river run/ you are under the nail" (*SD* 297). He boasts about his complete domination and alludes to the Israeli colonial objective of controlling the area from the Nile River to Tigris and Euphrates. Then he bluntly goes back to the Israeli mythical memory of Samson and Delilah addressing the car passengers "*are you waiting for Delilah?/ to uncover my secret and cut my hair braids/ takes my eyes out and ties me like an ox to a grinder/ in vain you are waiting*" (*SD* 298; my translation and italics). He tells

the passengers to sign their submission in the palm of his hand which he decrees as their autograph and diary.

Reem appears symbolically at this moment wearing the Palestinian Keffiyeh, a symbol of Palestinian resistance, and defiantly confronts him saying, "no we have another diary/ oh you Sampson/ another autograph/ *now we sign on the white bandages covering wounds/white bandages are covering earth/ on the forehead of the olive tree*, there is a whit bandage/over the lily, there is a bandage/even the white clouds are covered by white bandages/and the sun is a nurse roams around the patients/the diary of the occupied land has become/these whit bandages" (*SD* 299; my italics). Olive trees constitute a national cultural symbol for Palestine, the 'wounds' and the 'white bandage' standing for resistance; Reem is using rhetoric and figures of speech to show how resistance has spread all over Palestine and provided them with new life. Hope is even obtained in the hall and the audience, as Assem tells his father, deserted their seats in the hall, "to support us with bread and white bandage/ and bank note" (*SD* 303).

After this, there is the final crucial confrontation between Samson and Delilah by the end of the play when Reem, now presented as a 'freedom fighter,' is captured by the Israelis. Defiantly she confronts Samson, her oppressor, saying "you are trembling with fear/ even when you are covering the trembled body with wires/ you are trembling" (*SD* 307). With the emergence of Palestinian resistance, Israelis' fear emerged as well; they fear the real owners of the land. Reem answers defiantly, " I know that/ I know that you are Samson/ I know that we are in your iron helmet like broken eggs/but what about the fifth day Samson/ what about the ninth and tenth days of June/ the eggshell became barricades/ and the egg became a bomb Samson" (*SD* 308). Reem, who evokes epistemic disobedience to the Israeli myth, is in the Palestinian version of the story of Samson a symbol of Palestine, a brave defiant woman regardless of the hardships. Despite the defeat, Palestinians did not lose faith because of the emergence of resistance represented in Reem and Assem. Reem is now aware that resistance gave them a new life; it turned them from 'broken egg shells into barricades.' The development of Reem's character displays the way she evolves from a heartbroken shocked mother to a catalyst for her people's change, reminding them of their loss and calling them to rebellion, and finally she transforms into the captive helpless defiant rebel who discovers and defies the absurd strength of her oppressor and realizes that her salvation lies in resistance and real authentic action.

However, under his control, the brutal oppressor tortures Reem and threatens her with her lost baby and asks her to betray her co-rebels and say their names, but she defiantly and faithfully refuses, as against the Israeli version that presents Delilah as deceitful, betraying and unfaithful, "I searched for him to give him the name of his father/ the name of his home

town… to give him my name/ and tell him the name of his enemy/ the murderer of his home country/ your name Samson" (*SD* 310). Reem, who later on will be called Delilah, is now well aware of the eternal antagonism and conflict with the Israeli Samsons in the past and in the present. Part of her son's identity is to know the name of his hometown, his father, mother, and most importantly the name of his enemy who stole his home country. Bseiso subverts the Israeli myth of Samson to reclaim the identity of Palestinians as freedom fighters who resist the oppression of those who stole their home country. With her perseverance and persistence, this brave Palestinian woman wins the battle in her confrontation with the Israeli killing machine. Her defiant resilient words scare Samson, as he tells Raheel, the other Israeli officer, "this woman Raheel/ there is something unbreakable inside her" Raheel responds: "Sampson…/*Your destiny is to break* …/*Or to be broken*… (*SD* 217; my italics).

