University Kasdi Merbah Ouargla

Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages

Department of English Language

Dissertation:

ACADEMIC MASTER

Domain: Letters and Foreign Languages

Field: Translation and Translation Studies

Prepared by: Kheireddine BEN AMMAR

Title:

Literal Translation of the Holy Quran

Problems and solutions

Publically defended

On: 04/06/2014

Before the jury

Belarbi Ahmed Nour Eddine	President	UKM-Ouargla
Dr. Koudded Mohamed	Supervisor	UKM-Ouargla
Dr. Jamel Goui	Examiner	UKM-Ouargla

Academic Year: 2013 /2014

مـذكــرة:

ماستــر أكاديمــي

ميدان: الآداب واللغـات الأجنبيــة

مجـال: اللغـة الإنجليزيــة

اختصاص: الترجمة وعلم دراسات الترجمة

من إعداد: خيرالدين بن عمار

بعنوان

التـرجمـة الحـرفيــة للقـرآن الكـــريم

مشاكل و حلول

تمت مناقشتها علنيا

بتاريخ: 2014/06/04

أمام اللجنة المكونة من

أ. بلعربي أحمد نور الدين	**رئيس اللجنة**	**جامعة قاصدي مرباح ـورقلة**
د. كوداد محمد	**المشـــرف**	**جامعة قاصدي مرباح- ورقلة**
د. قوي جمال	**المناقــش**	**جامعة قاصدي مرباح - ورقلة**

السنــة الجامعية: 2013/2014

Dedication

This work is dedicated to whom fill me with love, enlighten my way,

and support me

My lovely parents

To my sisters Hasna and Hala

To my brothers Sofiane, Imad

The twins

Abdel Wahab & Abdel Ghani

To all BEN AMMAR family

To my Best friends: Naoufel, Maadh, Abdelrahmane, Lazhar, Tarek

and who lives in my heart

Bless you All

Acknowledgments

Table of contents

Chapter III: Analysis of Literal translation cases in

'Arberry' and 'Yusuf' translations

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	expression	translation
SL	Source language	اللغة المصدر
ST	Source text	النص المصدر
TL	Target language	اللغة الهدف
TT	Target text	النص الهدف

List of Tables

Introduction

Statement of the problem:

The Quranic discourse is oriented to all human kind without exceptions. Although it is revealed in Arabic, its glorious messages and meaning covered all nations and all cultures. Thus, the holy Quran has been translated into many languages, since translation has a great role in spreading Islam all over the world. These translations have varied between free and literal translations. In the other way, questions raised about the acceptability of literal translation by Muslim scholars, especially about the fidelity to the original text. If we look at these glorious meanings with literal translation, it is obvious that there is a huge difference between both, the source text and the target text.

Aims of the Study:

The topic is chosen to reveal some thoughts about the Islamic religion that usually come as a result to literal translation of the Holy Quran, although its sensitivity concerning the glorious matters. We aimed to show the limitations of literal translation in the Quranic discourse, and the extent of working in the Holy Quran. Moreover, the research wanted to show how much this type of translation is faithful to the original text. In addition, the dissertation aimed to grasp type of mis-translating of such expression and the reasons behind it, and to reveal reasons behind the failure of such work.

Hypothesis:

For many theorists literal translation of the holy Quran is completely betrayal to the source text, because it intentionally or unmeant distorts its meanings. They insist on a dynamic approach for translations of the glorious texts, while other believe that it is the most accurate and the most loyal to the original text. As well as many of Quran, verses are incomprehensible because of the literal translations.

Research questions:

The problem that this research tries to find an answer for is; what is the negative effect that literal translation does to the original text generally, and to the Holy Quran specifically. This research is looking for an answer to the following questions:

- To what extent the literal translation works on the holy Quran.

- When can the translators render the Holy Quran literally?

- How can the translator use footnote to explain the literal translation?

Methodology:

Investigating the advantages and drawbacks of literal translation in the holy Quran provokes the researcher to adopt qualitative descriptive method, which strolls with these kinds of researches. We attempted to apply most of theoretical aspects of this research on the translation of the non-Muslim translator ARBERRY whose translation of the Quran named "The Quran interpreted", and ABDULLAH YUSUF ALI whose translation named 'The Glorious Quran' which is considered as one of the most famous translations of the holy Quran. Therefore, we tried to analysis some of the contradicted cases between the original's meanings and the target text of those two translations.

Structure of the study:

This study was divided into theoretical and practical parts; the first chapter of the theoretical part was devoted to an overview of the translations of the holy Quran across the old time to the present day. The second chapter is oriented to a general study of literal translations in and specifically of the holy Quran, focusing on the views of theorists to this type of translation, as well as to the consequences of literal transition on scale of lexis and semantics.

However, the third chapter of this research was concerned with the analysis of some cases (verses) of the translation of "ARBERRY" and "Yusuf Ali", its effect on the meaning of the source text. Finally, a conclusion summarizes the research and answers the research questions.

Chapter one

Translation of the Holy Quran

1- Introduction :

The holy Quran is the word of Allah, and it is the sacred book of all Muslims around the world. The Quran is the only sacred book that remains unchanged since it was first revealed and written down for over than fourteen hundred years ago. This miracle challenged all the Arab of that period and in all the times, the style used, the high level of language, the terms, all that made it impossible to equalize the miracle of our prophet Mohamed (peace be upon him) although in the abode of Arabic language.

This chapter will be consisting of four main titles. The first is the concept of translation; the second is an overview of translation. The third is about the history of sacred translation, the last are aspects about the translation of the holy Quran. We conclude the chapter with maintaining the important points that we have dealt with, to pave the road for the next chapter.

2- An overview of translation:

Translation is expressing what written in one language (SL) into another language (TL), so, actually it is expressing one thought or more by words. This process relies on two main elements:

1- The thought that words implies, that is to say the meaning of this words.
2- The form of both (SL) and (TL) and everything comes with (structure of sentences, rhetoric, grammar . . . etc).

From those two elements we find that the meaning or the thoughts come in the first place while translating.

The term 'translate' has Latin and Classical Greek roots and its basic is that of carrying something across, from Latin transferre or Greek metapherein. Translation is a communication or, more precisely, a form of cross-cultural communication. Translation is the act of translating. To translate means to change from one language to another, to interpret, to transfer, and to change. Translation is the act of rendering what expressed in one language by means of another language. According to Oxford Dictionary "Translation" is the process of translating words or text from one language into another. The term translation "itself has several meanings: it can refer to the general subject field, the product (the text that has been translated) or the process (the act of producing the translation, otherwise known as translating). The process of translation

between two different written languages involves the translator changing an original written text (the source text or ST) in the original verbal language (the source language or SL) into a written text (the target text or TT) in a different verbal language (the target language or TL) " (Jeremy Munday,2008, p.5).

Hatim and Munday (2004) define translation from two different perspectives. First as a process, translation is an act of taking a text from one language and transforming it into another. In this sense, Munday focuses on the part of the translator. Second as a product, translation focuses on the results achieved by the translator, the concrete product of translation. Another point of view sees translation as:

> "all the processes and methods used to render and/or transfer the meaning of the source language text into the target language as closely, completely and accurately as possible, using: (1) words/phrases which already have a direct equivalent in Arabic language; (2) new words or terms for which no ready-made equivalent are available in Arabic; (3) foreign words or terms written in Arabic letters as pronounced in their native origin; and (4) foreign words or terms made to fit Arabic pronunciation spelling and grammar" (Hasan Ghazala,2008, p.1).

Peter Newmark (1988, p.5) defines translation as "rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text."

In addition, translation is "the reproduction in the receptor language of the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning, and second in terms of style" (Nida & Taber, 2003, p.12). What we notice after these definitions is that they are all emphasising on the meaning as prime factor in the process of translation; of course, this view has a plenty of supporter who think that this is the perfect way of translation. As well as other theorists adopt this trend and gave us a numerous concept about translation, among those there is J.C.Catford (1965, p.20) who defined translation as "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)".

Another well-known scholar named Ross (1981,p.9) state that "the most natural view is that translation preserves the meaning of the original in another language or form . . . Translation is not a restatement, where differences are minimized, but highlights certain equivalence in the

context of important dissimilarities ". Alexander Fraser Tytler (1978, p.16) laws of translation also suggests that "1- The translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work. 2- The style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original. 3- The translation should have all the ease of the original composition."

Chaim Rabin in his essay (1958,p.123) 'Linguistics of translation' says that "translation is a process by which a spoken or written utterance take place in one language which is intended and presumed to convey the same meaning as previously existing utterance in another language. It thus involves two distinct factors, a 'meaning', or reference to some slice of reality". De Beaugrande (1978, p.13) defines it by saying that "translation should not be studied as a comparing and contrasting of two texts, but as a process of interaction between author, translator, and the reader of the translation." (Quoted in Chiyab, 2006, p.22)

Translation is the transference of meaning from the Source Language (SL) to the Target Language (TL). Roman Jakobson defines translation in semiotic terms, suggesting that translation may occur not only between languages, but also within a language and between semiotic systems. In addition, many other scholars adopt the same definition as Jakobson, semiotic-based definition, on the other hand, are those definitions that take translation as the study of signs, symbols, codes. Among those there is Steiner (1975, p.414) who says, "Translation is the interpretation of verbal signs in one language by means of verbal signs in another". Also Frawley (1984,p.159) " translation means re-codification ", Diaz-Diocaretz also define it by saying " translation will be understood as the final product of problem solving and sign production of receptor-text (RT) functionally equivalent to a source text (ST), by a human being in a given language for a given group of text receivers ".

"Whatever definitions we come across, almost all of them can be subsumed under two definitions. The first definition is the replacement of one written text from one language to another in which the main goal of the translator is meaning. The second is the transference of a message communicated from one text into a message communicated in another, with a high degree of attaining equivalence of context of the message, components of the original text, and the semiotic elements of the text "(Said M.Shiyab,2006,p.22).

2-1- Types of translation:

As shown above, translation definition differs from one to another, and each theorist gives his definition according to a point of view. Because of all this diversity, translation in nowadays has been divided into different types, categories, and decisive criterions. This classification verily appeared to theorize for the science of translation and its arts. In what follows, we will adduce the different types of translation, and review the basis of these classifications:

Although there are many studies that dealt with the different types and patterns of translation, a few of these studies have mentioned the fact that the Arab was the first to make types of the translation, and they based their classification according to the way of translation. There are two famous method were adopted at that time: Yohana Ibn Al- Batriq and Hunayn Ibn Ishaq Al-Jawahiri method.

- Yohana Ibn Al- Batriq method and others: it is to break down the ST word by word and try to find the closest meaning for each word alone in the TT; it is like what known as word for word translation.
- Ibn Ishaq Al-Jawahiri method and others: it is to study the sentence in ST and get its meaning then express it with TL in the TT whether it equalize and match the ST or not, it is like what is known as sense for sense translation.

Indeed, the second way were adopted in a wide range, since it overcome the mistake that could happen from the use of metaphoric expression in the ST, and what makes the first way weak is the fact that you cannot find equivalence between SL & TL. In addition, the structure, syntax, and grammar differ from one language into another. The Arab in the past mentioned to make a distinction between written and oral translation. We see that obvious in using the term translator (مترجم) and interpreter (ترجمان). As we have previously said, The Arab made a great progress in their classification of translation, and they based it on many levels, for example: word & sentence level, complete & partial study of the text . . . etc.

Unfortunately, a very few studies point out the role played by the Arab in the field of translation, in spite of the fact that most of this categorization made today is to be based upon the principles made by the Arab.

In nowadays, translation is classified into different types that could be categorized according to a variety of standards. In what follows we will state the different types of translation.

