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AN ASSESSMENT OF ARBERRY’S TRANSLATION OF EMPHASIS IN QUR’ANIC DIALOGUE

Lama Edris*

Abstract: Studies on translations of the Qur’an into English are widely prominent. However, research on translating the emphasis in Qur’anic dialogue has not been given sufficient attention. This paper investigates the procedures followed by Arthur Arberry in translating emphasis in Qur’anic dialogue, considering the dialogue between God and His creation as an example. Arberry’s translation is selected because as a non-Muslim translator he is known to write without prejudice and is widely respected among academics. This main aim is to find to what extent Arberry’s procedures are successful in conveying the intended message of the emphasis used in the Qur’anic dialogue. To achieve this aim, different types of dialogue between God and His creation from Arberry’s translation are selected for analysis and compared with Taqīy al-dīn al-Hilali and Muḥsin Khan’s. The analysis not only relies on linguistic aspects, as have most of its predecessors, but also focuses on cultural aspects. Venuti’s “domestication” and “foreignisation” strategies are adopted as a theoretical framework in the analysis. This provides a more appropriate translation of emphasis in Qur’anic dialogue for religious and non-religious readers.
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INTRODUCTION

Translation is essential to understand foreign texts and builds bridges between cultures. The translation of the Qur’an into English has always had a number of difficulties due to the linguistic and cultural differences between the two languages: Arabic and English. However, certain techniques can be investigated to achieve the best possible translation of this holy text, the Qur’an, the Word of God, which is considered “the primary source of God’s revelation.”¹

Nida and Taber define translation as “reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style.”² Hatim and Mason think of translation as “an act of communication which

---

* Lama Edris is a doctoral researcher in Arabic, Islamic and translation studies at the University of Melbourne, researching the English translation of Qur’anic dialogue at cultural and linguistic levels. Lama holds an MA in literary translation from Al Baath University in Syria.

¹ Mehmet Ozalp, “What is this thing called Shari'ah?” (paper submitted to the Senate hearing on multiculturalism, Australian Parliament House, March 21, 2012).

attempts to relay, across cultural and linguistic boundaries, another act of communication.”

To examine translation from one language into another, two things should be considered: “to what extent the culture is in the text and to what extent the language is in culture.” The influence between translation and culture creates a problem for the translator, particularly if there are large cultural differences between the source text language (STL) and target text language (TTL).

Lawrence Venuti: Domestication and Foreignisation

According to the American theorist Lawrence Venuti, translation is “a process by which the chain of signifiers that constitutes the source-language text is replaced by a chain of signifiers in the target language which the translator provides on the strength of an interpretation.” In his book, The Translator’s Invisibility, Venuti concentrates mainly on two strategies: domestication which domesticates the STL to correspond with the cultural values of the TTL, and foreignisation which maintains the elements of the source culture making the translator visible, and making the reader realise they are reading a translation of the work from a foreign culture. Venuti refers to invisibility, one of the consequences of domestication, as a term used to:

describe the translator’s situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American culture. It refers to two mutually determining phenomena: one is an illusionistic effect of discourse, of the translator’s own manipulation of English; the other is the practice of reading and evaluating translations that have long prevailed in the United Kingdom and the United States, among other cultures, both English and foreign language.

These strategies (foreignisation and domestication) were first introduced by Schleiermacher, who states:

Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader toward him. Or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him. The two roads are so completely separate that the translator must follow one or the other as assiduously as possible, and any mixture of the two would produce a highly undesirable result, so much so that the fear might arise that author and reader would not meet at all.

For Schleiermacher, foreignisation indicates literalist or word for word translation. In contrast, domestication indicates “naturalising functionalism of ‘doing what the author would

---

7 Ibid. 1.
8 Schleiermacher’s strategies were introduced in his lecture “On the Different Methods of Translating” held at the Berlin Royal Academy of Sciences on June 24, 1823.
9 Cited in André Lefevere, Translation/history/culture: A Sourcebook (London: Routledge, 2002), 149.
have done if he had belonged to the target culture’ (more sense-for-sense).”¹⁰ Venuti, who adopts Schleiermacher’s strategies of domestication and foreignisation, claims the basic arrangement of the translation process begins with the STL, TTL, and their different linguistic and cultural items. In contrast, the conflicts emerging from the foreign writer, the translator, and the work come at the second level. Venuti also considers the source text and its translation as two separate components. Moreover, for him, the target text should be treated as the second part of the process; accordingly, it should receive the same balance as the source text.¹¹

Venuti reveals his tendency towards the foreignisation method. He focuses on keeping foreignness in the target language and culture and argues that foreignisation “entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language.”¹² For him, domestication, as a strategy, is “less an exchange of information than an appropriation of a foreign text for domestic purposes.”¹³ Some scholars criticise Venuti’s foreignisation approach, which aims to achieve “translations that can resist cultural dominance.”¹⁴ Venuti’s general goals are not criticised, but the chance of achieving them is considered to be remote. In addition, Venuti’s concepts are criticised as not defined in a strict way, and suitable and appropriate criteria for foreignisation are unfounded.¹⁵

Venuti’s translation strategies have been selected as criteria in this paper to assess Arberry’s translation of the Qur’anic dialogue between God and His creation. These strategies are selected in particular to help in defining the methods used by Arberry in his translation of Qur’anic dialogue. In other words, these strategies are adopted to discover whether it is more viable to domesticate the values of the STL to conform to those of the TTL or to retain some of the foreignness of the source text in the target text. Thus, the assessment in this paper will shed light on procedures followed by Arberry to see whether he moves towards the reader or brings the reader closer to the original text. The main aim behind this process is to reach a more viable translation that could reveal the intended meaning of the Qur’anic dialogue.