Raheel is the one who believes that Reem has another hidden name, Delilah, as she asks Reem "what is your name?" when Reem answers, "Reem," Raheel says: "Reem…!!!/A secret name…?/I know who are you?/*You are Delilah*…/This is your name…"(*SD* 223; my italics). With Raheel's renaming of Reem as Delilah, there is intertextuality with and subversion of the Israeli colonial myth. History is not just a study of the past, but an explanation of the present. The play ends with the symbolic confrontation between Samson and Raheel on one side and Assem and Reem (Delilah) on the other. Both Samson and Raheel are well aware that their salvation lies in their brutal killing of Palestinians and that is why they strongly fear Palestinian resistance; Assem and Reem are well aware that their salvation lies in resistance. The play ends while Reem and Assem being tortured (maybe to death) by Samson and Raheel as resistance is heard through the sound of the rebels' bomb explosions and gun fire from behind the car as Bseiso informs the readers in the stage directions, "a sound of bomb explosions and gun fire from behind the car…flame of fire gets higher… Samson retreats to the back and stands behind the cannon… Raheel rushes to him, then he holds the cannon nozzle and moves it right and left while saying 'I will destroy this car'" (*SD* 324). Bseiso reverses the Israeli story and inserts his own Palestinian version, in which Palestinians are tortured to death by Israeli killing machines and despite atrocious oppression, resistance is heard exploding and the helpless Reem (Delilah) is defiantly and victoriously heard saying, "turn around your grinder /*turn around Samson*/ turn around the cannon/ this is your grinder Samson/ *you will keep on turning till you fall/this is your fate*" (*SD* 325; my italics). Epistemic disobedience is apparent in the two portrayals of Delilah in the Israeli colonial matrix and the Palestinian subversive alternative presented in the play. They are in stark contrast: the Israeli portrayal shows Delilah as a spy, a whore who is paid for seducing Samson and learning his secrets; it is a

stereotypical colonial portrayal that glorifies Israelis and demonizes Palestinians. Bseiso's Palestinian version subverts the myth and represents Palestinians as bitterly suffering brutal criminal oppression and Delilah (Reem) as a brave Palestinian woman who defiantly resists her oppressor. That is why Bseiso chooses to end the play optimistically stressing that despite the capture of Reem and Assem, despite the bloody torture, resistance persists. The play significantly and symbolically ends with Reem uttering the final words sending Samson to his ominous doomed fate of revolving around a killing machine.

The myth of Samson and Delilah was cunningly plotted and was advertised for in various cultural and artistic forms: Hollywood produced the story three times and it was performed on stage several times. Ironically, even in the Arab world, the name Samson is associated with bravery and strength without being aware of the connotation of the name and the story in Israeli colonial discourse and how it is utilized by Zionists as a tool for misrepresenting Palestinians. The creators of the myth intentionally wanted to manipulate how it is presented so that they reach a specific target of misrepresenting Palestinians and idolizing Samson and hence the Israelis. They framed the mythical story religiously as they know how people consider religious stories as sacred and never to be questioned. Bseiso's play, when understood in the light of Cofino's notion about historical memory, represents the past in a way that makes such representation as a shaper of political development and changes. Such a representation, subversion, and epistemic disobedience of Samson's well-established myth in the West helps Palestinians to gain worldwide support and sympathy over the years, and this sympathy is vital for Palestinians to obtain some of their rights, one of these rights for example is the inalienable right of the Palestinian exiles to return to their stolen homes and leave behind the misery of the refugee camps (the unmovable car in the play).