The two oldest, 'Literal' versus 'Free' translations. The free Vs literal dichotomy is probably the most frequently encountered in traditional accounts of translation. Both " concerns the semantic, often syntactic closeness between the source and target texts . . . literalists tend to make form inseparable from content, while partisans of free translation tend to believe the same message can be conveyed in what is perhaps a radically different form". (Marilyn Gaddis Rose, 1981, p.31)

Another two famous types of translation called literary and Non-literary. As a point of agreements between those two, we can state that they "denote what is being translated, how the text is classified to begin with" (ibid). In the other hand, literary translation is "concerned with both 'sense' and style" (Bijay Kumar Das, 2008, p.27). In Non-literary translation "the emphasis was on sense" (opt cite). Easily saying, the first kind is totally deals with the translation of literature, but the second only with the translation of texts not related to literature.

According to the way of expression, we can also classify translation to two other types, Written Vs Oral translation. Written translation is that which deals with written texts and work to transfer them to another language restricting to the basis of complete translation, that is to say, the translator must not neglect any part or any items that forms the ST, and this is the difficulty of this type of translation. Oral translation in the other hand is older than the first one since the verbal communication between human being is the oldest. This kind is all about interpreting, the translation is going to be heard directly from the translator, and the meaning will be in spoken form. This kind affected by many factors especially time where the interpreter need to do an immediate translation for the meaning, and mostly, this type use partial translation where some items are dismissed for the sake of transferring the exact meaning.

J.C.Catford also make a wide distinction and categorization of the types of translation in his famous book 'A Linguistic Theory of Translation', he define those types according to 3 terms: the extent, level, and rank of translation, we are going to mention the two most important of them.

Full Vs partial translation: Catford defines those two according to the extent of SL text, he defines full translation by saying: "the entire text is submitted to the translation process: that is,

every part of the SL text is replaced by TL text material" (J.C.Catford, 1978, p.21). In this type, every item of the SL text is translated; every single detail is conveyed into the TL, whatever was the size of texts, a clause, or a group of books. For Partial translation he said that in this kind, "some part or parts of the SL text are left untranslated" (opt cite). Here, it is totally the opposite with the previous mentioned type, where some parts of the text intentionally left untranslated, and this makes the process of transfer into the TL simpler.

J.C.Catford continues his categorization moving to other types. At the levels of language, he said, translation is divided to two kinds, Total Vs Restricted. The first is the translation that happens on all the levels of language as Catford defines total translation: it is the "replacement of SL grammar and lexis by equivalent TL grammar and lexis with consequential replacement of SL phonology/graphology by (non-equivalent) TL phonology/graphology" (J.C.Catford, 1978, p.22). Restricted translation in the other side is the opposite of the Total translation, it happens at one level. He defines it: it is the "replacement of SL textual material by equivalent TL textual material, at only one level" (opt cite).

Another Famous three categories of translation made by the Russo-American structuralist Roman Jakobson (1959) in his seminal paper 'On linguistic aspects of translation' in Venuti (2000, p.114), they are:

- **Intralingual** translation: or rendering (an interpretation) of verbal signs in the same language.
- **Interlingual** translation: or (translation proper) an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other languages.
- **Intersemiotic** translation: or (transmutation) or interpretation of verbal signs by means of nonverbal signs system.

Jeremy Munday explaining those types said, "Intralingual translation would occur, for example, when we rephrase an expression or when we summarize or otherwise rewrite a text in the same language. Intersemiotic translation would occur if a written text were translated, for example, into music, film, or painting. It is interlingual translation, between two different verbal languages, which is the traditional, although by no means exclusive, focus of translation studies" (Munday, 2008, p.5).

3- History of translation :

The appearance of translation as an active human movement go along with the society development, it remained the means of communication between the people for a long period. Translation came out as a result for human activity (Business, Religion, Military . . . etc), the very first form of translation was the oral one, which is due to the simple language system and the non-existence of writing yet.

3-1- In the western world:

A lot of western translator appeared in ancient and modern times. Cicero and Horace (first century BC) were the old school of translation, they distinguish between word for word translation and sense for sense translation. St Jerome (fourth century CE) who was famous for his translation of the Greek Septuagint Bible into Latin, and he was the first who suggest to separate between the translation of religious texts and other texts. He makes it clear that the correct translation depends on translator understanding of the original text and the degree of mastering TL. Translation for many years kept in the subject of religious translation till the sixteenth century, when translation began to change into other domain and fields of study (politic, war, literature . . .etc).

The invention of printing technique in the fifteenth century helped translation to develop to the better. Moreover, the centuries came after, marked the appearance of many theorists as John Dryden (1631-1700), Abraham Cowley (1618-1667), Etienne Dolet (1915-1946). In the twentieth century, translation has become a science called translation studies, it became an important trend in language teaching and learning at school. This period has many scholar in all the fields, for instance, Jean-Paul Vinay and Darbelnet in stylistic, J.C.Catford (1965) with his book 'linguistic theory of translation', Eugene Nida (1964), Peter Newmark (1988), and many other figures that characterise the twenties.

3-2- In the Arab world:

The Arab did not live apart from others; they mixed with other nations and peoples. They build relations with Romans and Persians, communicated with them, affected by them and vice versa. Arab trade contribute in the expansion of these relation, a new connections happened led to

enrich the language and culture of nations. This could not be happen without translation, there are terms entered the Arabic language, also, too many words, terms, and syntax inserted to the Persians and Romans language system due to what they translated from the Arab science and literature that take a part of building their civilization.

Arab takes a good care of translation from the very beginning of Islam. " The spread of Islam and the communication with non-Arabic speaking communities as Jews, Romans and others pushed the prophet to look for translators and to encourage the learning of foreign languages " (Zainurrahman,2009,p.5).

In addition, the act of translation raised in time of Caliphs because of the Islamic conquests, and the need to maintain contact with Non-Arabic speaking communities, make it necessary to know their culture, science, and literature. " Translation knew an enhancement with the Caliph Al-Mansour, who built the city of Baghdad, and was also developed in the time of the Caliph Al-Ma'moun, who built 'Bait Al Hikma', which was the greatest institute of translation at the time " (opt cite).

The Arab interest at translation reaches the climax in time of Caliph Haroun Al-Rashid, who appreciates the work translator do, and generously gives money to them. Many famous translators, for instance, Yohana Ibn Al- Batriq, Ibn Naima Al-Himsi, Hunayn Ibn Ishaq Al-Jawahiri, and Al-Jahid, characterized this era. Those entire translators were famous for their translation and knowledge of TL language. "In addition to his insistence on the knowledge of the structure of the language and the culture of its people, Al-Jahid talked too much about the importance of revision after translation. In brief, Al-Jahid puts a wide range of theories in his two books Al-Hayawān and Al-Bayān Wa Attabayyun." (Opt cite). In nowadays, the Arab are far from what they were in the past, and that is because of many problems that surround it which inherent the creativity although in the recent years it witnessed a sort of progression.

4- The history of sacred texts translation:

Sacred translation is almost the topic of this dissertation, so we decided to take a quick look into these problematic texts at least in the topic of translation. Religious translation had been through a lot, and we preferred to divide it to two main point of discuss, the first is about Biblical translation, the second is about our topic which is the Holy Quran.

First, the history of Bible translation as Nida claims is divided into three principal periods: the Greco-Roman (200 BC to 700 AD), the Reformation (16th to 17th century), and the modern periods (19th to 20th century).

The Greco-Roman period, witnessed the first translation of bible that date back to the second century BC, it was the Old Testament. In addition, the New Testament was translated into Latin; also other languages were targeted like Coptic, Gothic, and even Arabic. St Jerome version of the bible had a big effect on the following translation; it was in the end of fourth century, "St Jerome's famous contentious version that was to have such influence on succeeding generations . . ." (Bassnett, 2002, p.53). He adopted sense for sense translation and he "insisted that the sense should have priority over the form" (Baker, 2001, p.23).

The Reformation period was marked by the enormous number of language varieties and touched every language at the time. William Tyndale's new testament was the famous one, it was for the first time written in English, " whose translation of the New testament formed the primary basis for the later development of the King James Version "(Ibid).

The modern period is where the translation of Bible have come to point when it end up in such great progress, and that is due to new studies on translation, new theorists which helped the translation world so much. As Nida claims in Mona Baker book, we can actually divide this period into two main phases, "the first phase saw the production of revisions and new translations into a number of major European Languages, . . . During the second phase, numerous translations were made by missionaries into languages of the 'third world' "(opt cite).

Now, let us look on the history of Holy Quran translation. Quran translation dates back to the prophet Mohamed (peace be upon him) because of an increasing need to spread the message of Islam to Non-Arabic speaking communities, it was by Salman AI-Farsi who did translate the meaning of *Sura* of *Al Fatiha* to Persian. The first translation into the European Languages was to Latin made by an order from Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny in 1143. It was first printed and published by Theodore Bibliander at Basel 1543 four hundred years after its composition. In 1647 Andre' Du Ryer translated it into French and it was a bad translation, full of mistakes, and even additions. The Scotsman Alexander Ross made the first translation into English in 1649. "This was indirect translation based on a French version by Sieur du Ryer and, like the Latin

translation sponsored by Abbot of Cluny had a dubious aims . . .” (Baker, 2001, p.203). Latin version by father Ludovic Maracci in 1698 was followed later by many English translations, one of these was by George Sale in 1734.

According to Arberry “ the superiority of Sale's to Ross is evident in every line; not only had he a good grasp of the Arabic language . . . but his English is more elegant and mature ” (Arberry,1996,p.12). Although it contains many faults because of his bad Arabic, his version translated into many other languages, for instance: French, German, Russian, and Swedish. Another English translation is for Bell's in 1939, and it was completely inaccurate because he made re-arrangement of the Surah, “Bell was one of small number of translators, including Rodwell (1861), who saw fit to rearrange the Sura(s) of the Qur'an on chronological grounds” (Baker, 2001, p.203). Subsequently, many others attempts to translate the Qur'an into English, Rodwell's rendering appeared in 1861, Palmer's in 1880, Bell's in 1939, and Dawood's in 1956. Professor Arberry's translation of the original Arabic was published in 1955 and was described as of the greatest literary distinction.

We also had two English translations by Moslems, in 1005 the Holy Quran, translated by Dr. Mohammed Abdul Hakim Khan, with short notes. In 1911, Ashgar and Company at Allahabad published the Arabic text with English translation, arranged chronologically, by Mina Abu'l Fazl.

5- Particularities about the translation of the Holy Quran:

5-1- Untranslatability of the Holy Qur'an:

What actually make the Holy Qur'an so special is the fact that it is the word of Allah, and this by itself raise questions of the translatability of its words, styles, structure, and of course the meaning. In addition, the permissibility of transforming the Word of Allah into a human book that could claim any equivalency to the Qur'an was a major element, made translators hesitate when it comes to translate the Holy Qur'an. Although this factors, the need to translate Qur'an arose in the early days of Islam when many non-Arabic speaking people espouse Islam. “During the Prophet Muhammad's era, the translation of the Qur'an was limited to diplomatic purposes” (Faiq, 2004, p.91). Translating the Qur'an was not only a need for the non-Arabic speaking communities, but it was also a necessity to make the message of the Qur'an accessible to all other people of the world. The Arabic language is unique among languages and superior to the

languages of all other nations, it contains a lot characteristics, it is a rich language, with metaphors, rhymes, rhythms and many other thing, it is virtually impossible to translate Arabic into any language than how about the Holy Quran. Hussein Abdul-Raof (2001) in his book 'Quran Translation' stresses the untranslatability of the Quran for numerous reasons. He states that Quranic discourse involves a syntactic, semantic, rhetorical, and cultural feature that differs from other types of Arabic discourse. He gives a Qur'an-specific syntactic feature as an example. Abdul-Raof says that some verses of the Quran use a feminine noun rather than a masculine noun. He gives the following verse as an example:

$$(\text{غُلِبَتِ ٱلرُّومُ})$$

(*The Roman Empire has been defeated*)

Abdul-Raof writes that a translation of these kinds of verses will not give the reader the same effect the original gives which "signifies humiliation, rhetorically it performs the function of sarcasm" (Abdul-Raof, 2001, p.51). Therefore, identical style to that of the language of the Quran will never achieved in the translation. Abdul-Raof claims that "Quranic discourse is a linguistic scenery characterized by a rainbow of syntactic, semantic, rhetorical, phonetic and cultural features that are distinct from other types of Arabic discourse" (quoted in Faiq, 2004, p.92). At last, we come up to a dead end when it is about the translation of Holy Qur'an, but to be not so pessimism, "Any attempt at translating the Qur'an is essentially a form of exegesis, or at least is based on an understanding of the text and consequently projects a certain point of view; Hence the preference given to Muslim as opposed to Non-Muslim translators" (Baker, 2001, p.201).