**Qur’anic Dialogue: Definition, Types and Aims**

Dialogue, “الْحَیْوَر” in the Arabic language, is derived from “الْحَثار”, which means “the return of the thing” and “to the thing.”¹⁶ It is a conversation between two or more sides, occurred mainly to either correct a speech or present an argument.¹⁷ The dialogue in the Qur’anic story differs from the literary one because it is a real dialogue that takes place between

---

¹⁵ Maria Tymoczko as cited in Myskja, Foreignisation and Resistance, 7.
real characters. It has its unique effect and delivers intended messages through Qur’anic stories.18

Dialogue has different manifestations, such as “argument” (al-Jidāl), “controversy” (al-muhājjah), debate (al-munāzarah) and talk (al-mukhāṭabah).19 however, all types are related to each other. That is, all these manifestations generally indicate conversations among participants.20 There are different types of Qur’anic dialogue, the most prominent of these are: the dialogue between God and His creations, prophets, angels, Satan and the People of the Scriptures; the dialogue between the prophets and their people; the dialogue between the believers and disbelievers; the dialogue among the believers; the dialogue among the disbelievers; and the dialogue to prove the Oneness of God.21 The primary aim behind the use of the dialogue in the Qur’an is to call to believe in God alone,22 offer guidance23 and teaching.24

Emphasis (al-Tawkīd)

Emphasis (al-tawkīd) is introduced in Arabic through different forms. The main types of emphasis used in Arabic grammar are “al-Tawkīd al-lafẓī” (literal emphasis) and “al-tawkīd al-ma'navī” (semantic emphasis).25 In Arabic semantics, sentences are divided mainly into two types. The first type is “al-insha” (literally meaning origination/performative), which is a sentence that cannot be proven as truth or falsehood because the action is initiated after uttering the speech, such as the command, the interrogative, the vocative, the prohibition and the optative styles. The second type is “al-khabar” (literally, information), which is a sentence that is possible to be proven true or false. In this type, the way in which the speaker introduces the information (al-khabar) to the addressee depends significantly on the context. In other words, the way of presenting the speech differs according to the addressee’s situation. If the addressee receives the information (al-khabar) without hesitation (this addressee has no foreknowledge of the information given), there is no need for the speaker to use any emphasis (tawkīd). This type of information is called “khabar ibtidā'ī.” However, if the addressee is uncertain about the truthfulness of the information, it is better for the speaker, in this case, to emphasise and

18 ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Khaṭīb, al-Qaṣaṣ al-Qur’ī nī fi Manṭūqatihi wa maṣḥūmihi [Qur’anic Stories in its
Operative and Concept] (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma’rifah, 1975), 124-129.
Different Methods] (paper presented at the Second International Arabic Language Conference, Dubai, May
8, 2013), 3-4.
20 Yayahū M. Ḥ. A. Zamzumū, al-Hiwār ’Adābihū wa Dawābiṭuḥū fī Da‘ā’ al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah [Dialogue:
its Methods and Regulations in the Light of the Book and the Sunnah] (Makkah: Dar al-Tariyibah wa al-
Qur’an], Al-Nur Academic Studies on Thought and Civilization 4, no. 4 (2011).
22 Muḥammad T. Ibn ’Āshūr, Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr: Tahrīr al-Māna’ al-Sadīd wa Tanwīr al- Ağil al-Jadīd
min tafsīr al-Kitāb al-Majūd [Editing and Enlightenment: Editing the Right Meaning and Enlightening the
Millennium of Ibn Mālik], vol. 3 (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr lil-ṭibā‘ah wa al-Naṣr wa al-Tawżī’, 1995), 293.
strengthen their speech in order to convince the addressee and this is known as “khabar ṭalabī.” Moreover, if the addressee completely denies or rejects the information, then it is better for the speaker to use one or more types of emphasis to convince the addressee. This is known as “khabar inkārī.” There are two purposes for use of this type of sentence (al-khabar). The primary purpose, “fā’idat al-khabar,” is related to the addressee’s knowledge of the information (when the addressee hears the information for the first time). The secondary purpose, “lāzim al-fā’idah,” is related to the speaker (when the speaker wants to show the addressee that they are aware of the information). Among the most prominent tools to emphasise the information (al-khabar) are the particles “inna” and “anna,” the letter “lām al-ibtidā’,” the oath “alqasam” and the repetition “al-tikrār.” When one of these particles is used, this offers emphasis without a need for repetition and at the same time shortens the sentence. In addition, if the particle “inna” is used and the particle “al-lām” is added to its “khabar,” these particles compensate for the triple repetition of the sentence.

Moreover, there is a deviation of speech from the three types of the information (al-khabar) mentioned above. This is when the speaker considers the addressee who knows some information as ignorant. This is due to the addressee who reveals some kind of ignorance. Introducing the information (al-khabar) carries many implications, which are revealed depending on the context. Some of these implied meanings are: exclamation, imperative, warning, glorifications, mercy, weakness, regret, praise, happiness and mockery.

**ASSESSMENT OF ARBERRY’S TRANSLATION OF EMPHASIS IN THE QUR’ANIC DIALOGUE BETWEEN GOD AND HIS CREATIONS**

This paper assesses the procedures used by Arberry in his translation of the emphasis in the Qur’anic dialogue between God and His creation. This analysis will be conducted at the cultural and linguistic levels, taking Venuti’s “domestication” and “foreignisation” strategies as a criterion. Venuti’s strategies are adopted due to the influential role of Venuti in the “cultural turn.” These strategies aid in defining the techniques used by Arberry in his translation of the emphasis. The main aim of such assessment is to discover whether it is more appropriate to domesticate the values of the STL to conform to those of the TTL, or to retain some of the foreignness of the source text in the target text. Accordingly, a more viable translation that

---

27 ‘Aabdu Allah al-‘Akbarī, al-Libāb fī ‘Ilal al-Binā’ wa al-‘I‘tāb [The Core of the Issues of al-Binā’(words which do not change the shape of their endings) and al-‘I‘tāb (the inflection)] (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Fikr, 1995), 166-205.
28 Muṣṭafá al-Ḥāshimī, Jawāhir al-Balāghah, 55-58.
29 “Cultural turn” is used in the discipline of translation studies to indicate the movement towards analysis from a cultural perspective; that is, “linguistic theories of translation have been sidelined and attention has centred on translation as cultural transfer and the interface of translation with other growing disciplines within cultural studies.” Cited in Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (London & New York: Routledge, 2001), 142.
reveals the intended meaning of the Qur’anic dialogue between God and His creation would be achieved.