The play, through reconstructing the myth of Samson and Delilah, is constructing a national memory that is utilized to reclaim not only Palestinians' rights, but their identity that is attached to a stolen homeland and a stolen history as well. Paul Ricoeur asserts that the role of a critical historian is not only to revise and update the history of a given community, but to correct, criticize, and even refute taken-for-granted historical narratives (2004, 500). Bseiso as a playwright is a critical historian who refutes and criticizes taken-for granted historical narratives and inserts the counter Palestinian version of the colonial Israeli historical narrative. Rossington et al. clarify that in relation to memory, first person accounts of subaltern memory are vital historical resources most often missing from the archive. They add that subaltern's discursive identities offer a way to remember those people who were neither expressive nor entirely representable. For them,

memory is central to post colonialism because of "the ways in which personal and cultural memory can be used to analyze and potentially undermine or contest the structures of empire" (2007, 9). Memory plays a vital role in documenting history and identity, in subverting colonial knowledge, and in evoking epistemic disobedience and this is of crucial significance for Palestinians due to the persistence and urgency of the Palestinian cause up to the moment.

Through such memories, Palestinians resist Zionists colonization of and assault on the Palestinian memory by misrepresenting Palestinians either as nonexistent or as cowards who fled their homeland and who lack a strong sense of national identity. The insertion of Palestinian freedom fighters in the Palestinian narrative is a crucial counter discourse for colonial Israeli discourse that represents Palestinians as either deserters and sellers of their land or as nonexistent before 1948 and represented the land of Palestine as desolate and barren. This is part of the epistemic disobedience that Bseiso evokes against the Israeli mainstream 'grand' narrative which claims that Palestinians voluntarily fled their villages in accordance with orders given by Arab armies.

For decades, Palestinians and their predicament misrepresented by colonial Israeli discourse (coloniality of knowledge). Edward Said in his introduction to the book *Blaming the Victims: Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question* (2001) points out that the conflict over Palestine is unusual because Palestine is an almost mythological territory saturated with religious ideology and endowed with overwhelming cultural significance. He further elaborates that the conflict between Zionists and non-Jewish native inhabitants of Palestine was won by Israel because the Zionists had already won the political battle for Palestine in the international world in which ideas, representations, rhetoric, and images were at stake. Accordingly in Western academic and public life, especially the US, resistance to Israel has been associated not simply with terrorism and communism, but also with anti-Semitism. Said points out that "the place of Palestinians in such public locales as the American television screen, the daily newspaper, the commercial film, shrinks to few stereotypes – the mad Islamic zealot, the gratuitously violent killer of innocents, the desperately irrational and savage primitive" (2001, 3). It goes without saying that fighting such misrepresentations is a must for Palestinians to fight back and reclaim their lost homeland and lost rights and this could only be achieved through decolonization of knowledge and epistemic disobedience to the Israeli colonial matrix of distorting Palestinians and their cause.

A demonstrative example of such spurious scholarship on Palestine is a book titled *The Palestinians: People, History, Politics* (1975). The book represents the American Zionist Lobby in America, as it is typical of colonial

Zionist discourse and its propaganda regarding Palestine and Palestinians in the West and America in particular. The book consists of papers (by Israeli academics) contained in issues of the Middle East Information Series and the Middle East Review, published by the American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East. In the book, Zionists and their supporters falsify and twist facts, of connection to Bseiso's play is Terence Prittie's article "Middle East Refugee", he asks 'why did the Arab leave?' and *knowledgably* offers the typical answer of the Zionist European discourse and presents Palestinian exodus as caused by a memorandum sent by the Arab National Committee in to Arab League governments asking for the transfer of the Arabs to neighboring Arab countries. This recalls Mignolo's 'zero point' epistemology which is a detached and neutral point of observation from which the knowing subject maps the world and its problems, classifies people and projects into what is good for them (2009, 160). Pritti (the knowing subject) refers to radio broadcasts ordering Palestinians to leave in 1948 in order to clear the way for Arab armies. He further claims that the military and civil authorities and Jewish representatives expressed their profound regret at this grave decision. He even goes on claiming how the Jewish 'gentle' Mayor of Haifa, Shabetai Levi, with the tears streaming down his face, implored the city's Arabs to stay in their homes and guaranteed to look after them(1974,54). They falsify, deny and dismiss how Zionists intimidated and terrorized the peaceful citizens by explosions and massacres, how they warned the Arab citizens and ordered them to leave or to face the same fate as Deir Yassin victims. Prittie, even argues that the basic causes of the exodus "are more obvious, they were the Arab guerrilla warfare which began in November 1947, and the invasion of Palestine by the armies of outside states." He further says that the Zionists won because the Palestinian Arabs were the weakest, "lacking a strong sense of identity and purpose, ready to bolt in the belief that would be enabled to return by other Arabs fighting their battle for them. The Jews on the contrary, stood and fought, trusting in themselves"(1975, 55).