5-2- Legitimacy of Holy Qur'an translation:

Many Muslims scholars rejected the idea of translating the Holy Quran, many others support translating it, and each of them has his arguments. The scholars of Islam debated this subject for a long time. These raise questions of legitimacy of Holy Quran translation, whether it is permissible or not. Prophet Mohammed (pbuh) was the messenger of Allah, in addition, he was the last prophets, and his message is the final one until the day of doom. The message of Quran is in Arabic, the language of the prophet (pbuh) and his people, but, since he is a messenger for all

humankind, how could it be possible for this message to reach the entire universe without translation.

To be honest, the translation of Holy Quran did happen during the life of the prophet (pbuh), especially in his letters to the rulers of the time. Hussein Abdul-Raof claims, "The Muslim scholar Imam Abu Hanifah, for example, sanctioned the reading of al-FaatiHa (the Opening – chapter 1) in its translated form in any language in prayers" (Faiq, 2004, p.91).

Translating the Quran from Non-Muslims translators caused many problems, led to scratch the Islam and give a bad image about it. Due to this reason, Muslim scholars decided to ameliorate those translations made by Non-Muslim translators, and enable Non- Muslim speaking communities understand better the Islam, as result, they put a very strict conditions for this work to do. The concept of interpreting the Quran (Tafsir) was the perfect solution for this debates since the translation of Quran is the translation of its meaning, and it was considered as an obligation some times for Muslims scholars in order to spread well the message of Islam. When we say interpretation of Quran, we mean by that exegesis of the Quran, as Hussein Abdul-Raof said, "Only exegetical translation is allowed, that is translation based on commentary and explication of the Quranic text." (Opt cite)

Therefore, any translation of the Holy Quran is actually a translation of its meaning since it is the word of Allah, despite the Fact that there is no perfect or adequate translation made by human, than how about the Miracle of the Quran. Further, there is an agreement among translator that to do a good work you need first to understand the ST very well. You must surround its entire aspects and concepts. When it comes to religious texts, it is completely another topic, because of the sensitivity of these texts. Therefore, scholar of Islam agrees that Muslims translators whom understand the Islam and its concepts must do the task of Quran translation.

Hassan Mustapha declares that and she says, "Any attempt at translating the Quran is essentially a form of exegesis, or at least is based on an understanding of the text and consequently projects a certain point of view; Hence, the preference given to Muslim as opposed to non-Muslim translators. Terms such as 'explanation', 'interpretation', and 'paraphrase' take on exegetic hues in the context of translating the Quran, and this have implications for legitimizing any such attempt" (Baker, 2001, p.201).

We conclude by saying that all Muslims scholars lay stress on the fact that the Quran is an inimitable text to translate to a foreign language. At the same time, the increasing number of Muslims around the world put another pressure on Muslims scholars to translate the meaning of the glorious Quran for non-Muslims for enabling them to have knowledge of the message of Islam. Therefore, we can declare that no one ever can give a translation for the Holy Quran.

6 – Conclusion:

As it was seen through this chapter, the history of translation is rich of events that make it so fruitful, and at the same time negotiable. The translation history of the Holy Quran is full of issues that raise many questions about the validity of its translation and interpretation to non-Arabic speaking countries. All along, literal translation of the Quran remains in much debates. That is what chapter two try to establish.

Chapter two

Literal translation

1- Introduction:

Literal translation remains for a long period a topic of much debate between scholars as for translators all around the world. The first translations of Bible to the different European languages raise the question of its capability of transferring the exact message to the reader as the original. There are translators defend on literal translation, they believe that to be faithful to the original you should stick to this kind of translation. Others disagree with them in the fact that we should respect the TT and its language since it is the main concern of any translator willing to transfer the meaning of ST, and give the same effect of the original. Of this and that, the question whether literal translation is acceptable or not remain debatable, this is what this chapter will try to study, and clear the ambiguity surrounding this kind of translation. Firstly, will look at the concept of literal translation proposed by theorists in an attempt to understand it clearly. Secondly, will give some opinions on the literal translation. Thirdly, will illustrate the problems of literal translation. Fourthly, will discuss the main concern, which is the literal translation of the Holy Quran.

2- An overview of literal translation:

In general, literal translation happens when the translator tries to make a translation of ST look as possible as he can like ST in the TT language, without caring too much about the form of the latter. Theorists named literal translation so many names; for example, Eugene Nida (1964,p.159) categorizes literal translation as formal equivalence, he says: "Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content . . . one is concerned that the message of the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language". He adds that " the type of translation which most completely typifies this structural equivalence might be called a 'gloss translation' in which the translator attempts to produce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original" (opt cite).

Another name for literal translation was made by J.C.Catford; it is Formal correspondence. He says: "any TL category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the same place in the economy of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL" (Catford, 1965, p.27). He adds that literal translation start from " from a

word-for-word translation, but makes changes in conformity with TL grammar inserting additional words and changing structures at any rank ”(opt cite). Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet also broach literal translation, they define it by saying: “ Literal, or word for word, translation is the direct transfer of a SL text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate TL text in which the translators’ task is limited to observing the adherence to the linguistic servitudes of the TL” (Vinay& Darbelnet, 1995, p.33).

So again, there is an emphasizing on the Form beside The content. Said M.Shiyab (2006, p.28) argues, “This kind of translation focuses on the linguistic structure of the source text. It ignores the semiotic, pragmatic, and contextual connotations of text-structure, while taking into account the linguistic conventions of the target language”. The multilingual Peter Newmark (1988, p.46) talked in a wide range of interest on literal translation saying that it is “The SL grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TL equivalents but the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context”. This is also the view taken by Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2002, p.16), they argue that “literal translation is when the denotative meaning of words is taken as if straight from the dictionary (that is, out of context), but TL grammar is respected”.

3- Opinions on the literal translation:

Literal translation had been in many debates between the translators over the years, since the very first translation of the Bible that were literally translated into the different European languages. Translators treat this kind of translation with so many concepts, so many attitudes, and so many claims. There is who support it. Who simply does not, and who just sit in between, each of them gives his opinions and arguments. Arab history of translation had these debates of literal translation. In the Abbasid period (750-1250), there was a very big translation activity. Literal translation was adopted at that time from numerous translators, such as Yuhanna Ibn al-Batriq and Ibn Naima al-Himsi. Mona Baker said that their way “was highly literal and consisted of translating each Greek word with an equivalent Arabic word and, where none existed, borrowing the Greek word into Arabic” (cited in Munday, 2008, p.22).

As it mentioned above, Bible translation were the perfect example of literal translation. The common belief at that time was to translate as closely as possible the original text to the target text. They claim that Translation of the New Testament is based upon the belief that every word

of the original is God-breathed, so it became necessary for translator to stick to the original even if it was vague. In addition, they claim that any other kind of translation can distort the original, since the translator is a human, and he can wrong the reader by his own understanding of the ST.

Another big supporter to the literal translation is the multilingual Peter Newmark. He has a different meaning for it, he looks at it from faithfulness point of view, he said: "When you ask how close, how faithful, how true a version is in translation to the original, you can have nothing else in mind except the spirit of the original, which is the reverse of concrete" (1991, p.124). He argues that if you want to be faithful to the style of the original you must be literal in your translation. He adds that "if the genius or the particular of the foreign language is to be preserved, clearly and straight, only two procedures can preserve it, transference and literal translation" (Ibid). He actually declares that "one is faithful to the author not out of loyalty to the author (the author's precise style is hardly worth it), but simply out of loyalty to one's client and the readership (who, one assumes, want to know exactly what the author wrote) . . ." (Opt cite, p.126).

Professor Hassan Ghazala adds to Newmark concept of literal translation and asserts on that by saying "literal translation is committed to the real meaning, or meanings, of a word or an expression in language . . . literal meaning is the real, accurate and contextual meaning of a word" (Ghazala, 2008, p.10). He asserts, "It is the translation of meaning in context; it takes into account the TL grammar and word order. Metaphorical and special uses of language are also accounted for in the TL" (opt cite).

Although all this arguments and concepts trying to legitimate for literal translation, but in fact they failed to produce one coherent translation of any work starting from the Bible itself. Indeed, they succeed in giving a literal counterpart of a SL in TL, but that was at the expense of the intended message, on the contrary, they distort the original text trying to preserve it.

In contrast to those who support literal translation, there are theorists rejected this kind of translation, justifying this by the complete failure of the espoused approach. St. Jerome rejects this type of translation. He writes, "Now I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek, except of course in the case of the Holy Scripture, where even the syntax

contains a mystery, I render not word for word, but sense for sense" (Cited in Munday, 2008, p.20).

In the Arab world also there were whom espoused sense for sense, Mona Baker for instance said that " Ibn Ishaq and al-Jawahiri, consisted of translating sense-for-sense, creating fluent target texts which conveyed the meaning of the original without distorting the target language" (opt cite, p.22). Martin Luther also follows St Jerome in rejecting a word-for-word translation. Another group of theorists marked the seventeenth century attacked this approach of translation, among them there is Cowley who hated the poetry to be "converted faithfully and word for word into French or Italian prose" (opt cite, p.25). John Dryden also opposes this trend. He reduces all translation to three categories:

> "(1) '**metaphrase**': 'word by word and line by line' translation, which corresponds to literal translation; (2) '**paraphrase**': 'translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense'; this involves changing whole phrases and more or less corresponds to faithful or sense-for-sense translation; (3) '**imitation**': 'forsaking' both words and sense; this corresponds to Cowley's very free translation and is more or less adaptation" (opt cite, p.26).

Dryden writes, "it is impossible to translate verbally and well at the same time. It is much like dancing on ropes with fettered legs. A man may shun a fall by using caution, but the gracefulness of motion is not to be expected" (cited in Nida 1964, p.18). Dryden insists, "imitation and verbal version are in my opinion the two extremes, which ought to be avoided" (Ibid). Alexander Pope also asserts on Dryden opinion: " 'no literal translation can be just to an excellent original' . . . and yet 'no rash paraphrase can make amends' "(Ibid). Campbell criteria of good translation are as follows:

> "(1) To give a just representation of the sense of the original.

(2) To convey into his version, as much as possible, in a consistency with the genius of the language which he writes, the author's spirit and manner.

(3) To take care that the version have, "at least so far the quality of an original performance, as to appear natural and easy " (Ibid).

To conclude Campbell criteria it can be said that he believes that any translation must be faithful to the original. Etienne Dolet set out five principles in favour not to follow literal translation as follows:

"(1) the translator must perfectly understand the sense and material of the original author, although he [sic] should feel free to clarify obscurities. (2) The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL, so as not to lessen the majesty of the language. (3) The translator should avoid word-for-word renderings. (4) The translator should avoid Latinate and unusual forms. (5) The translator should assemble and liaise words eloquently to avoid clumsiness" (Munday, 2008, p.27).