The assessment is conducted on the emphasis used in the Qur’anic dialogue between God and His creation and presented with its equivalent from Arberry’s translation.\(^{30}\) al-Hilālī and Khān’s translation\(^{31}\) is also presented to provide a comparison between a non-Muslim translator from an English speaking background and Muslim translators from Arabic and non-Arabic speaking backgrounds. Arberry’s translation has been selected in particular because a translator has undertaken it without prejudice despite being non-religious. In addition, Arberry’s translation has a prominent status in the academic field. On the other hand, al-Hilālī and Khān’s translation has been selected due to its wide availability in English countries. Besides, it is written by translators from Islamic, Arabic and non-Arabic backgrounds, and has been authorised by the highest religious authority in Saudi Arabia.

The analysis will mainly cover Arberry’s translation of the emphasis in some selected dialogues between God and His creation. That is, the analysis will tackle the translation of emphasis in the dialogues: between God, the angels and Satan about the creation of Adam (Ādam); between God and Adam; between God and Noah, between God and Moses and between God and Jesus. Although there is an implicit meaning behind each dialogue in the Qur’an, it is difficult to cover all Qur’anic dialogues in this paper. The dialogues between God and His creation are chosen in particular for the analysis due to the prominent translation difficulties found in such dialogues (as will be seen in the discussion to be followed).

1. The Dialogue between God, the Angels and Satan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue</th>
<th>Arberry’s Translation</th>
<th>al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وَإِذْ قَالَ رَبُّكَ لِلْمَلَََلِّيهِنَّ إِنِّي جَاعِلُ فِي الْأَرْضِ خَلِيفَةً</td>
<td>30. And when thy Lord said to the angels, ‘I am setting in the earth a viceroy.’ They said, ‘What, wilt Thou set therein one who will do corruption there, and shed blood, while we proclaim Thy praise and call Thee Holy?’ He said, ‘Assuredly I know that you know not.’</td>
<td>30. And (remember) when your Lord said to the angels: “Verily, I am going to place (mankind) generations after generations on earth.” They said: &quot;Will You place therein those who will make mischief therein and shed blood, -- while we glorify You with praises and thanks (Exalted be You above all that they associate with You as partners) and sanctify You.&quot; He (God) said: &quot;I know that which you do not know.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This dialogue between God, the angels and Satan deals mainly with the creation of Adam, the first man on Earth. The creation of man is noted in several Qur’anic stories and is mostly introduced in dialogues between God the Creator and His angels. In these dialogues, God expresses His intention to create the first man. Moreover, the creation of the first man is connected with Satan’s defiance and consequently to Adam’s sin. This dialogue from Surah “al-Baqarah” (The Cow) was particularly selected because it includes the most prominent translation difficulties regarding emphasis in comparison with others. Here God addresses the angels, telling them that He is going to create a “khalīfah” (vicegerent), who will be His deputy on Earth. The angels ask God whether He will appoint someone who will cause disorder and shed blood on the earth while they are engaged in praising and sanctifying Him. God Exalted replies that He knows what the angels do not know. After this, God teaches Adam the names of all things, then asks the angels to tell Him these names, if they speak truly (believing that God would not create anything more knowledgeable or deserving than they are). The angels’ response is that God is “al-‘Alīm” (All-knowing) and “al-ḥakīm” (All-wise), and they know nothing but what He has taught them. God asks Adam to indicate these names to the Angels, and when Adam does so, God says: “Did I not tell you I know the unseen things of the heavens and earth?” In addition, He knows what the angels reveal (when they ask God if He will appoint a vicegerent “khalifah”) and what they hide (when they say God would not create anything more knowledgeable than them). Then God asks the angels to prostrate themselves before Adam (a bow of salutation). They all do so, except Satan, who refuses due to his arrogance and so becomes one of the disbelievers.

33 Ibid, 281.
34 Arberry, The Koran Interpreted, 2:33.
Arberry’s translation of this dialogue carries losses regarding emphasis. The particle “inna” in “‘innā jā‘ilun fī al-arḍī khaliṣfātān” is omitted in Arberry’s translation: “I am setting in the earth a viceroy.”36 Such omission leads to translation loss at the semantic level. The primary meaning of the ayah is revealed in Arberry’s translation, but the intended emphasis of the STL is not conveyed. In other words, the translation fails to indicate the emphasis intended by the STL “inna,” which is used in God’s speech to inform the angels that He is creating a man on earth.37 Therefore, it is recommended to compensate for the STL particle in the TTL by adding a word with a similar emphatic meaning, such as “indeed.” al-Hilālī and Khān’s translation is recommended since it saves the STL intended emphasis: “Verily, I am going to place (mankind) generations after generations on earth.”38

Another difficulty regarding emphasis appears in Arberry’s translation of “alam aqūl lakum innī a’lamu” as “Did I not tell you I know”, 39 The particle “inna” in this context is used as a reiteration of the preceding ayah, “‘innī a’lamu mā lā ta’lamūn” (Assuredly I know that you know not).40 This ayah is introduced to re-establish the meaning intended by the preceding one. This is to emphasis and elaborate further that God’s knowledge includes “al-ghaib” (the unseen) things of the heavens and earth and all things that the angels have revealed and hidden.41 al-Hilālī and Khān also neglect this emphasis when they render this Qur’anic passage as: “Did I not tell you that I know the Ghaib (unseen) in the heavens and the earth.” 42 To reveal the intended meaning of the STL emphasis, it is advisable to use an emphatic word. It is also recommended to use a loan word with a bracketed illustration, as achieved by al-Hilālī and Khān, to render the word “al-ghaib,” which is semantically complex and carries different shades of meaning: Did I not tell you (that) verily/indeed/ surely, I know al-ghaib (the unseen) in the heavens and the earth.