A recent example of the spurious academic research on Palestine, is a book by Meir Letzivak, *Palestinian Collective Memory and National Identity* (2009), colonial Israeli discourse insists that two important indications of "the weakness of Palestinian national identity and cohesion were the sale of land to Jews by Palestinian landlords and the clandestine cooperation of a large number of Palestinians with the Zionists, mostly for financial benefit" (3). Such discourses that the Israeli colonialism have been propagated not only in Europe and the USA, but even in the Arab countries as some Arabs, especially the young generation, circulate such myths, were so powerful and effective and continue up to the moment. Against such colonial claims Bseiso is documenting Palestinians resistance, sacrifices and fights against Zionists

colonial enterprise and their systematic forced displacement of the Palestinians in the play and in this he offers epistemic disobedience, which as Mignolo points out, means to delink from the illusion of 'zero point' epistemology presented by the Israeli colonial discourse and matrix of power. Literary narration decolonizes the memory of the past from colonial discourse and its misrepresentations. Through memory, Palestinians safeguard against the death of the idea, which is an even greater loss than the loss of the land. However, keeping the idea alive requires more than just sentimentally invoking the past; it is an active process of struggle which entails remembering, understanding, realizing, and resisting to repossess and reclaim a history and an identity affiliated to a land. Resistance for Palestinians is the only guarantee for existence and persistence. Edward Said delineates that "despite the odds and even though the Palestinians underwent difficult and, it may confidently be said, maddeningly unjust times, *the people did not disappear, nor in all the intermittent defeats did they cry 'enough' or give up on being Palestinians*" (2001, 7; my italics). Said points out that for Palestinians who were the so-called remnants after 1948, they established organizations like *al-Ard* (the Land) to foster Palestinian culture and traditions. He also refers to the slow emergence of a post-1948 Palestinian literature with important works by Kanafani, Darwish, Fadwa Touqan, Sameh al-Kassem and many others. Said significantly points out that by the 1980s, the world had begun only very slowly to take notice of the reality of Palestinian resistance and Israeli brutality even though the narrative of Palestinian history was still underground. Said believes that the narrative of Palestinian history on the land of Palestine must be told and retold innumerable times. Such a narrative decodes the Israeli myth by presenting the Palestinian story of the land (2001, 11).

Bseiso was among the first who started to decode the myths and to offer epistemic disobedience through his works. In the play under study, he refutes such claims and proves that Palestinians possess a strong sense of identity; they stood, fought, and died defending their homeland. He proves that Palestinians never forget their homes and never forget their Palestinian identity attached to their Palestinian land even if the houses were intentionally demolished; memories of their homeland are alive in their psyche and transmitted from generation to generation. It is significant to remember what Rossington et al. highlight about memory and how it is central to post colonialism because of the ways in which personal and cultural memory can be used to analyze and undermine the structures of empire and how memory plays a pivotal role in subverting the hegemony of colonial history by offering alternative versions of established archives (2007, 9). Ricoeur believes that memory, in the form of testimony, is the foundation of history: "we must not forget that everything starts not from the archives, but from testimony and

that . . . we have nothing better than testimony, in the final analysis, to assure ourselves that something did happen in the past" (2004, 147). In the past, Palestinians existed on the land of Palestine, and fought, defending their land despite the systematic atrocities of the Israeli colonial army that even continues up to the moment.