Alexander Fraser Tytler's (1790) likewise set up three general laws rejecting Literal translation as follows:

"1) the translator should give a complete transcript of the idea of the original work.

2) The style and manner of the writing should be of the same character as that of the original.

3) The translation should have all the ease of the original composition" (Ibid).

He asserts "That in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language as to be as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to

which that language belongs as it is by those who speak the language of the original work"
(Tytler, 1797, p.14 cited in Munday, 2008, p.27).

Nida and Taber in their book, 'The Theory and Practice of Translation', make it clear that this
kind of translation is wrong and cannot render the exact meaning of the original, we quote,
"literal rendering is both unnatural and misleading" (Nida and Taber, 1982, p.16). Their opinions
come from an analysis for many translation of the Bible. They say that translator must strive for
meaning rather than identity and look after wherever that could be, the emphasis should be on
"the reproduction of the message rather than the conservation of the form of the utterance" (Opt
cite, p.12). They state that sometimes, the translator should neglect the formal structure for the
sake of the message.

In addition, they emphasise this declaring: "we can emphasize the basic principle that contextual
consistency is more important than verbal consistency, and that in order to preserve the content it
is necessary to make certain changes in form "(opt cite, p.101). They argue, "Formal
correspondence distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and hence
distorts the message, so as to cause the receptor to misunderstand or to labour unduly hard" (opt
cite, p.201). This is actually what they named literalness, they write, it is a "quality of a
translation in which the form of the original has been reproduced in the receptor language in such
a way as to distort the message and/or the patterns of the receptor language" (opt cite, p.203). As
result, they stress that translating process must aim at reproducing the message, and a
conscientious translator will want the closest natural equivalent.

Not far from that, Mona Baker (1992) also adopted the same attitudes against literal translation,
she refuse any kind of this approach. She made it clear and obvious that "There is no one- to-one
correspondence between orthographic words and elements of meaning within or across
languages" (Baker, 1992, p.11). She pointed out a very important thing, which is, "The choice of
a suitable equivalence in a given text depends on a wide variety of factors. Some of these factors
may be strictly linguistic, others may be extra-linguistic" (opt cite, p.17). Dickins, Hervey and
Higgins rejected literal translation also, they argue that "In translation, lexical loss is very
common, but it is just one kind of translation loss among many. It can occur for all sorts of
reasons. It very often arises from the fact that exact synonymy between ST words and TL words
is relatively rare" (2002, p. 97).

Walter Benjamin (1923) in his essay 'The task of the translator' state, "A literal rendering of the syntax completely demolishes the theory of reproduction of meaning and is a direct threat to comprehensibility" (Venuti, 2000, p.21). Catford neither support literal translation nor reject it, he create the term rank-bound translation clearing that literal translation lies between. The five ranks he sets are sentence, clause, group, word, and morpheme. Catford says that literal translation is difficult when translating into languages that do not have the same grammatical ranks. He adds, "Literal translation, like word for word, tends to remain lexically word for word" (Catford, 1965, p.25). Vladimir Nabokov (1955) in his essay 'Problems of translation "ONEGIN" in English' said that, "the term 'literal translation' is tautological since anything but that is not truly a translation but an imitation, an adaptation or a parody" (Venuti, 2000, p.77).

4- The consequences of literal translation:

The problems caused by literal translation are too many, but the main the problem is the distortion of the original message and misleading the reader. As stated above, many theorists go against this approach of translation arguing that it will never help the translator of an ST to transfer the same effect to a TT. Mona Baker (1992) in her masterpiece of translation 'In other words' states many problems at different level that could a literal translation do. These levels differ from words, to idioms, to styles, to cohesion and coherence, "when such difficulties are encountered by the translator, the whole issue of the translatability of the text is raised" (Bassnett, 2002, p.39). Vinay and Darbelnet (1995, p.34) said that literal translation is unacceptable because it "gives another meaning or has no meaning, it is structurally impossible, and does not have corresponding expression within the metalinguistic experience of TL or has a corresponding expression but not within the same register". The following words will try to discuss these problems.

4-1- On word:

Languages around the world are different in every single details, Culler (1976) said that "the concepts . . . of one language may differ radically from these of another . . . each language articulates or organizes the world differently" (cited in Baker, 1992, p.10). Bolinger and Sears (1968, p. 43) defines word as "the smallest unit of language that can be used by itself" (cited in

Baker, 1992, p.11). She adds and defines written word as "any sequence of letters with an orthographic space on either side" (Baker, 1992, p.11).

The meaning of a word vary from denotative to connotative, which means that each word has a different meaning in every context, from the moment that these words combined together, they produce a totally different sense from that in isolation. Hassan Ghazala (2008, p.83) states, "Although any language is words in isolation, it cannot be understood as such. Words are used together in special combinations, texts, and contexts."

As a result, the translator will distort the content of an ST if he treats words out of context. Any strict adherence to the original with neglecting the TL linguistic system will harm the ultimate intention of a translator, which is rendering ST content. Dickins, Hervey, and Higgins (2002) declares that literal translation causes problem on the word level and lexical loss is common due to the fact that "meanings are not found exclusively in the words listed individually in the dictionary . . . it very often arises from the fact that exact synonymy between ST words and TL words is relatively rare" (2002, p.97). Baker states that one word in SL could have a various meaning in TL. Nida and Taber emphasise that and explain by saying:

> "Since words cover areas of meaning and are not mere points of meaning, and
> since in different languages the semantic areas of corresponding words are not
> identical, it is inevitable that the choice of the right word in the receptor language
> to translate a word in the source-language text depends more on the context than
> upon a fixed system of verbal consistency" (1982, p.15).

As conclusion, literal translation causes problems on the word level. In an attempt to render the original for TL reader, translator could unconsciously harm and distort the intended message if he treats word out of their context.

Mona Baker (1992) stress the need to translate words according to their context, we quote, "in the majority of cases, words have 'blurred edges'; their meanings are, to a large extent, negotiable and are only realized in specific contexts" (p.17). This explain the way that word should be treated with when translating, and once the translator has understood the meaning of the words, he has to render the whole meaning of that sentence into the target language in a form that match it. Ghazala also declare that literal translation at the level of lexical is only acceptable under "one

condition: when it is a literal translation of the meaning of English words in context and in an Arabic word order, and not a literal translation of words in isolation nor in an English word order" (2008, p.87).

4-2- On idiom:

When it comes to the translation of idioms, literal translation could cause very serious problems at all the levels. Thus, it is agreed that idioms are one of the most difficult tasks in the process of translation, idioms are surrounded with so many boundaries, they are fixed expressions demands the translator to have a good knowledge of the cultural and linguistic aspects of ST and TT.

When you translate idioms, you simply cannot handle it by literal translation; definitely, you will fail, because the meaning carried with is not in the part but in the whole. Hassan Ghazala (2008, p.128) defines idioms by saying: "an idiom is a fixed phrase whose form is usually unchangeable, and whose meaning is always the same, inflexible, metaphorical, and indirect". Baker defines idioms as follows: "they are frozen patterns of language which allow little or no variation in form and, often carry meaning which cannot deduce from its individual component" (1992, p.63). She adds that "the main problems that idiomatic expressions pose in translation relate to two areas: the ability to recognize and interpret an idiom correctly; and the difficulties involved in rendering the various aspects of meaning that an idiom or fixed expression conveys into the target language" (opt cite, p.65).

Dickins, Hervey and Higgins (2002) define idiom as "we mean a fixed figurative expression whose meaning cannot be deduced from the denotative meanings of the words that make it up" (opt cite, p.18). Nida and Taber (1969) discussed idioms in details, they say that idioms are like any other elements, constructed with normal grammatical patterns, but their intended meaning implied not in the parts, but it is in the sum, which put forward the validity of the literal translation.

Baker (1992) suggest some strategies that could possibly help the translation of idioms, she said that one could use an idiom of similar meaning and form in the target language as that of the source language, but this occasionally could be reached. In addition, using an idiom similar in meaning but different in form, and this is less difficult than the first strategy. Furthermore, the use of rephrasing is also a common strategy when you fail to find a match between TL and SL.

At last, omission also can be considered since it does not affect the meaning (opt cite). Bear in mind that not all this strategies are ideal to adopt, but the smart translator should find a way to handle it and play on those idioms in an ideal patterns.

4-3- On style:

The meaning of a given text is very much in need of style to accomplish it. It is true that we can grasp the meaning without looking at the style, but in fact it will lack the full intended meaning, in addition a slight change on the style change the meaning somehow. Therefore, the style actually has a powerful effect on a translated text. Style therefor defined as follows: "style is the different choices made by writers from the language stock in regard to layout (or shape), grammar, vocabulary, (or words) and phonology (or sounds), namely, from all aspects, levels, and components of language" (Ghazala, 2008, p.223). Since the languages differ, the styles do.

Nida and Taber (1982, p.13) state the importance of style in the translation process declaring: "though style is secondary to content, it is nevertheless important. One should not translate poetry as though it were prose or expository material as though it were straight narrative." Any attempts to translate the same style cause the loss and the distortion of the message. This is made clear by them, whom point out that "if it is stylistically heavy, it makes comprehension almost impossible" (opt cite, p.2).

Nida (1964,p.2) claims that " if he attempts to approximate the stylistic qualities of the original, he is likely to sacrifice much of the meaning, while strict adherence to the literal content usually results in considerable loss of the stylistic flavour". For example, in the case of Arabic conjunction stylistic feature 'و', the literal translation of it to English 'and' could produce a kind of style completely contrary to a good English usage. As Nida and Taber suggest that style is a secondary to the content, although we should try to preserve it when it is possible to minimize the loss. Hence, theorists attempt to confirm the right delivering of a message to the reader as possible as they can. Due to that, the strict adhering to the style of the original and the disregard of the target language style will produce confusing, unreadable, and misleading texts for TL reader.

4-4- On cohesion:

Cohesion is one of most important thing in building texts characterized by perfectness and completeness. Callow (1974, p.30) declare the fact that "each language has its own patterns to convey the interrelation ships of persons and events; in no language may these patterns be ignored, if the translation is to be understood by its readers" (cited in Baker, 1992, p.180).

Baker defines cohesion as "the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which provides links between various parts of a text" (Ibid). Newmark (1987, p.295) states, "the topic of cohesion . . . has always appeared to me the most useful constituent of discourse analysis or text linguistics applicable to translation." Cohesion is studied upon the text, each cohesive text has devices helps make it cohesive, and this varies between languages. As a result, if the text is not cohesive, readability will be compromised and the message will not be easily understood.

5- Conclusion :

This chapter tried to establish that literal translation is a vague pattern of translation that mislead and distort the meaning of the original text. This why almost all the theorists reject this kind of translation arguing that there is no one to one correspondence between orthographic words and elements of meaning within or across languages. It is stated that literal translation creates problems at many levels: words, idiom, and style. This is what the third chapter tries to analyse and come up with the appropriate proofs about the invalidity of literal translation.

Chapter three

Chapter three

1- Introduction :

This chapter is the practical part of the dissertation. We will try to examine the concept of the literal translation and its validity in case of the Holy Quran. This chapter based on analysing the translated verses, which considered a literal translation of the holy Quran, stating the problems, and the solutions. First, we will present the corpus (translation work) of the study that we are going to proceed basing on it. Secondly, we will go into the details of our main concern, which it is the literal translation of the Holy Quran.