Arberry compensates for the particle “in” in “innaka anta al-‘alīmu al-hakīmu” when he renders it as “Surely Thou art the All-knowing, the All-wise.” 44 However, he fails to compensate for “damīr al-‘asf” (the separating pronoun); “anta” (you). “Damīr al-‘asf” is a clearly separate pronoun, used in Arabic grammar to distinguish the nominative predicate “al-khabar” from the adjective “al-sifāh” or appositive “al-badal.”45 In other words, this kind of pronoun is used to eliminate any confusion and to emphasise that any noun immediately following is a nominative predicate. It is also used to indicate “al-ḥasr” (restriction) and “al-takhṣīṣ” (specification). In this dialogue, “anta” (you) is preceded by a pronoun. So, “damīr

36 Arberry, The Koran Interpreted, 2:30.
39 Ibid, 2:30, 33.
40 Ibid, 2:30.
44 Arberry, The Koran Interpreted, 2:32.
45 ‘Aabbās Ḥasan, al-Nāhu al-Wāfī [Adequate Grammar], vol. 1 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Maʿārif, 2009), 244.
"al-faṣl" is generally not used for clarification. There is no confusion in this case since, in Arabic grammar, the pronoun is not followed by an adjective. Accordingly, “ḥamīr al-faṣl” is used in this context to emphasize the meaning of the preceding noun. This is achieved through “al-ḥaṣr” (the restriction mode). Moreover, this restriction is considered “qaṣr ḥaqīqī,” to restrict All-knowledge and All-wisdom to God alone. This is to confront the angels’ belief that they have knowledge and wisdom. This type of restriction can be also considered “qaṣr ḥaqīqī,” since it tends to limit All-knowledge and All-wisdom to God Exalted. Arberry’s translation could reveal the primary meaning of the STL, yet, it fails to save the STL style of restriction, which in turn affects the revelation of the STL’s intended meaning. In contrast, al-Hilālī and Khān have better revealed this STL stylistic feature when they render this passage as: “Verily, it is You, the All-Knower, the All-Wise.” To reveal more the intended meaning of such an emphatic STL tool, it is possible either to repeat the pronoun as follows: Verily, You (only You)/Verily You! You are the All-knowing, the All-wise, or add a word in brackets to indicate this specification: Verily, You (alone) are the All-knowing, the All-wise.

2. **The Dialogue between God and Prophets**

**The Dialogue between God and Adam (Ādam)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue</th>
<th>Arberry’s Translation</th>
<th>al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وَقَاسَمَهُمَا إِنِي لَكُمَا لَمِنَ النَّاصِحِينَ</td>
<td>21. And he swore to them, “Truly, I am for you a sincere adviser.” left align text; right align numbers</td>
<td>21. And he [Shaitān (Satan)] swore by God to them both (saying): “Verily, I am one of the sincere well-wishers for you both.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this dialogue between God Almighty and Adam from Surah “al-A’rāf” (The Heights), God asks Adam to dwell in the Garden with Eve (Ḥawwā’) and to eat from it wherever he and his wife will, but not to approach a particular tree lest they become evildoers. The Qur’an presents this dialogue in other surahs, such as Surah “al-Baqarah” (The Cow) and Surah “Ṭa Ḥā” (Ta-Ha), but these dialogues are indirect, since the participants are not communicating face to face. In contrast, this dialogue forms connections between participants, which makes it more viable to be assessed in this paper. The dialogue between God and Adam is the first dialogue between God and man, so it has unique characteristics, implicit meanings and sermons. God has used this dialogue as a warning to Adam and his wife, and as a reminder to
rid themselves of their negligence and be aware of their sin. It is used as a means of warning, reminding and teaching people.\footnote{Zaki al-Milād, al-Ḥiwrār fī al-Qur‘ān: Namādhij wa Mahādī [Dialogue in the Qur’an: Models and Principles] (Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: King Abdulaziz Center for National Dialogue, 2010), 28-29.}

In this ayah “wa-qāsamahumā innī lakūmā lamina al-nāṣiḥīn,” which Arberry renders as “And he swore to them, ‘Truly, I am for you a sincere adviser,’”\footnote{Arberry, The Koran Interpreted, 7:21.} there are three types of emphasis in Satan’s oath. This is because Satan feels that Adam and Eve do not believe him.\footnote{Ibn ‘Āshūr, Al-Tafsīr al-Ṭawīl, vol. 8, 60.} The three emphatic tools used in this Qur’ānic passage are: the particle “innā” which is followed by a nominal sentence, “al-jār wa al-majrūr” (the preposition and the genitive noun), “lakūmā” which is foregrounded, and the letter “lām al-muzahlaqah” (the “la” which is pushed away from its proper place).\footnote{‘Aabd al-Wāḥid Ṣāliḥ, al-I‘rāb al-Mufassal li-Kitāb Allah al-Murattal [The Detailed Parsing of the Recited Book of God], vol. 3 (Jordan, Amman: Dār al-Kīr līl-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 1993), 394.} Moreover, the verb “al-muqāsamah” (swearing) which is a derivative of “al-mufā’alah” is used to exaggerate the verb in order to express rhetorically Satan’s promise to Adam and Eve. That is, this verb reveals that Satan appears as an adviser to Adam and Eve when swearing to them both, and they, in turn, swear to accept his advice.\footnote{Maḥmūd ‘A. al-Zamakhsharī, Al-Kashshāf ‘an Ḥaqq ‘iq Ghwāmiḍ al-Tanzīl [The Detector of the Facts of the Mystery of the Revelation], vol. 2 (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1986), 95.}