In the forward to *Discourse and Palestine: Power, Text and Context* (1995, i-ii), Ibrahim Abu- Lughod elucidates that the battle for determining the fate of Palestine and Palestinians has always transcended the frontiers of Palestine and the Arab world. It was fought first in Europe and then by World War II, in the USA. The battle for the consciousness – for the mind and heart – of outsiders turned out to be crucial in determining the outcome of the 'battles' for Palestine. "The issue now is the extent to which the evolving discourse on the continuing contest, albeit in altered form, will bear the imprint of the hardened discourse of the past" (Abu-Lughod, Forward). Palestinian writers have been trying to erase and refute that "hardened discourse of the past" through epistemic disobedience and decolonization of knowledge through creating their own discourse, by inserting the Palestinian version of the history of the land of Palestine in their works. Being discourse makers, they try to create a Palestinian discourse of the land of Palestine through narrating their land and place memories. That is why the Israeli colonial matrix of power has banned the theatrical production of many Palestinian literary works that urge Palestinians to adhere to their identity as resistant fighters and urge them to be attached to their land with all of its memories.

Conclusion

As it has been elaborated throughout the paper, land and historical memory have been used simply but effectively in Irish and Palestinian plays as an effective subversive strategy of epistemic disobedience that aims at decolonizing knowledge and reclaiming national identity. Said called for narrating and re-narrating the narrative of Palestinian history innumerable times as "*Such a narrative decodes the Israeli myth by presenting the Palestinian story of the land*" (2001, 11; my italics) and when it is juxtaposed to Irish national narration, this adds more clarification and understanding that might lead to more sympathy and support for Palestinians in their struggle to reclaim and regain their stolen homeland. One of the findings of the paper is that the Palestinian and Irish battles have been battles against oblivion and forgetfulness, to forget is to cease to exist, to remember is to exist and resist; remembrance is a form of epistemic disobedience against colonial hegemonic knowledge and disinformation. In relation to Palestine (the postcolonial colony and the anti-colonial struggle that is still alive) another finding is that through his play, Bseiso stresses the fact that Palestinians (against the claims of Israeli colonial discourse) did not flee or sell their homeland, they resisted

as they have a strong sense of identity and patriotism for their homeland; they were deceived, manipulated, and mercilessly banished from Palestine (as proven nowadays in Gaza). Such decolonization of knowledge and epistemic disobedience is evoked through historical memory of Palestine in the play. Said rightly stresses how Palestinians (dispossessed, stateless, and exiled) have gone from the status of "non-persons to that of a universally acknowledged national collectivity, that is, a people, by virtue not of force of arms, but *by those unmilitary means some of which are the mobilized force of memory*"(*Alif* 2004; my italics).

Friel and Bseiso search, unearth, conjure, and narrate concealed histories (existent in memories) that is needed for the struggle over the land. For Said the main battle in imperialism is over land, but when it came to who owned the land, who had the right to settle and work on it, these issues were contested, and even decided in narrative; nations are narrations. Narrative is at the heart of the history and world of empire and *"it becomes the method colonized people use to assert their own identity and the existence of their own history"* (1993, xii; my italics). In a similar vein, Ricoeur emphasizes that history begins and ends with the reciting of a tale. He asserts that narrative is a redefining of what is already defined, a reinterpretation of what is already interpreted. He adds that the future is "guaranteed by the ability to possess a narrative identity, to collect the past in historical or fictive form" (1995, 224). This is what Friel and Bseiso have attempted to do in their examined plays in the paper. Literature conjures subversive decolonial alternatives that engage in the decolonization of knowledge and disentanglement from the colonial matrix of power. As subversive literature and knowledge producers, the selected authors evoke archival narratives which provide decolonial knowledge and thinking which lead to transformation and a decolonial future. Ashcroft emphasizes that the transformation of history stands as one of the most strategic and powerfully effective modes of cultural resistance. A key strategy in this transformation is "the interpolation of historical discourse. This involves not only the insertion of a contestatory voice, a different version […] but an entry into the discourse which disrupts its discursive features and reveals the limitations of the discourse itself […] *it is in the literary texts that some of the most disruptive and evocative potentialities of historical interpolation may occur*" (2001, 103; my italics).