2- Material and Methodology :

2-1- Materials :

This study based on the translations of Arthur John Arberry and Abdullah Yusuf Ali. We point out the following verses:

Number	Surah	The translation	Verse number
1	Ali 'Imran	"It is He who sent down upon thee the Book, wherein are verses clear that are the Essence of the Book, and others ambiguous. As for those in whose hearts is swerving, they follow the ambiguous part, desiring dissension, and desiring its interpretation; and none knows its interpretation, save only God and those firmly rooted in knowledge say, 'We believe in it; all is from our Lord'; yet none remembers, but men possessed of minds " (Arberry)	7
2	An Nisaa'	" Mankind, fear your Lord, who created you of a single soul, and from it created its mate, and from the pair of them scattered abroad many men and women; and fear God by whom you demand one of another, and the **wombs**; surely God ever watches over you " (Arberry)	1

		And those you may be rebellious admonish; banish them to their couches, and **beat them**	34
3	Al Hijr	" And lower thy wing unto the believers " (Arberry)	88
4	Al Israa'	" And keep not thy hand chained to thy neck, or outspread it widespread altogether, or thou wilt sit reproached and denuded " (Arberry)	29
5	Al Kahf	" Then we **smote their ears** many years in the cave " (Arberry)	11
6	Al Anbiyaa'	" So they returned one to another, . . ." (Arberry)	64
7	An Nahl	"Surely, **Abraham was a nation** obedient unto God, a man of pure faith and no idolater"	120

(1) Arberry translations

Number	Surah	The translation	Verse number
1	Ali 'Imran	"He it is Who has sent down to thee the Book: In it are verses basic or fundamental (of established meaning); they are the foundation of the Book: others are allegorical. But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings, but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah and those who are firmly grounded in knowledge say: "We believe in the Book; the whole of it is from our Lord:" and none will grasp the Message except men of understanding." (Ali)	7

2	An Nisaa'	"O mankind! reverence your Guardian-Lord, who created you from a single person, created, of like nature, His mate, and from them twain scattered (like seeds) countless men and women;- reverence Allah, through whom ye demand your mutual (rights), and (reverence) the wombs (That bore you): for Allah ever watches over you. " (Ali)	1
		"As to those women on whose part ye fear disloyalty and ill-conduct, admonish them (first), (Next), refuse to share their beds, (And last) **beat them (lightly)**"	34
3	Al Hijr	"Strain not thine eyes. (Wistfully) at what We have bestowed on some of them, nor grieve over them: but lower thy wing (in gentleness) to the believers" (Ali)	88
4	Al Israa'	"Make not thy hand tied (like a niggard´s) to thy neck, nor stretch it forth to its utmost reach, so that thou become blameworthy and destitute" (Ali)	29
5	Al Kahf	"Then We draw (a veil) over their ears, for a number of years, in the Cave, (so that they heard not) " (Ali)	11
6	Al Anbiyaa'	"So they turned to themselves and said, . . .) (Ali)	64
7	An Nahl	"Abraham was **indeed a model**, devoutly obedient to Allah, (and) true in Faith, and he joined not gods with Allah"	120

(2) Ali Yusuf translations

2-2-   Methodology :

The work from the beginning tried to clear the view on the literal translation of Holy Quran, according to that we have chosen a corpus that we based our study on, in order to accomplish the whole study that we start. The study is on Arthur John Arberry and Abdullah Yusuf Ali translation of the Holy Quran. On that basis, we tried to be as objective as we can in our analysis of the given translations, and at the same time fulfil the aims of this study. The analyses do not intend to judge the translation at any basis rather than to maintain the problems of literal translation of the Holy Quran.

3- Identification of the selected translations:

This overview includes the translator background, the translation work, and its unique features.

3-1-   Arthur John Arberry translation:

3-1-1- Background of the translator:

A.J.Arberry was born on May 12, 1905 at Trafton, Buckland, Portsmouth in England. He "was a British orientalist, scholar, translator, editor, and author who wrote, translated, or edited about 90 books on Persian- and Arab-language subjects. He specialized in Sufi studies, but is also known for his excellent translation of the Koran. AJ Arberry attended Cambridge University, where he studied Persian and Arabic with R. A. Nicholson, an experience which he considered the turning point of his life. After graduation, Arberry worked in Cairo as head of the classics department at Cairo University. During the war years, he worked at various posts in London to support the war effort with his linguistic skills. In 1944, Arberry was appointed to the chair of Persian at the School of Oriental and African Studies at London University, and then two years later to the chair of Arabic. In 1947, Arberry returned to Cambridge as the Sir Thomas Adams Professor of Arabic. Professor AJ Arberry remained there till his death in 1969" (Studies in Comparative Religion).

3-1-2- Translation work:

"The 1955 translation of Arthur John Arberry was the first English translation by a bona fide scholar of Arabic and Islam. A Cambridge University graduate, he spent several years in the

Middle East perfecting his Arabic and Persian language skills. For a short while, he served as professor of classics at Cairo University; in 1946, he was professor of Persian at University of London, and the next year transferred to Cambridge to become professor of Arabic, serving there until his death in 1969. His title, *The Koran Interpreted*, acknowledged the orthodox Muslim view that the Qur'an cannot be translated, but only interpreted. He rendered the Qur'an into understandable English and separated text from tradition. The translation is without prejudice and is probably the best around. The Arberry version has earned the admiration of intellectuals worldwide, and having been reprinted several times, remains the reference of choice for most academics. It seems destined to maintain that position for the foreseeable future." (Khaleel Mohammed, spring 2005).

3-2- Yusuf Ali Translation:

3-2-1- Background of the Translator:

"Abdullah Yusuf Ali was born on April 4, 1872 in Surat, India. He was sent to Bombay for his education. While there, he attended the new school of the Anjuman-e-Islam. He was barely 8 or 9 when he left home. Classes were taught in both Urdu and English. When he was 15, Ali left Wilson's school and entered its senior section, Wilson College, which was affiliated to the University of Bombay. Sherif thinks that Ali's education in the Anjuman School helped him resist the cultural onslaught of the dominant British colonizer.

Ali arrived in Britain in 1891 to study law at ST. John College. He eventually became one of the best students. He worked in the Indian Civil Service (ICS). He was appointed on 23 January 1896 an assistant magistrate and collector in Saharanpur, India. After few years in India, he returned to Britain and get married with Teresa Mary Shalders. They divorced in 1912.

For many years, Ali was searching, collecting data about Quran translation. When he returned to his country, he finished work on the translation of the holy Quran. He died on the 10th of December 1953 in London" (M.A.Sherif, 1994).

3-2-1- The translation work:

"Among those Qur'an translations which found Saudi favor and, therefore, wide distribution was the Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali rendition that, from its first appearance in 1934 until very recently, was the most popular English version among Muslims. While not an Islamic scholar in any formal sense, Yusuf 'Ali, an Indian civil servant, had studied classics at Cambridge University, graduated as a lawyer from Lincoln's Inn in London, and was gifted with an eloquent, vivid writing style. He sought to convey the music and richness of the Arabic with poetic English versification. While his rendering of the text is not bad, there are serious problems in his copious footnotes; in many cases, he reproduces the exegetical material from medieval texts without making any effort at contextualization. He wrote at a time full of both, growing Arab animosity toward Zionism, and in a milieu that condoned anti-Semitism, Yusuf 'Ali constructed his oeuvre as a polemic against Jews.

Several Muslim scholars have built upon the Yusuf 'Ali translation. In 1989, Saudi Arabia's Ar-Rajhi banking company financed the U.S.-based Amana Corporation's project to revise the translation to reflect an interpretation more in conjunction with the line of Islamic thought followed in Saudi Arabia. Ar-Rahji offered the resulting version for free to mosques, schools, and libraries throughout the world. The footnoted commentary about Jews remained so egregious that, in April 2002, the Los Angeles school district banned its use at local schools. While the Yusuf 'Ali translation still remains in publication, it has lost influence because of its dated language and the appearance of more recent works whose publication and distribution the Saudi government has also sought to subsidize" (Khaleel Mohammed, spring 2005).

4- The problems of the literal translation of the Holy Quran:

4-1- At the level of the word:

The literal translation of words from the Holy Quran caused the distortion of its intended meaning, The reader of those words will be misled, and he will never get the correct meaning if he red these translations. In what follows will try to clarify this cases with Arberry and Ali translations of the Quran:

يَٰٓأَيُّهَا ٱلنَّاسُ ٱتَّقُوا۟ رَبَّكُمُ ٱلَّذِى خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَٰحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا

رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَآءً ۚ وَٱتَّقُوا۟ ٱللَّهَ ٱلَّذِى تَسَآءَلُونَ بِهِۦ وَٱلْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا ۝

Yusuf Ali	Arberry
O mankind! reverence your Guardian-Lord, who created you from a single person, created, of like nature, His mate, and from them twain scattered (like seeds) countless men and women;-reverence Allah, through whom ye demand your mutual (rights),and (reverence) the **wombs** (That bore you): for Allah ever watches over you.	Mankind, **fear** your Lord, who created you of a single soul, and from it created its mate, and from the pair of them scattered abroad many men and women; and fear God by whom you demand one of another, and the **wombs**; surely God ever watches over you

Translations of verse (1) from Ali 'Imran Surah

As we see in these translations, the wrong use of the two word 'fear' and 'wombs' has led to distort the intended meaning of the Quran. The reader of this translation will be misled, the two words are literally translated which caused a vagueness in this verse. While the intended meaning of 'wombs' is the kinship and 'fear' is to be faithful and dutiful, here it is totally harmed meaning. The translator thinks that as long as he adhere to the ST, he cannot be too far from the meaning, Instead, what he has done is the opposite, a translation full of mistakes and ambiguity.

Another example:

إِنَّ إِبْرَٰهِيمَ كَانَ أُمَّةً قَانِتًا لِّلَّهِ حَنِيفًا وَلَمْ يَكُ مِنَ ٱلْمُشْرِكِينَ ۝

Yusuf Ali	Arberry

"Abraham was **indeed a model**, devoutly obedient to Allah, (and) true in Faith, and he joined not gods with Allah" (Ali,16:120)	"Surely, **Abraham was a nation** obedient unto God, a man of pure faith and no idolater" (Arberry,16:120)

Translations of verse (120) from An Nahl Surah

Here, we notice that Arberry translation failed to the correct meaning, while Ali translation indeed succeeded. The word meaning of 'أمة' is a man teaches people religious rules, so he is a like a model to them, therefor, the word 'nations' is not correct.

Another verse:

وَٱلَّٰتِى تَخَافُونَ نُشُوزَهُنَّ فَعِظُوهُنَّ وَٱهْجُرُوهُنَّ فِى ٱلْمَضَاجِعِ وَٱضْرِبُوهُنَّ

Yusuf Ali	**Arberry**
As to those women on whose part ye fear disloyalty and ill-conduct, admonish them (first), (Next), refuse to share their beds, (And last) **beat them (lightly)**	And those you may be rebellious admonish; banish them to their couches, and **beat them**,

Translations of verse (34) from An Nisaa' Surah

Here, we see that the use of exegetes helped Ali render the right meaning of the words 'beat them' which is beat them gently and without harm. By contrast, Arberry did not use the explanation; as a result, the reader of this verse will misunderstand the true meaning that Ayah intends to express.

4-2- At the level of idiom:

Translating idioms and fixed expressions is tough and not an easy task; this is also applicable in the Quran. As we state in the second chapter, when he deals with idioms, a translator should first look at their intended meaning in the context, before he choose and translate it literally. Unfortunately, some translations of the meaning of the Quran are not free from literal translation of some idioms. The following example illustrates that:

<div dir="rtl">

فَضَرَبْنَا عَلَىٰٓ ءَاذَانِهِمْ فِى ٱلْكَهْفِ سِنِينَ عَدَدًا ﴿١١﴾

</div>

Yusuf Ali	Arberry
'Then We draw (a veil) over their ears, for a number of years, in the Cave, (so that they heard not)'	'Then we **smote their ears** many years in the cave'

Translations of verse (11) from Al Kahf Surah

Here as obvious, being literal in translation caused again a very bad translation. The idiom "فضربنا على ءاذانهم" translated literally by Arberry to "smote their ears." In fact, "this idiom means that God has sealed their ears so they do not hear anything while they were sleeping in the cave" (Abdul-Raof, 2001, p.31). Moreover, all of this misunderstand is because of the literal translation, and it make the reader picture a bad image on the Islam. But if we look at Ali translation we notes that he use an explanation to make the intended meaning clear, this help to understand the intended meaning very much better comparing with Arberry translation.

