



Australian Journal of Islamic Studies

<https://ajis.com.au>

ISSN (online): 2207-4414  
Centre for Islamic Studies and Civilisation  
Charles Sturt University CRICOS 00005F  
Islamic Sciences and Research Academy of Australia

## An Assessment of Arberry's Translation of Emphasis in Qur'anic Dialogue

Lama Edris

To cite this article:

Edris, Lama. "An Assessment of Arberry's Translation of Emphasis in Qur'anic Dialogue." *Australian Journal of Islamic Studies* 4, no. 1 (2019): 33-53.



Published online: 18 July 2019



[Submit](#) your article to this journal



[View](#) related and/or other articles in this issue

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at  
<https://ajis.com.au/index.php/ajis/tncs>

## 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 Taqiyy 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.

**Keywords:** *emphasis, Holy Qur'an, dialogue, translation*

### 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."<sup>1</sup>

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."<sup>2</sup> 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.

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

<sup>2</sup> Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 12.

attempts to relay, across cultural and linguistic boundaries, another act of communication.”<sup>3</sup> 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.”<sup>4</sup> 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).<sup>5</sup>

### ***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.”<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

These strategies (foreignisation and domestication) were first introduced by Schleiermacher,<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

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

---

<sup>3</sup> Basil Hatim and Ian Mason, *The Translator as Communicator* (London: Routledge, 1997), 1.

<sup>4</sup> Monireh Akbari, “The Role of Culture in Translation,” *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies* 3, no. 8 (2013): 13.

<sup>5</sup> Lei Yanbo, *Metaphors in Chinese Literary Translation – A Case Study of Fortress Besieged* (Macau: University of Macau, 2011), 7.

<sup>6</sup> Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London & New York: Routledge, 1995), 17.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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)."<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

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."<sup>12</sup> For him, domestication, as a strategy, is "less an exchange of information than an appropriation of a foreign text for domestic purposes."<sup>13</sup> Some scholars criticise Venuti's foreignisation approach, which aims to achieve "translations that can resist cultural dominance."<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

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, "*al-ḥiwār*" in the Arabic language, is derived from "*al-ḥawr*", which means "the return of the thing" and "to the thing."<sup>16</sup> It is a conversation between two or more sides, occurred mainly to either correct a speech or present an argument.<sup>17</sup> The dialogue in the Qur'anic story differs from the literary one because it is a real dialogue that takes place between

<sup>10</sup> Anthony Pym, "Schleiermacher and the Problem of Blending." *Translation and Literature* 4, no. 1 (1995): 5.

<sup>11</sup> Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 18.

<sup>12</sup> Lawrence Venuti, "The American Tradition," In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, eds. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (London & New York: Routledge, 1997), 242.

<sup>13</sup> Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 22.

<sup>14</sup> Kjetil Myskja, Foreignisation and Resistance: Lawrence Venuti and his Critics. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12, no. 2 (2013): 1.

<sup>15</sup> Maria Tymoczko as cited in Myskja, Foreignisation and Resistance, 7.

<sup>16</sup> Edward William Lane, "Ḥawr," in *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1863), 217.

<sup>17</sup> Ṣāliḥ 'A. Ḥamīd, *'Uṣūl al-Ḥiwār wa 'Ādabihī fī al-Islām* [Rules and Regulations of Dialogue in Islam] (Makkah, Jeddah: Dar al-Manārah, 1994), 7.

real characters. It has its unique effect and delivers intended messages through Qur'anic stories.<sup>18</sup>

Dialogue has different manifestations, such as “argument” (*al-Jidāl*), “controversy” (*al-muḥājjah*), debate (*al-munāzarah*) and talk (*al-mukhāṭabah*);<sup>19</sup> however, all types are related to each other. That is, all these manifestations generally indicate conversations among participants.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> The primary aim behind the use of the dialogue in the Qur'an is to call to believe in God alone,<sup>22</sup> offer guidance<sup>23</sup> and teaching.<sup>24</sup>

### **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-laḥẓī*” (literal emphasis) and “*al-tawkīd al-ma'nawī*” (semantic emphasis).<sup>25</sup> 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'i*.” However, if the addressee is uncertain about the truthfulness of the information, it is better for the speaker, in this case, to emphasise and

<sup>18</sup> 'Abd al-Karīm al-Khaṭīb, *al-Qaṣaṣ al-Qur'ānī fī Maṭṭūqihī wa Maḥūmihī* [Qur'anic Stories in its Operative and Concept] (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma'rifaḥ, 1975), 124-129.

<sup>19</sup> Sanā' M. 'A al-Thaqafī, “al-Ḥiwār fī al-Qur'ān wa Tanaww' Asālibih” [Dialogue in the Qur'an and its Different Methods] (paper presented at the Second International Arabic Language Conference, Dubai, May 8, 2013), 3-4.

<sup>20</sup> Yahyá M. Ḥ. A. Zamzamī, *al-Ḥiwār 'Ādābuhū wa Ḍawābiḥuhū fī Ḍaū' al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah* [Dialogue: its Methods and Regulations in the Light of the Book and the Sunnah] (Makkah: Dar al-Tarbiyah wa al-Turāth, 1994), 24-28.

<sup>21</sup> Ishāq Raḥmanī, “Dirasat 'Uslūb al-Ḥiwār fī al-Qur'ān” [The Study of the Style of Dialogue in the Holy Qur'an], *Al-Nur Academic Studies on Thought and Civilization* 4, no. 4 (2011).