Freil, and Bseiso have been able to produce a: 'contestatory voice,' meanings and knowledge that defy colonial knowledge. Land and historical memory represented in their literary works show how the Irish and Palestinian issues, as examples of settler colonialism, illuminate each other Bseiso's subversive anti-colonial narrative examined in proximity to other anti-colonial narratives, the Irish one as presented in Freil's, adds more depth and elaboration to the two issues and more urgently to the Palestinian dilemma

due to its persistence and emergency up to the moment. In *The Cure at Troy 1990*, Irish poet Seamus Heaney (Noble Prize winner) says: "history says, Don't hope/On this side of the grave./But then, once in a lifetime/The longed-for tidal wave/Of justice can rise up,/And hope and history rhyme" (1990, 77), history and hope can rhyme as long as natives memorize their past and are fully aware of how to use it for their present and future. These lines could be utilized to conclude the paper saying that an examination and understanding of the Palestinian cause in relation to the Irish one might add to the growing understanding and sympathy in the world these days of the traumatic suffering and victimhood of the Palestinians since the establishment of the state of Israel. Such sympathy and understanding might help in ending the Palestinian misery and victimhood and finally we can quote Heaney's words and say " then, once in a lifetime/The longed-for tidal wave/Of justice can rise up,/And hope and history rhyme" in PALESTINE.

References

Abu-Lughod, Ibrahim. 1995. "Foreword." In *Discourse and Palestine: Power, Text and Context*, edited by Annelies Moors, Toine Van Teeffelen, Sharif Kanaan, and Ilham Abu Ghazaleh., i–ii. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Ashcroft, Bill. 2001. *Post-Colonial Transformation*. London: Routledge.

Baker, Charles. 2000. "'It's the same me, isn't it?': The Language Question and Brian Friel's *Translations*." *The Midwest Quarterly* 41, no. (3): 264–275.

Barker, Chris. 2000. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications Inc.

Bseiso, Muin. 1979. *Shimshūn wa Dalīlah* [Samson and Delilah]. Cairo: Egyptian General Authority for Copyright and Publishing.

Cleary, Joe. 2002. *Literature, Partition and the Nation State: Culture and Conflict in Ireland, Israel and Palestine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2012. "Postcolonial Writing in Ireland." In *The Cambridge History of Postcolonial Literature*, edited by Ato Quayson, 544–553. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Confino, Alon. 2011. "History and Memory." In *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, edited by Axel Schneider and Daniel Woolf, 36–51. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199225996.003.0003.

El-Messiri, Abdelwahab. 2003. *Fī al-Khiṭāb wa-al-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Sahyūnī* [In the Zionist Terminology Discourse: A Theoretical and Practical Study]. Cairo: Dar El Shorouk.

Deane, Ciaran. 2009. "Brian Friel's *Translations*: The Origins of a Cultural Experiment." *Field Day Review* 5: 6–47.

Deane, Seamus. 1987. *Celtic Revivals: Essays in Modern Irish Literature 1880–1980*. London: Faber & Faber.

---. 1995. "Imperialism/Nationalism." In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, edited by Frank Lentricchia, 354–368. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fanon, Frantz. 1994. "On National Culture." In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, 36–52. New York: Columbia University Press.

Friel, Brian. 1981. *Translations*. London: Faber & Faber.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 2007. "From the Collective Memory." In *Theories of Memory*, edited by Michael Rossington and Anne Whitehead. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hall, Stuart. 1994. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, 392–403. New York: Columbia University Press.

---. 1996. "Who Needs an Identity?" In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay, 1–18. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Handal, Natali. 2015. "Introduction." In *Inside/Outside: Six Plays from Palestine and the Diaspora*, 18–61. New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Heaney, Seamus. 1990. *The Cure at Troy*. London: Faber & Faber.