Another example is as follows:

<div dir="rtl">

فَرَجَعُوٓاْ إِلَىٰٓ أَنفُسِهِمْ فَقَالُوٓاْ إِنَّكُمْ أَنتُمُ ٱلظَّٰلِمُونَ ﴿٦٤﴾

</div>

Yusuf Ali	Arberry
'So they turned to themselves and said'	'So they returned one to another'

Translations of verse (64) from Al Anbiyaa' Surah

Here again, the adherence to the original, according to Mir (1989, p.12), has obscured the underlying meaning of the Quranic verbal idiom (رجع إلى نفسه) means "to engage in self-appraisal, to subject yourself to scrutiny" (cited in Hussein Abdul-Raof, 2001, p.31). Mir (1989, p.12) declare that the translation of the Quranic verbal idioms is too literal and does not bring out spirit of the idiom" (ibid).

4-3- At the level of style:

As we discussed above in the second chapter, style also has its convenient role in rendering the meaning even thou it comes as a secondary factor. Abdul-Raof (2001, p.181) argues, "The literal translation of the Quranic style in an attempt to optimize linguistic architectural charm produced ponderous and laboured style in English." Therefore, when a reader reads the Quran in English, he struggles to understand and follow the meaning because this style is heavy. This is clear in the following example:

هُوَ ٱلَّذِىٓ أَنزَلَ عَلَيْكَ ٱلْكِتَٰبَ مِنْهُ ءَايَٰتٌ مُّحْكَمَٰتٌ هُنَّ أُمُّ ٱلْكِتَٰبِ وَأُخَرُ مُتَشَٰبِهَٰتٌ ۖ فَأَمَّا

ٱلَّذِينَ فِى قُلُوبِهِمْ زَيْغٌ فَيَتَّبِعُونَ مَا تَشَٰبَهَ مِنْهُ ٱبْتِغَآءَ ٱلْفِتْنَةِ وَٱبْتِغَآءَ تَأْوِيلِهِۦ ۗ وَمَا يَعْلَمُ تَأْوِيلَهُۥٓ إِلَّا

ٱللَّهُ ۗ وَٱلرَّٰسِخُونَ فِى ٱلْعِلْمِ يَقُولُونَ ءَامَنَّا بِهِۦ كُلٌّ مِّنْ عِندِ رَبِّنَا ۗ وَمَا يَذَّكَّرُ إِلَّآ أُوْلُوا۟ ٱلْأَلْبَٰبِ ﴿٧﴾

Yusuf Ali	Arberry
He it is Who has sent down to thee the Book:	It is He who sent down upon thee the Book,

In it are verses basic or fundamental (of established meaning); they are the foundation of the Book: others are allegorical. But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings, but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah **and** those who are firmly grounded in knowledge say: "We believe in the Book; the whole of it is from our Lord:" and none will grasp the Message except men of understanding..	wherein are verses clear that are the Essence of the Book, and others ambiguous. As for those in whose hearts is swerving, they follow the ambiguous part, desiring dissension, and desiring its interpretation; and none knows its interpretation, save only God **and** those firmly rooted in knowledge say, 'We believe in it; all is from our Lord'; yet none remembers, but men possessed of minds

Translations of verse (7) from Ali 'Imran Surah

In this verse, Arberry tried to preserve the style of the original. In contrary, he produced a heavy style in an intention to give the reader the same impression of the original. The Quran meaning was not given clearly. Abdul-Raof (2001) said that the translator must break the first part of the verse (after 'God') then start a different sentence. The use of the conjunction 'and' after God to preserve the Arabic conjunction 'و', results an ambiguity and misunderstanding. Therefore, the reader understands that those who are firmly grounded in knowledge are alike with God in knowing the unseen. As a result, the meaning becomes that God and those rooted in knowledge are alike.

4-4- At the level of metaphor:

Arabic uses the metaphor more than any other language in the world. The use of metaphor is so special in a given text, and its meaning differs from language to language. The Holy Quran is full of this kind of expression, almost in every verse there is a metaphor. In following examples will see if the literal translation of the Quran metaphor helpful or it hinder the meaning:

وَلَا تَجْعَلْ يَدَكَ مَغْلُولَةً إِلَىٰ عُنُقِكَ وَلَا تَبْسُطْهَا كُلَّ ٱلْبَسْطِ فَتَقْعُدَ مَلُومًا مَّحْسُورًا ﴿٢٩﴾

Yusuf Ali	Arberry
Make not thy hand tied (like a niggard´s) to thy neck, nor stretch it forth to its utmost reach, so that thou become blameworthy and destitute.	And keep not thy hand chained to thy neck, or outspread it widespread altogether, or thou wilt sit reproached and denuded

Translations of verse (29) from Al Israa' Surah

Here, the literal translation of the metaphors of the verse actually gives no sense to the reader. Akbar (1978, p.2) said that this kind of rendering is "a hindrance to the full understanding of the Quran" (cited in Abdel Raof, 2001, p.27).

لَا تَمُدَّنَّ عَيْنَيْكَ إِلَىٰ مَا مَتَّعْنَا بِهِۦٓ أَزْوَٰجًا مِّنْهُمْ وَلَا تَحْزَنْ عَلَيْهِمْ وَٱخْفِضْ جَنَاحَكَ

لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ ﴿٨٨﴾

"And lower thy wing unto the believers" (Arberry Q15:88)

This is another proof that literal translation again failed to render the meaning of the metaphorical use of the expression (و اخفض جناحك للمؤمنين) which means to be modest and humble with other people.

5- Conclusion :

In this chapter, we tried all along the study to maintain for the idea of the vagueness of the Literal translation of the Holy Quran; we have given a vivid analysis to some verses translation that occurs to be translated literally. We have chosen two translations works, and we come with the conclusion that literal translation is invalid in all the cases and at all the levels.

Conclusion

It has been approved that Literal translation of the Holy Quran could not render the content; and it make the original text render none of its contained meaning to a target language. Translators agreed that what should be rendered to the audience is the meaning; they have agreed that only the meaning of the Quran can be translated into other languages. This survey attempt to make it clear that there is no acceptance for literal translation.

The first chapter attempt to give an overview of the history of sacred translation, mainly the Holy Quran. We saw that the attempt for translating the Quran was due to a lot reasons:

1) To face the corrupt translations that were produced which caused a very serious problems rendering an incomplete idea about the Quran in particular, and Islam in general.
2) Since the message of the Islam is universal, that made Muslim scholar try to produce such a good translation of the Quran for those who do not speak Arabic language.
3) Third reason was to make none Muslims understand at perfect the Islam.

Therefore, translation must be accurate as much as possible.

The Second chapter, attempts to proof that adherence to the original text would make very bad, inaccurate, and unreadable translation. The shortcomings that hinder the production of a readable text result from the incapability of the translators themselves and not from the inability of English to express the original. In addition, literal translation is not suitable when it comes to translating the sacred texts in general and to the Quran specifically.

We conclude that only the translation of meaning can be appropriate for Quran, also using the exegesis would be a great solution to face Holy Quran Translation difficulties.

References

- القرآن الكريم .

Ali, A. Y. (1983). The Holy Quran: text, translation and commentary. Brentwood, Md.:

    Amana Corp..

Arberry, A. J. (1996). *The Koran interpreted: a translation*. New York, N.Y.: Simon &

    Schuster.

Baker, M. (2001). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies* (3. ed.). London: Routledge.

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation; an essay in applied linguistics*.

    London: Oxford University Press.

Das, B. K. (2008). *Handbook of translation studies* (2nd. ed.). New Delhi: Atlantic

    Publishers & Distributors Ltd..

Dickins, J., Hervey, S. G., & Higgins, I. (2002). *Thinking Arabic translation: a course in

    translation method : Arabic to English*. London: Routledge.

Faiq, S. (2004). *Cultural encounters in translation from Arabic*. Clevedon, U.K.:

    Multilingual Matters.

Ghazala, H. (2008). *Translation as problems and solutions*. Beirute, Lebanon: Dar el-ilm

    lilmalayin.

Guillaume, A. (19901956). *Islam* (Rev. ed.). London, England: Penguin Books.

Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation an advanced resource book*. London:

    Routledge.

Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing translation studies: theories and applications* (2nd ed.).

    London: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.

Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation*. Clevedon [England]: Multilingual Matters.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating, by Eugene A. Nida.*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Raof, H. (2001). *Qur'an translation: discourse, texture and exegesis*. Richmond: Curzon.

Rose, M. G. (1981). *Translation spectrum essays in theory and practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel: aspects of language and translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tytler, A. F. (1978). *Essay on the principles of translation* (New ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Venuti, L. (2000). *The Translation studies reader*. London and Nework: Routledge.

Vinay, J., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English a methodology for translation*. Amsterdam [Netherlands: J. Benjamins Pub. Co..

Zainurrahman, Z. (2009). *The Theories of Translation*. Morocco: Translation Directory and Translation Journals.

Websites:

Mohammed, K. (n.d.). SPRING 2005 أ• VOLUME XII: NUMBER 2. *Assessing English Translations of the Qur'an*. Retrieved May 20, 2014, from

http://www.meforum.org/717/assessing-english-translations-of-the-quran

Sherif, M. A. (1994, January 1). jabore96. *jabore96*. Retrieved May 20, 2014, from

http://www.renaissance.com.pk/jabore96.html

ملخص المذكرة

الـترجمة الحـرفيـة للقرآن الكـريم

مشـاكل وحلول

مقدمة

أنزل القرآن الكريم على نبي الله محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم ليكون المعجزة الربانية التي ستبقى إلى يوم الدين ، أرسله الله تعالى إلى العالمين بدون استثناء ، و على الرغم من نزوله باللغة العربية ، لكن رسالته السمحة و النقية غطت كل الأمم و الثقافات. انتشار الاسلام و توسع محيط دولته اثار الكثير من الأسئلة حول كيفية ايصال معاني القرآن الكريم لتلك الأمم الحديثة العهد في الاسلام ، و تلك التي لا تتكلم اللغة العربية. كان الحل الأمثل هو اعتماد الترجمة إلى مختلف لغات الأمم ، فكانت بذلك الترجمة وسيلة فعالة لنشر الدين الإسلامي حول العالم. تنوعت ترجمة القرآن الكريم بين تلك التي اعتمدت حرفية النقل ، و تلك التي اختارت الحرية في الترجمة ، هذا التنوع في الترجمة بدوره أثار الكثير من التساؤلات حول قابلية ترجمة النص القرآني عموما و خاصة الحرفية منها. علماء الإسلام انقسموا بين من يرفض رفضا قاطعا ترجمة القرآن الكريم نظرا لقدسية نصه أولا ، و نظرا للخوف من ضياع معناه أو تحريفه ثانيا ، و هناك من يساند فكرة ترجمته لعديد الأسباب ، منها الهدف الأسمى لرسالة الإسلام ألا و هو عالميته. الترجمة الحرفية للقرآن الكريم باتفاق جميع العلماء تسبب الكثير من المشاكل لمعنى النص الأصلي ، و لو ألقينا نظرة على تلك الترجمات الحرفية و قارناها بالنص المصدر لوجدنا فرقا شاسعا بين الأصل و الهدف.