Arberry compensates for some of the STL emphasis when rendering “innānī” as “Truly, I am,” and foregrounding the preposition and genitive noun in the TTL, “for you a sincere adviser.” However, he misses the emphasis in “lāmin al-nāṣiḥīn” when rendering it as “a sincere adviser.”\footnote{Arberry, The Koran Interpreted, 7:21.} Like Arberry, al-Hilālī and Khān could compensate for some of these emphatic tools, while missing others. They compensate for the emphasis in “one of the sincere well-wishers,” but background the preposition and genitive noun: “one of the sincere well-wishers for you both.”\footnote{Arberry, The Koran Interpreted, 7:21.} They follow the domestication strategy in their translation of this ayah. However, as Baker states: “Grammatical sequences are part of the abstract system of language. In context, grammaticality does not necessarily ensure acceptability or coherence...The acceptability, rather than grammaticality, of any of these sequences in a given context depends on how it fits into its surrounding textual environment.”\footnote{Baker, In Other Words, 124.} Accordingly, for the sake of authenticity and to reveal the intended purpose of the emphasis used in the STL, it is recommended to compensate for all emphasis used in the STL. The suggested translation would be: And he (Satan) swore (by God) to them both, “Truly, I am for you both one of the sincere advisers.” It is also advisable to insert the speakers’ name between two brackets after the pronouns to avoid any room of ambiguity in the TTL. It is also necessary to save the STL dual form by adding one of the TTL equivalents that indicates duality in the translation such as “both” (as achieved in the suggested translation above). This addition can more clearly reveal the intended meaning of the STL that Satan has whispered evil for Adam and his wife.\footnote{Tāntawi, al-Tafṣīr al-Wasīṭ, vol. 5, 257.}
The Dialogue between God and Noah (Nūḥ)

Table 3: Emphasis in the Dialogue between God and Noah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue</th>
<th>Arberry’s Translation</th>
<th>al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وَنَادَى نُوحٌ رَبَّهُ فَقَالَ رَبَّ مَنِّي مِنْ أَهْلِي</td>
<td>45. And Noah called unto his Lord, and said, “O my Lord, my son is of my family, and Thy promise is surely the truth. Thou art the justest of those that judge.”</td>
<td>45. And Nûh (Noah) called upon his Lord and said, “O my Lord! Verily, my son is of my family! And certainly, Your Promise is true, and You are the Most Just of the judges.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فَقَالَ يَا نُوحُ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ أَهْلِكَ إِنَّهُ عَمَلٌ غَيْرُ صَالِحٍ</td>
<td>46. Said He, “Noah, he is not of thy family; verily, his work is unrighteous, so ask not of Me that of which you have no knowledge! I admonish you, lest you be one of the ignorant.”</td>
<td>46. He said: “O Nûh (Noah)! Surely, he is not of your family; it is a deed not righteous. Do not ask of Me that whereof thou hast no knowledge. I admonish thee, lest thou shouldst be among the ignorant.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The story of Prophet Noah is presented in eleven surahs in the Qur’an. The dialogue above between God and Noah is chosen for analysis from Surah “Hūd” (Hud) because Noah’s story in this surah is “longer and more detailed than in any other surah.” More details present more concepts that might consequently lead to greater translation difficulties. Besides, the dialogue in some other surahs is one-sided (as in Surah Noah), whereas it is direct in Surah “Hūd” (Hud) with several participants. In this dialogue, Noah calls on God to save his son, as God has promised to save Noah and his family from the destruction brought upon the idolaters (the people of Noah). However, God informs Noah that (due to his evil conduct) his son is not of his household Whom He has promised to save. Moreover, God warns Noah not to ask about what he does not know, in order not to be among the ignorant. Accordingly, Noah asks God to forgive him for the sin he committed when asking Him that about which he has no knowledge. The dialogue ends with blessings from God to Noah and to some of the nations accompanying him in the ship. God also tells him about some people (descendants of the nations accompanying Noah in the ship), who will be given pleasure for a while, followed by a painful doom due to their disbelief. This dialogue clearly demonstrates how the messengers (such as Noah) “fully trust the truth revealed to them and see God’s victory as inevitable.”

In this dialogue, Arberry successfully compensates for the STL emphatic particle “inna” in “wa-inna wa’daka al-haqq” when he renders it as “and Thy promise is surely the truth.” Noah’s claim, “wa inna wa’daka al-haqq” (and Thy promise is surely the truth), is “khabar” (information) used to indicate “lāzim al-fāʿ idah,” related to the speaker (Noah), who already knows that God’s promise is assuredly true. However, he omits this particle, which comes
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before a nominal sentence in “Rabbī inna ibnī min ahlī,” which he renders as “O my Lord, my son is of my family.” This particle is used to emphasise Noah’s concern for his son. In contrast, al-Hilālī and Khān compensate for this particle in their translation using a TTL equivalent, that is “Verily”: “O my Lord! Verily, my son is of my family!” Arberry’s omission of “inna” affects the STL authenticity and fails to convey the STL intended emphatic meaning. The particle “inna” in “inna ibnī min ahlī” (my son is of my family) is used by Noah to emphasise “al-khabar” (the information), which indicates his interest in his son. In addition, there is an implication in Noah’s statement; that is, introducing his apology to God. This is because Noah asks God a question without knowing the degree of its acceptability. He asks God this question because Noah thinks there is reason to take mercy on his son (who is a member of his family). He is not ignorant of his son’s evil doing, but he seeks God’s intercession. To reveal the intended message behind such an emphatic tool, it would have been better to follow the外国化 strategy and save the STL emphatic tool in the translation, as achieved by al-Hilālī and Khān: “O my Lord! Verily, my son is of my family...”