---. 1991. "Review of *Translations*." In *Modern Irish Drama*, edited by J. Harrington, 557–559. New York: Norton.

Kansteiner, Wulf. 2002. "Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies." *History and Theory* 41, no. 2: 179–197. https://doi.org/10.1111/0018–2656.00198 .

Khalidi, Rashid. 1997. *Palestinian Identity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Khalidi, Ismail, and Naomi Wallace. 2015. "Preface." In *Inside/Outside: Six Plays from Palestine and the Diaspora*, edited by Ismail Khalidi and Naomi Wallace, 13–15. New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Kiberd, Declan. 1996. *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation*. London: Random House.

Kramer, Gudrun. 2008. *A History of Palestine: From the Ottoman Conquest to the Founding of the State of Israel*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Letzvak, Meir. 2009. *Palestinian Collective Memory and National Identity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lloyd, David. 2020. "Redemptive Constellations: Irish-Palestinian Relays in Emily Jacir's *Notes for a Cannon*." *Third Text* 34, no. (3): 327–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/09528822.2020.1814079 .

Massad, Joseph. 2006. *The Persistence of the Palestinian Question*. New York: Routledge.

Mignolo, Walter. 2009. "Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom." *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, no. 7–8: 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275 .

---. 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Misztal, Barbara. 2011. "Memory and History." In *Memory Ireland: History and Modernity*, edited by Oona Frawley, 3–17. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1j1w050 .

Pappé, Ilan. 2004. *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2005. "State of Denial: The Nakba in Israeli History and Today." In *Speaking the Truth: Zionism, Israel, and Occupation*, edited by Michael Prior. Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press.

---. 2006. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Pine, Richard. 1990. *Brian Friel and Ireland's Drama*. London: Routledge.

Prittie, Terrance. 1975. "Middle East Refugees." In *The Palestinians: People, History, Politics*, edited by Michael Curtis, Joseph Neyer, and Chaim Waxman, 51–73. New York: American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1995. "The Creativity of Language." In *States of Mind: Dialogues with Contemporary Thinkers on the European Mind*, interviewed by Richard Kearney, 216–245. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

---. 2004. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by Kathlen Blamey and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rabasa, Jose. 1995. "Allegories of Atlas." In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 358–364. London: Routledge.

Roche, Anthony. 2007. "Contemporary Drama in English: 1940–2000." In *The Cambridge History of Irish Literature, Volume 2, 1890–2000*, edited by Margret Kelleher and Philip O'Leary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rossington, Michael, and Anne Whitehead. 2007. "Introduction." In *Theories of Memory*, edited by Michael Rossington and Anne Whitehead, 1–18. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

---. 2007. "Collective Memory." In *Theories of Memory*, edited by Michael Rossington and Anne Whitehead, 134–139. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Said, Edward. 1992. *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage Books.

---. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

---. 2001. “Introduction.” In *Blaming the Victims: Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question*, edited by Edward Said and Christopher Hitchens, 1–20. New York: Verso.

---. 2004. “Memory, Inequality and Power.” *Alif*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.

Shehadeh, Raja. 2022. “Edward Said Memorial Lecture – March 2022.” AUC, School of Humanities and Social Sciences. YouTube video, 1:16:53. March 28, 2022. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VysWPwdHogA.

Shlaim, Avi. 2001. “Israel and the Arab Coalition in 1948.” In *The War for Palestine: Rewriting the History of 1948*, edited by E. L. Rogan, A. Shlaim, C. Tripp, and J. A. Clancy-Smith, 79–103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thiang’o, Ngugi wa. 1994. “The Language of African Literature.” In *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, 435–455. New York: Columbia University Press.

Turki, Fawaz. 1981. “Meaning in Palestinian History: Text and Context.” *Arab Studies Quarterly* 3, no. (4): 371–383. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41857582 .

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2010. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native.” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. (4): 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240 .