اختيار موضوع الترجمة الحرفية للقرآن الكريم تم في محاولة لكي نوضح مفهوم هذا النوع من الترجمة و تأثيره على المعنى الأصلي للقرآن الكريم ، و ذلك لجعل رسالة الاسلام مفهومة أكثر فأكثر ، و هذا ما يتأتى من الترجمة السليمة لمعاني الكتاب المحفوظ. حساسية النص الديني عموما و النص القرآني خاصة يطرح التساؤل حول حدود ترجمة هاته الأنواع من النصوص إلى لغات أخرى غير الأصلي. بالإضافة إلى كل هذا، اهتمت المذكرة بإظهار مدى أمانة هذا النوع من الترجمة للنص الأصلي و القارئ ، أيضا اهتمت باستخلاص

أخطاء هذه الترجمة فيما يخص النص القرآني و الأسباب المؤدية لمثل تلك الأخطاء الجسيمة، كما و أردنا

تحديد الأشخاص المؤهلين أو المخولين بالقيام بالترجمة على مثل هذا النوع من النصوص.

يتفق الكثير من المفكرين و الباحثين في مجال الترجمة على فكرة واحدة ألا و هي أن الترجمة الحرفية للقرآن

الكريم تخون النص القرآني ، سواء كان ذلك عن قصد أو عن غير قصد ، فهي تسبب في تشويه المعاني

الحقيقية للآيات ، كما و يقترحون الترجمة الديناميكية لنيدا كحل لترجمة أمثل لمثل هذا النوع من النصوص،

على النقيض من ذلك هناك فئة من المفكرين يدافعون على هذا النوع من الترجمة كخيار أمثل لتفادي ضياع

الولاء للنص الأصلي.

من خلال هذا و ذاك تم طرح عديد التساؤلات التي تبحث لها عن إجابة حول هذا الموضوع الحساس نذكر

منها :

- إلى أي مدى تتناسب عملية الترجمة الحرفية و القرآن الكريم ؟

- متى يجب على المترجم ترجمة القرآن الكريم ترجمة حرفية ؟

- هل من الممكن أن يستعمل المترجم خاصية التهميش أو التفسير أثناء ترجمة القرآن الكريم ؟

تبنت المذكرة هاهنا منهج وصفي نوعي أثناء القيام بعملية الدراسة و التحقيق، و هو ما يتناسب مع هذا النوع

من الترجمات، و الذي يكشف سلبياته و إيجابياته. حاول الباحث العمل بمعظم النظريات المتعلقة بالموضوع

و تطبيقها فعليا على ترجمتين للقرآن الكريم ، الأولى هي لمترجم و مفكر غير مسلم يدعى "Arberry" قام

بترجمة القرآن الكريم تحت مسمى "The Koran interpreted" و التي كانت من أوائل الترجمات ، والثانية

هي لعالم و مترجم مسلم يدعى محمد يوسف علي تحت مسمى " The Glorious Quran" ، و التي تعد

من أشهر الترجمات للقرآن الكريم و التي نجحت إلى حدى ما في نقل محتو النص القرآني على اعتبار أنه لا توجد ترجمة كاملة. حولنا القيام بعملية تحليل و مقارنة لبعض التناقضات و الأخطاء الواضحة بين النص الأصل و النص الهدف.

قسمت هذه الدراسة إلى قسمين أساسيين ، نظري و تطبيقي ، الجزء النظري يحتوي على فصلين ، الأول منهما يتحدث بصفة عامة حول مفهوم الترجمة و أهم المراحل التاريخية التي مرت خلالها مع التركيز على تاريخ ترجمة النصوص المقدسة عموما ، و على القرآن الكريم خصوصا. أما الفصل الثاني فخصص لدراسة الترجمة الحرفية عموما و إعطاء تعريفها و أنواعها، كما وتم التحدث في هذا الفصل عن الترجمة الحرفية للقرآن الكريم و رأي عامة علماء الإسلام فيها، مع ذكر تبعات هذا النوع من الترجمة على المعنى المقصود من الآيات. أما الجزء التطبيقي فيحتوي على فصل واحد فقط حاول فيه الباحث تحليل بعض الحالات في ترجمات كل من محمد يوسف علي و آربري و دراسة تأثيرها على معنى الآيات القرآنية.

ختاما لهذا العمل المتواضع حولت الخاتمة عرض اهم النتائج المتصل إليها مع الإجابة عليها فاتحين بذلك المجال لمزيد من الدراسات في هذا الموضوع الحساس جدا.

الفصل الأول:

مفهوم الترجمة:

اختلفت آراء المفكرين و الباحثين في تعريف الترجمة عموما، لكن يمكن تلخيصها بأنها التعبير عن ما قيل في اللغة المصدر و تحويل معناه إلى اللغة الهدف. عرفها بيتر نيو مارك بأنها إيصال معنى النص إلى لغة أخرى بنفس الطريقة التي قصدها كاتب النص الأصلي. عرفها مانداي بأنها تغيير نص في لغة منطوقة ما إلى نص في لغة منطوقة ما أخرى.

أنواع الترجمة :

كما هو موضح في الأعلى، غالبا ما نظر للترجمة بأنها تطبيق عملي يهدف إلى إيصال نص من لغة إلى أخرى، و بأنها تلك العملية التي تسعى لتحقيق التكافؤ بين اللغتين. من هذا المنطلق ، قام المفكرون بتقسيم الترجمة إلى عدة انواع و أقسام.

على الرغم من تعدد الدراسات حول انواع الترجمة و أنماطها ، فإن القليل منها أشارت إلى أنه كان للعرب السبق في تقسيم الترجمة ، و قد أقاموا تقسيمهم على أساس طريقة الترجمة ، منهجان في الترجمة كانا مشهورين عند العرب ألا و هما ، طريقة يوحنا ابن البطريق و طريقة حنين ابن اسحاق الجواهري ، الأول انتهج السعي وراء الالتصاق الشديد بالنص الأصلي و شكله و كلماته. ، و الثاني وراء المعنى.

في العصر الحديث تعددت تقسيمات الترجمة ، منها تلك الخاصة برومان جاكوبسون ، قسمها إلى ثلاث ، الترجمة في نفس اللغة و الترجمة من لغة (أ) إلى لغة (ب) و ترجمة الرموز.

نظرة عامة حول تاريخ الترجمة :

الناظر في تاريخ الترجمة يرى بأنها تمتد إلى أزمان غابرة ، منذ الأزل ظهرت الحاجة إلى الترجمة لضمان التواصل بين مختلف الشعوب ، أول أشكالها كان الشفوية و ذلك نظرا لعدم اكتشاف الكتابة بعد.

عند الغرب :

تاريخ الترجمة عند الغرب حافل بالأحداث ، ابتداءا من شيشرون إلى هوراس الذين يعتبران المدرسة القديمة للترجمة بتأسيسهما لمنهجي المعنى بالمعنى و الكلمة بالكلمة. يأتي خلفهم القس جيروم المشهور بترجمته للتوراة من اللغة الإغريقية إلى اللاتينية ، و قد كان من أوائل من دعوا إلى الفصل بين ترجمة النصوص الدينية و النصوص الأخرى. تزامن اختراع الطباعة مع انتقال و توسع موضوع الترجمة إلى ميادين أخرى غير الدين لتشمل السياسة و الحروب و الآداب. سجل العصر الحديث ظهور العديد من الوجوه في ميدان الترجمة نذكر منهم على سبيل المثال : كاتفورد ، يوجين نايدا ، اتيان دولي . . . الخ.

عند العرب :

كان لتجارة العرب عبر الزمان الأثر الكبير في بناء علاقات وطيدة مع مختلف شعوب العالم ، من الهند إلى الفرس إلى الرومان ، هاته الأشياء بدورها أدت إلى اختلاط الثقافات و اللغات ، مما أدى إلى ظهور الترجمة كوسيلة مهمة و أساسية في عملية التواصل. دخلت إلى العربية الكثير من الكلمات الجديدة ، و نفس الشيء بالنسبة إلى اللغات الأخرى و الثقافات. اعتنى العرب بالترجمة منذ البدايات الأولى للإسلام ، و ذلك واضح في رسائل رسول الرحمة إلى ملوك العالم آنذاك امثال الفرس و الرومان. الفتوحات الإسلامية في عهد الخلفاء الراشدين و غيرهم عززت من دور الترجمة و عجلت به ، و ذلك نظرا للعدد المتزايد للمسلمين الذين لا

يعرفون لغة القرآن الكريم. بلغت الترجمة ذروة نشاطها في عهد الدولة الأموية و الدولة العباسية ، ظهر حينها عدة مترجمين أشهرهم يوحنا ابن البطريق و حنين بن اسحاق الجواهري ، كما لا ننسى الأديب الكبير الملقب بالجاحظ والذي وضع الكثير من الشروط لمن يريد ان يصبح مترجما في كتابيه الحيوان و البيان و التبيان. شهدت حركة الترجمة بعد ذلك انحدارا شديدا في منحنى تطورها و ذلك راجع إلى الكثير من الأحداث التي أحاطت بدولة الإسلام.

تاريخ ترجمة النصوص المقدسة :

ترجمة النصوص المقدسة هي تقريبا موضوع هذه المذكرة ، لذا كان من المفيد ان نلقي و لو نظرة سريعة حول تاريخ ترجمة هذا النوع من النصوص و محاولة الإحاطة بجميع العوامل التي أحاطت بها عبر التاريخ. قسمنا هذه النقطة إلى اثنين ، أولا سنتكلم عن ترجمة الكتاب المقدس ألا و هو الإنجيل ، والثانية سنتحدث فيها حول تاريخ ترجمة كتابنا الإسلام ، القرآن الكريم.

مرت ترجمة الكتاب المقدس حسب نايدا بثلاث مراحل : الفترة الإغريقية-الرومانية(200 ق.م إلى 700ب.م) ، فترة الاصلاحات (القرن 16 إلى القرن 17) ، الفترة العصرية (19 ق إلى 20 ق). الفترة الأولى شهدت أولى ترجمات الانجيل او العهد القديم، تلاه ترجمة العهد الجديد إلى اللاتينية ، ترجمة القس جيروم كانت ذا اثر كبير في ما تلاها من ترجمات ، اعتمد فيها نقل المعنى بالمعنى. الفترة الثانية شهدت تعدد الترجمات و تنوعها إلى مختلف اللغات ، كما شهدت أول ترجمة للكتاب المقدس إلى اللغة الإنجليزية من طرف وليام تندال و التي كانت أساسا لكثير من الترجمات التي اتت بعده. الفترة الثالثة شهدت ازدهارا كبيرا في ترجمة الكتاب المقدس و ذلك راجع إلى الدراسات الجديدة الحاصلة في ميدان الترجمة و التي أدت إلى إعادة مراجعة الترجمات السابقة ، و اصدار ترجمات جديدة نتيجة لحملات التبشير في العالم الثالث.

ننتقل الآن إلى ترجمة كتاب الإسلام ، القرآن الكريم ، حيث بدأت ترجمته منذ عهد نبي الله محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم و ذلك بسبب الحاجة لنشر الدين الإسلامي إلى كافة الناس ، سلمان الفارسي هو من ترجم معاني سورة الفاتحة إلى الفرس. كانت أول ترجمة للقرآن إلى اللغات الأوروبية إلى اللغة اللاتينية عن طريق أبوت كلوني (1143). ترجمة القرآن شهدت الكثير من التحريف لمعانيه و أحيانا حتى تغيير ترتيب سور القرآن الكريم و ذلك بسبب الحملات المسعورة على الإسلام ، كما لا ننسى أن نذكر وجود ترجمات قيمة له.