Moreover, the statement “wa anta aḥkamu al-ḥākimīn,” which is rendered by Arberry as: “Thou art the justest of those that judge,” indicates Noah’s confession of God’s power. That is, nothing stands in the way of God’s judgement and decree. Noah’s asking regarding his son is considered to be a supplication to God and a request for something that can be achieved. In other words, Noah using just three statements as supplication is thought of as “taʿrīḍ” (innuendo) of the matter without mentioning it directly. This style is characterised by politeness and indicates the speaker’s hesitation to ask the question due to the addressee’s knowledge of the matter. It is as if Noah is saying: Should I ask You or not? Arberry compensates for some styles used in the STL; however, he fails to compensate for others. For example, Arberry is successful in compensating for the STL “taḍarru” (supplication) when he uses the superlative form in “Thou art the justest of those that judge.” Moreover, he saves the particle “inna” when adding “surely” in the following passage: “and Thy promise is surely the truth.” However, in “Rabbī inna ibnī min ahlī,” which Arberry renders as “O my Lord, my son is of my family,” he fails to compensate for the intended STL emphatic form.

God replays to Noah saying: “innahu laysa min ahlīka innahu ‘amalun ghayru ṣāliḥin” (he is not of thy family; it is a deed not righteous). His response reflects that Noah’s son does not belong to his religion and beliefs and that those who believe in one religion are recognised as relatives. God’s response aims to emphasise “al-khabar” (the information) in “innahu laysa
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“min ahlika” (he is not of thy family)\textsuperscript{79} due to its indication to strange information. Moreover, the use of “innahu ‘amalun ghayru ṣālihin” (it is a deed not righteous)\textsuperscript{80} illustrates the meaning and contains the emphatic particle “inna” to show interest. Thus, following the foreignisation strategy (literal translation) is recommended to reveal the meaning intended by the use of the ST emphasis. al-Hilālī and Khān preserve the STL emphasis in their translation: “O Nūh (Noah)l! Surely, he is not of your family; verily, his work is unrighteous…”\textsuperscript{81} Moreover, al-Hilālī and Khān follow the domestication strategy to clarify the pronominal referent, the subject of “inna,” as follows: “verily, his work is unrighteous.”\textsuperscript{82} Following such a strategy avoids any room for ambiguity regarding the pronominal referent, yet it leads to a semantic loss. The STL infinitive “‘amalun” (deed) is used to show intensity in describing the lack of righteousness of Noah’s son.\textsuperscript{83} In other words, Noah’s son is described as if he is the unrighteous deed, which connotatively means that his work is unrighteous. This sentence illustrates why God tells Noah that his son is not of his family.\textsuperscript{84} Following the foreignisation strategy when translating this statement, as achieved by Arberry, could preserve the intensity intended in the STL. However, Arberry’s translation fails to clarify the pronominal referent, so it is recommended to use the pronoun “he” instead of “it” for the sake of authenticity and to avoid any room of ambiguity in the TTL. A footnote is also recommended to clarify the STL intended message such as: “he is a deed not righteous” means “his work is unrighteous,” which is used to show intensity in describing Noah’s son’s lack of righteousness. The suggested translation would be: Verily, he is not of thy family; Indeed, he is a deed not righteous.

The Dialogue between God and Moses (Mūsā)

Table 4: Emphasis in The Dialogue between God and Moses (Mūsā)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue</th>
<th>Arberry’s Translation</th>
<th>al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>فَلَمَّا أَتاها نُودِيَ مِنْ شاطِئِ الْوادِ الَْْيْمَنِ فِي الْبُقْعَةِ الْمُبارَكَةِ مِنَ الشَّجَرَةِ أَنْ يا مُوسى إِنِي أَنَا اللَّهُ الْرَّحْمَٰنُ الْرَّحِيمُ (30)</td>
<td>30. When he came to it, a voice cried from the right of the watercourse, in the sacred hollow, coming from the tree: ‘Moses, I am God, the Lord of the Alameen (man, kind, jinns and all that exists)!’</td>
<td>30. So when he reached it (the fire), he was called from the right side of the valley, in the blessed place from the tree: &quot;O Moosa (Moses)! Verily! I am Allah, the Lord of the Alameen (man, kind, jinns and all that exists)!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This dialogue between God and Moses (Mūsā) indicates how God chose Moses to be His prophet, and to call Pharaoh and his people to worship God alone. Such a dialogue occurs in many surahs in the Qur’ān and the one which is chosen for assessment in this paper is from Surah “al-Qaṣaṣ” (The Stories). In this dialogue, Moses sees a fire while lost in the desert on
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\textsuperscript{83} Tantawi, al-Tafsīr al-Wasīṭ, vol. 7, 214.
\textsuperscript{84} Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Mafāṭīḥ al-Ghāib: al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr [Keys of the Unseen: the Great Interpretation], vol. 18 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1999), 357.
his return home (to Egypt). Seeing the fire, he comes to it and then Moses is called by God: “Moses, I am God, the Lord of all Being.”

85 God then presents Moses with two proofs: the turning of stick into a snake and the white hand. God asks Moses to throw down his stick and turns it into a huge snake. Then He asks Moses to press his hand into his side, so it becomes white without any evil. After showing these signs to Moses, God asks him to go to Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, and his people who have transgressed, to call them to worship God alone. Moses replies to God by saying he is afraid to return to Pharaoh and his people because Moses killed a man among them. He also asks God to appoint a helper for him, his brother Aaron, who claims to be more eloquent than him. Moses wants his brother with him to strengthen him in his task. He wants Aaron to confirm his calling as true because Moses is afraid Pharaoh and his people will belie him. God promises Moses to strengthen him with his brother and to give both of them power so Pharaoh and his followers will not harm them both. Besides, God tells Moses that he, his brother and their followers will be the victors.

86

The most prominent translation loss regarding emphasis can be clearly seen in Arberry’s translation of “an yā Mūsá innī anā Allau Rabbu al-‘ālamīna” as “Moses, I am God, the Lord of all Being.”

87 Arberry fails to compensate for the STL emphasis used in this statement. The omission of the particle “inna” does not indicate the emphasis intended in the STL to emphasise “al-khabar” (the information), which serves as proof, to remove any doubt about the source of the words that Moses has heard. That is, surely it is God who utters the words to Moses. al-Hilālī and Khān’s translation is recommended since it compensates for the STL emphatic form: “O Moosa (Moses)! Verily! I am Allah, the Lord of the Alameen (mankind, jinns and all that exists)!”. 88

Moreover, al-Hilālī and Khān’s translation successfully saves the vocative particle “yā” in “yā Mūsá” (O Moses), which is used to indicate an intended message. The vocative particle is used in this context to call and honour Moses. Moreover, God mentions the name of the addressee “Moses” to reflect His love and honour towards one beloved of “aṣḥiyyaʾihi al-mukhsalātin” (those who are only believe in God alone). al-Hilālī and Khān also successfully compensate for the cultural-specific term “al-ʿālamīna” when using a loan word followed by an explanation in brackets. This word “al-ʿālamīna” indicates various meanings that cannot be compensated for using a literal translation as done by Arberry when rendering it as: “the Lord of all Being,” “al-ʿAlamīn” is: “plural for ‘Alam, which encompasses everything in existence except Allah.”

89 al-Hilālī and Khān indicate the multiple meanings implied in this term when they use the loan word followed by an explanation in brackets.
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**The Dialogue between God and Jesus (‘Īsá)**

Table 5: Emphasis in the Dialogue between God and Jesus (‘Īsá)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue</th>
<th>Arberry’s Translation</th>
<th>al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| وَإِذْ قَالَ اللَّهُ يَا عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ أَأَنتَ قُلْتَ للَّهِ أَنِّي أَنْتَ قُلْتُ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمِيَّةَ إِلََٰهَيْنِ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهَ قَالَ سُبْحَانَكَ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أَقُولَ مَا لَيْسَ لِي بِحَق ٍ إِن كُنتُ قُلْتُهُ فَقَدْ عَلِمْتَهُ تَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِي وَلََ أَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِكَ إِنَّكَ أَنتَ عَلََّمُ الْغُيُوبِ | 116. And when God said, 'O Jesus son of Mary, didst thou say unto men, "Take me and my mother as gods, apart from God"?' He said, 'To Thee be glory! It is not mine to say what I have no right to. If I indeed said it, Thou knowest it, knowing what is within my soul, and I know not what is within Thy soul; Thou knowest the things unseen.' | 116. And (remember) when Allah will say (on the Day of Resurrection): "O Iesah (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary)! Did you say unto men: Worship me and my mother as two gods besides Allah? " He will say: "Glory be to You! It was not for me to say what I had no right to say. Had I said such a thing, You would surely have known it. You know what is in my inner self though I do not know what is in Yours, truly, You, only You, are the All-Knower of all that is hidden and unseen.

| ما قُلْتُ لِهُمْ إِلَّا مَا أَمَرْتُنِي بِهِ أَنِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ وَكُنتُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مَّا دُمْتُ فِيهِمْ فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنتَ أَنتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَنتَ عَلَىَٰ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ | 117. I only said to them what Thou didst command me: "Serve God, my Lord and your Lord." And I was a witness over them, while I remained among them; but when Thou didst take me to Thyself, Thou wast Thyself the watcher over them; Thou Thyself art witness of everything. | 117. "Never did I say to them aught except what You (Allah) did command me to say: Worship Allah, my Lord and you Lord. And I was a witness over them while I dwelt amongst them, but when You took me up, You were the Watcher over them, and You are a Witness to all things. (This is a great admonition and warning to the Christians of the whole world). |

This dialogue between God and Jesus (‘Īsá) appears in Surah “al-Mā‘idah” (The Table). It is the only dialogue that runs directly between God and Jesus in the Qur’an. The dialogue deals with the claim of divinity. God asks Jesus if he asks his people to take his mother and he as gods apart from God. Jesus answers by glorifying God and then denying such a claim: “To Thee be glory! It is not mine to say what I have no right to. If I indeed said it, Thou knowest it, knowing what is within my soul, and I know not what is within Thy soul; Thou knowest the things unseen.”93 He wants to ask for God’s support as witness to his innocence as being just a servant to God. After that Jesus states to God what he said to his people which is not but calling them to worship God alone: “I only said to them what Thou didst command me: ‘Serve God, my Lord and your Lord. ’ And I was a witness over them, while I remained among them; but when Thou didst take me to Thyself, Thou wast Thyself the watcher over them; Thou Thyself art witness of everything.”94 Jesus at the end mentions his irresponsibility for what his people will do after him.95 God comments on Jesus’ response by saying: “This is the day the truthful shall be profitèd by their truthfulness. For them await gardens underneath which rivers flow, therein dwelling forever and ever; God being well-pleased with them and they well-pleased

94 Ibid, 5:117.
with Him; that is the mighty triumph.” That is, on the judgement day, the truth will be of great profit for those who are truthful. Moreover, God will be pleased with the truthful and they will be pleased with Him, the result of which will be the mighty success. The “final note” of this Qur’anic dialogue states the kingdom of the heavens and earth and all that is in them belongs to God alone who has power over everything.