جوانب من ترجمة القرآن الكريم :

عدم قابلية ترجمة القرآن :

الشيء الذي يجعل من القرآن خاصا جدا هو حقيقة أنه كلمة الله تعالى التي أنزلها على عبده و رسوله محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم إلى كافة الناس ، و هذا بحد ذاته يطرح تساؤل تعذر ترجمة القرآن الكريم ، بالإضافة إلى لغته العربية الفصحى التي أعجزت كل العرب ، تركيبه ، أسلوبه ، كلماته ، نصه ، كل هاته الأشياء تجعل من ترجمته ترجمة مثلى أمرا مستحيلا. لكن رسالة الإسلام عالمية و ليست خاصة بالعرب أو ممن تكلم العربية ، هذا أدى إلى الحاجة إلى ترجمته ، بل جعلها أمرا لازما لجعل رسالة القرآن قابلة للوصول إلى الوصول.

حكم ترجمة القرآن الكريم :

اختلف علماء الإسلام في مشروعية ترجمة القرآن الكريم من عدمها، و كل فريق لديه حججه و براهينه، فريق يمنع ترجمته و يصر على أن من أراد فهم القرآن أن يتعلم لغته، سبب ثان و هو الخوف من ضياع معانيه و تحريفها. لكن من جهة نظر أخرى هناك من يساند ترجمة القرآن الكريم بما أن الرسول صلى الله عليه و سلم

ارسل للعالمين و كذلك القرآن و معانيه ،من هذا المنطلق ظهرت الحاجة إلى ترجمته إلى مختلف لغات العالم ، هذا الأمر حدث منذ زمنه صلى اش عليه و سلم ، كذلك الذين خاضوا في ترجمة القرآن كان من أعداء الإسلام مما ادى إلى رسم صورة سيئة عن الإسلام و المسلمين ، هذا سبب ثان أدى بعلماء الإسلام إلى التحرك للحد من مثل هذه الممارسات ، و ذلك بوضع شروط صارمة لمن يريد أن يترجم كتاب اش ، كما ان الترجمة التفسيرية أي استعمال كتب التفسير في الترجمة صار أمرا ضروريا و أمرا لا مفر منه.

الفصل الثاني :

مفهوم الترجمة الحرفية :

تعرف الترجمة الحرفية بأنها محاولة المترجم خلق نص هدف يشبه إلى حد كبير النص الأصلي. سعيد شياب يقول بأن هذا النوع يركز كثيرا على تركيب النص الأصلي ، و يهمل الجانب البراغماتي و السياقي. بيتر نيو مارك عرفها بأن بنية النص الأصلي تنقل إلى أقرب مكافئ لها في اللغة الهدف ، لكن الكلمات مجددا تترجم مفردة و خارج السياق.

آراء حول الترجمة الحرفية :

تعددت الآراء حول الترجمة الحرفية ، فهناك من يناصر مثل هذا النوع من الترجمة ، و هناك من يرفضه رفضا قاطعا. احد هؤلاء الذين يناصرون فكرة الترجمة الحرفية هو بيتر نيو مارك الذي يدعي بأن الترجمة الحرفية هي الوسيلة الوحيدة للحفاظ على روح النص الأصلي. حسن غزالة أيضا ينظر إلى الترجمة الحرفية من جانب الحرفية للمعنى ، حيث أن المترجم حسب وجهة نظره يأخذ أيضا بعين الاعتبار جانب القواعد و النحو و الصرف و المجا في ترجمته.

المناهضون لهذا النوع من الترجمة عديدون نذكر منهم على سبيل المثال ، بداية من القس جيروم و مناصرته للمعنى قبل الشكل ، أيضا دريدن الذي يقول بأنه من المستحيل أن تجتمع الحرفية في النقل مع الكفاءة في المعنى في نفس الوقت. نايدا و تابر يقران بأن النقل الحرفي غير طبيعي و مضلل.

نتائج الترجمة الحرفية :

المشاكل التي تتسبب فيها الترجمة الحرفية كثيرة و عديدة ، لكن أهمها هو تحريف المعنى الأصلي للنص ، كما أنها لا تساعد من يظن أنها قدرة على خلق نفس تأثير النص الأصلي على أساس أن عملية الترجمة برمتها عملية تقريبية ، و لا يمكن لأي أحد أن ينتج ترجمة كاملة. فيناي و داربلنات يقولان بأنا ترجمة فاشلة لأنها إما تعطي معنى أخر أو لا تعطي أي معنى أساسا ، كما أنها مستحيلة لغويا على أساس أن الأنظمة اللغوية تختلف. سوف نتعرض في القادم إلى مجموعة من المشاكل التي تسببها الترجمة الحرفية على عدة مستويات :

- **الكلمة :**

تختلف اللغات في العالم في كل جزئية منها ، و بما أن الكلمات هي المكون الرئيسي لكل لغة فمعانيها تختلف باختلاف تلك اللغة أو تلك. الكلمة حسب بولينجر هي أصغر وحدة لغوية يمكن استعمالها لوحدها. معاني الكلمة يختلف من المعنى المعجمي إلى المعنى الدلالي ، كما أن معنى الكلمة خاضع بشكل أساسي للسياق الذي يوجد فيه ، فمعنى كلمة في نص قد يختلف عن نص أخر. من هنا يطرح التساؤل حول صحة ترجمة الكلمات خارج سياقها و إعتماد المعنى المعجمي فقط ، أو التركيز على ترتيب الكلمة في لغة (أ) على

غرار ترتيبها في لغة (ب). النقل الحرفي للكلمة يؤدي إلى ايذاء النظام اللغوي الخاص باللغة الهدف مهما

كانت تلك الترجمة ذات كفاءة.

- **العبارات الاصطلاحية :**

هي عبارة عن تعابير ثابتة معناها خاضع لعدة عوامل و جوانب تحد من قابلية فهمها إذا ما ترجمت إلى لغة

أخرى غير اللغة الأصل. المعنى مقيد بعوامل ثقافية تختلف من مجتمع لأخر على غرار الاختلافات اللغوية

بين الشعوب. هذا الشيء يحد كثيرا من عملية ترجمة التعابير الاصطلاحية فما بالك لو ترجمت ترجمة

حرفية.

- **الأسلوب:**

هل يمكن ان نفصل الأسلوب من المعنى ، الإجابة هي لا. المعنى المقدم في نص ما هو ما هو في حاجة ماسة

إلى الأسلوب لجعله يتضح أكثر. يمكن استخلاص المعنى بدون النظر إلى الأسلوب لكنه سيفتقد المعنى

الكامل في المقابل. يقول نايدا بأنه إذا قرر المترجم مقاربة أسلوب النص المصدر فإنه لا محالة سيضحي

كثيرا بالمعنى المقصود لذلك النص عند ترجمته إلى لغة أخرى.

- **التماسك :**

التماسك هو احد اهم العوامل أثناء بناء نص لغوي ذو معنى و يسعى إلى الكمال. و لكل لغة أدواتها التي

تخولها بناء نصوص متماسكة ذات معنى ، و إهمال هذا الشيء اثناء عملية الترجمة يؤدي بنا إلى انتاج

نص فارغ غير ذي معنى.

الفصل الثالث :

حاول الباحث من خلال هذا الفصل أن يتطرق إلى الترجمة الحرفية للقرآن الكريم من خلال تحليل ترجمتين لكتاب الله ترجمتا بواسطة كل من آربري (Arberry) و محمد يوسف علي معالجين بذلك حالات الترجمة الحرفية الموجودة.

الخاتمة :

تم اثبات أن الترجمة الحرفية لا يمكن أن تفي بالمطلوب منها عندما يتعلق بالنص القرآني و الذي هو موضوع دراستنا ، حيث لا تمكن النص الأصلي من إيصال محتوى معناه إلى اللغة الهدف. اتفق المترجمون بأن الذي يجب ترجمته و التركيز عليه هو نقل المعنى ، فالمعنى هو الشيء الوحيد الذي يمكن ترجمته بالنسبة للقرآن الكريم. حاولت هذه المذكرة أن تسلط الضوء على حقيقة أن الترجمة الحرفية غير مقبولة على الإطلاق.

الفصل الأول حاولنا فيه إلقاء نظرة سريعة على تاريخ الترجمة المقدسة و بالضبط القرآن الكريم، كما و استخلصنا بأن ترجمة القرآن الكريم كانت لعدة أسباب :

1–لمواجهة الترجمة الفاسدة أو الخاطئة و التي سببت الكثير من المشاكل ، و نقلت بذلك صور سيئة عن الإسلام و المسلمين.

2–بما أن الرسالة السماوية هي للناس أجمعين، فكان لزاما القيام بترجمة القرآن الكريم لأولئك الذين لا يتكلمون لغته.

3–لجعل الناس تفهم اكثر عن الإسلام.

الفصل الثاني حول اثبات فشل الترجمة الحرفية في نقل المعنى على العموم ، و أن الالتصاق الشديد بالنص الأصلي يؤدي إلى ترجمة سيئة و غير دقيقة و أيضا غير مقروءة. أيضا لا حظنا بأن النقص الذي يمنع من انتاج نص كفؤ قادر على نقل المعنى راجع أيضا إلى أن المترجمين في حد ذاتهم تنقصهم الكثير من الكفاءة على اعتبار ان النصوص الدينية من أصعب النصوص عندما يتعلق الأمر بترجمتها ، فعلى غرار ضرورة كفاء المترجم لغويا ، يجب عليه أيضا أن يفهم النص القرآني جيدا كي يستطيع في المقابل ترجمته. اللغة العربية صعبة المراس ، و كذلك لغة القرآن التي تعد أفصح العربية ، و هذا ما يجعل إعتماد الحرفية في ترجمته أمرا من المستحيل تحقيقه ، فقد اعجز أهل البلاغة و الفصاحة في زمانهم فما بالك بترجمته إلى لغة أخرى.

نختم قولنا بأن المعنى هو الشيء الوحيد القابل للنقل بالنسبة للقرآن الكريم ، كما نقترح ضرورة استخدام التفاسير أثناء عملية نقل المعنى .

Abstract

This study aims at revealing to which extent literal translation keeps the meaning of the original text of the Holy Quran, as well as the extent it works out with the sacred text. I tried, in fact, to answer how literal translation distorts the Holy book; comparing between two of the most common translations of the Quran, analysing the differences between the translation of Arberry (Christian) and translation of Yusuf Ali (Muslim). I arrived at the cultures and reasons that pushed to effect both translations, and the works of Muslims to enhance these translations since the message of Islam is universal and make non-Arabic speakers stand at the exact meaning of the original text.

Keywords: Holy Quran, Literal translation, Arberry, Yusuf Ali.

ملخص الدراسة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى كشف مدى محافظة الترجمة الحرفية على معاني نص القرآن الكريم ، بالإضافة إلى إيضاح مدى موافقة هذا النوع من الترجمة للنصوص المقدسة. حاولت من خلال هذا الجهد المتواضع إبراز التحريف الكبير لمعاني القرآن الكريم الناجم عن الترجمة الحرفية ، حيث قارنت بين اثنين من أشهر الترجمات الحرفية للقرآن الكريم مركزا على الاختلافات الواردة في كل من ترجمة آربري (مسيحي) و ترجمة علي يوسف (مسلم). و توصلت إلى أن اختلاف الثقافات و الدافع وراء ترجمة النص المقدس تؤثر و بشكل كبير على الترجمات الحرفية ، و مع هذا يعمل المترجمون المسلمون لتحسين الترجمات الحرفية لتحقيق رسالة الإسلام الشاملة و هذا لجعل غير الناطقين بالعربية يقفون عند المعنى الحقيقي الوارد في القرآن الكريم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القرآن الكريم ، الترجمة الحرفية ، آربري ، يوسف علي.