Arberry’s translation of “wa-idh qāla Allahu yā ‘Īsā ibna Maryam a’anta qulta li-alnāsi ittakhidhūnī wa-ummiya ilāhayni min dāni Allahi qāla subhānaka mā yakumu lī an aqīla mā laysa lī bi-ḥaqqīn in kuntu qultuhu faqad ‘alimtahu ta’lamu mā fī nafsī wa-lā a’lamu mā fī nafsika innaka anta ‘allāmu al-ghuyūbi” as “And when God said, ‘O Jesus son of Mary, didst thou say unto men, “Take me and my mother as gods, apart from God?’ Thou knowest it, knowing what is within my soul, and I know not what is within Thy soul; Thou knowest the things unseen.”” carries a translation difficulty regarding the emphasis. There is difficulty in his translation of the emphatic form in “innaka anta ‘allāmu al-ghuyūbi” (Thou knowest the things unseen.”) Jesus saying “in kuntu qultuhu faqad ‘alimtahu ta’lamu mā fī nafsī wa-lā a’lamu mā fī nafsika innaka anta ‘allāmu al-ghuyūbi” (If I indeed said it, Thou knowest it, knowing what is within my soul, and I know not what is within Thy soul; Thou knowest the things unseen) is used to emphasise his answer to God, that he does not say to his people “ittakhidhūnī wa-ummiya ilāhayni min dāni Allahi” (Take me and my mother as gods, apart from God?). Jesus follows the style of “mushākalah” (affinity; repeating the same word to indicate different meanings) in his replay to God, which is considered a rhetorical device that indicates eloquence. In other words, Jesus’ replay to God is considered a justification; that is, if he says this, God indeed will know it because God alone is All Knower of all the unseen. Al-Hilālī and Khān’s translation is recommended since it reveals the intended emphasis of the original. They successfully compensate for the emphasis in “innaka anta ‘allāmu al-ghuyūbi,” which they render as: “truly, You, only You, are the All Knower of all that is hidden and unseen.” The particle “inna” indicates “al-τα’līl” (justification) and “damūr al-ṣafṣaf” (separating pronoun), “‘anta” indicates “al-ḥaṣr” (the restriction). On the other hand, Arberry’s translation successfully compensates for the STL emphatic tool “damūr al-ṣafṣaf” (separating pronoun), “‘anta” in: “flammā tawaffaytani kunt anta al-Raqība ‘alayhim wa-anta ‘lā kulli shay’in shahīdun,” which is rendered as “but when Thou didst take me to Thyself, Thou wast Thyself the watcher over them; Thou Thyself art witness of
everything).”¹⁰⁷ “Ḍamīr al-faṣl” (separating pronoun), “‘anta” is used in “Kunt anta al-Raqība ‘alayhim” (Thou wast Thyself the watcher over them)¹⁰⁸ to indicate “al-ḥāṣr” (the restriction), which means, it is You (God), only You, are “al-Raqīb” (the Watcher) over them (Jesus’ people), and it is not me (Jesus). Moreover, the statement “wa-anta ‘lā kulli shay’in shahīdun” (Thou Thyself art witness of everything)¹⁰⁹ is used as “tadhyyil” (additional clause),¹¹⁰ which means a succession of two clauses in which the second indicates the meaning of the first for the sake of emphasis.¹¹¹ In contrast, al-Hilālī and Khān’s translation fails to compensate for the emphasis intended by the STL: “but when You took me up, You were the Watcher over them, and You are a Witness to all things. (This is a great admonition and warning to the Christians of the whole world)”.¹¹² Moreover, their using of a long-bracketed strategy to illustrate the meaning of this ayah interrupts the natural flow of the translation. Accordingly, Arberry’s translation is recommended in this context.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of Arberry’s translation of the emphasis in the Qur’anic dialogue between God and His creation compared by al-Hilālī and Khān has addressed to discover the procedures used by Arberry to translate the emphasis in Qur’anic dialogue. It is also conducted to see to what extent these procedures are successful in conveying the intended message of the emphasis from linguistic and cultural perspectives. The assessment process investigates Arberry’s translation of the emphasis in the selected Qur’anic dialogue at cultural and linguistic levels. Venuti’s strategies of “domestication” and “foreignisation” are taken as a standard for the analysis of the selected Qur’anic dialogues. The primary aim is to achieve a better translation of the emphasis in the Qur’anic dialogue that can reproduce the intended meaning for English-speaking readers from a religious and non-religious background. The dialogues chosen for analysis are those between God and His creation. Some of the main findings drawn from this paper analysis are:

1. Arberry, as well as al-Hilālī and Khān, have done an outstanding effort when rendering the Qur’an into English, the matter that helps the English-speaking readers (religious and non-religious) to understand the meaning of the Qur’an.
2. Most of the difficulties in Arberry’s translation of the emphasis are attributed to his non-Arabic background, lack of resources (references of exegeses) and lack of compensation strategy (footnotes or endnotes).
3. It is found that linguistic losses in regard to the emphasis have mainly contributed to semantic, religious and cultural losses.

¹⁰⁷ Arberry, The Koran Interpreted, 5:117.
¹⁰⁸ Ibid.
¹⁰⁹ Ibid.
¹¹⁰ Ibn ‘Āshūr, Al-Tahārīr wa al-Tanwīr, vol. 7, 117.
4. Losses in translating emphasis can be reduced through following more appropriate translation strategies, which can be more authentic and reveal the STL intended meaning in the translation.

5. It is noticed that following the foreignisation strategy would reduce the translation loss of the emphasis discussed in this paper.

6. Most of the difficulties in Arberry’s translation of the emphasis are attributed to his omission to many of the STL emphatic forms. Such omissions affect not only authenticity to the text but also the intended meaning.

7. It is recommended that “emphasis,” which always carries an implied purpose, should be compensated for in the translation using one of the TTL equivalents for the sake of authenticity and to reveal the intended meaning.
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