<sup>22</sup> Muḥammad Ṭ. Ibn 'Āshūr, *Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr: Tahrīr al-Ma'na al-Sadīd wa Tanwīr al-Aqil al-Jadīd min tafsīr al-Kitāb al-Majīd* [Editing and Enlightenment: Editing the Right Meaning and Enlightening the New Mind from the Interpretation of the Great Book], vol. 12 (Tunisia: al-Dar al-Tūnisīyah lil-Nashir, 1984), 44-107.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, vol. 16, 111-122.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, vol. 15, 370.

<sup>25</sup> Jamāl al-Dīn Ibn-Hishām, *'Awḍaḥ al-Masalik 'Ilā 'Alfīyat 'Ibn Mālik* [The Clearest Way to the Millennium of 'Ibn Mālik], vol. 3 (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr lil-ṭibā'ah wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī', 1995), 293.

strengthen their speech in order to convince the addressee and this is known as “*khābar 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 “*khābar inkārī*.” There are two purposes for use of this type of sentence (*al-khābar*). The primary purpose, “*fā'idat al-khābar*,” 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-khābar*) are the particles “*inna*” and “*anna*,” the letter “*lām al-ibtidā'*,” the oath “*al-qasam*” and the repetition “*al-tikrār*.”<sup>26</sup> 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 “*khābar*,” these particles compensate for the triple repetition of the sentence.<sup>27</sup>

Moreover, there is a deviation of speech from the three types of the information (*al-khābar*) 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-khābar*) 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.<sup>28</sup>

## 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.”<sup>29</sup> 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

<sup>26</sup> Muṣṭafā al-Hāshimī, *Jawāhir al-Balāghah fī al-Ma‘ānī wa al-Bayān wa al-Badī‘* [The Jewels of Rhetoric in the Science of the Meanings, Eloquence and Rhetorical Figures] (Beirut, Lebanon al-Maktabah al-‘Aṣrīyah, 1999), 55-58.

<sup>27</sup> ‘Aabdu Allah al-‘Akbarī, *al-Libāb fī ‘Ilal al-Binā’ wa al-‘I‘rāb* [The Core of the Issues of al-Binā’ (words which do not change the shape of their endings) and al-‘I‘rāb (the inflection)] (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Fikr, 1995), 166-205.

<sup>28</sup> Muṣṭafā al-Hāshimī, *Jawāhir al-Balāghah*, 55-58.

<sup>29</sup> “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.<sup>30</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān's translation<sup>31</sup> 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 1: Emphasis in the Dialogue between God, the Angels and Satan about the Creation of Adam (*Ādam*)**

Arabic Qur'anic Dialogue	Arberry's Translation	al-Hilālī and Khān's Translation
وإِذْ قَالَ رَبُّكَ لِلْمَلَائِكَةِ إِنِّي جَاعِلٌ فِي الْأَرْضِ خَلِيفَةً قَالُوا أَتَجْعَلُ فِيهَا مَنْ يُفْسِدُ فِيهَا وَيَسْفِكُ الدِّمَاءَ وَنَحْنُ نُسَبِّحُ بِحَمْدِكَ وَنُقَدِّسُ لَكَ قَالَ (30) إِنِّي أَعْلَمُ مَا لَا تَعْلَمُونَ	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.'	30. And (remember) when your Lord said to the angels: "Verily, I am going to place (mankind) generations after generations on earth." They said: "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." He (God) said: "I know that which you do not know."

<sup>30</sup> Arthur J. Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964).

<sup>31</sup> Taqiyy al-dīn al-Hilālī and Muḥsin Khān, *The Noble Quran: English Translation of the Meanings and Commentary* (Saudi Arabia, al-Madinah al-Munawwarah: King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holy Qur'an, 1996).

Arabic Qur'anic Dialogue	Arberry's Translation	al-Hilālī and Khān's Translation
وَعَلَّمَ آدَمَ الْأَسْمَاءَ كُلَّهَا ثُمَّ عَرَضَهُمْ عَلَى الْمَلَائِكَةِ فَقَالَ أَنْبِئُونِي بِأَسْمَاءِ هَؤُلَاءِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ (31)	31. And He taught Adam the names, all of them; then He presented them unto the angels and said, 'Now tell Me the names of these, if you speak truly.'	31. And He taught Adam all the names (of everything), then He showed them to the angels and said, "Tell Me the names of these if you are truthful."
قَالُوا سُبْحَانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَلِيمُ الْحَكِيمُ (32)	32. They said, 'Glory be to Thee! We know not save what Thou hast taught us. Surely Thou art the All-knowing, the All-wise.'	32. They (angels) said: "Glory be to You, we have no knowledge except what you have taught us. Verily, it is You, the All-Knower, the All-Wise."
قَالَ يَا آدَمُ أَنْبِئْهُمْ بِأَسْمَائِهِمْ فَلَمَّا أَنْبَأَهُمْ بِأَسْمَائِهِمْ قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ لَكُمْ إِنِّي أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبِ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَأَعْلَمُ مَا تُبْدُونَ وَمَا كُنْتُمْ تُكْتُمُونَ (33)	33. He said, 'Adam, tell them their names.' And when he had told them their names He said, 'Did I not tell you I know the unseen things of the heavens and earth? And I know what things you reveal, and what you were hiding.'	33. He said: "O Adam! Inform them of their names," and when he had informed them of their names, He said: "Did I not tell you that I know the Ghaib (unseen) in the heavens and the earth, and I know what you reveal and what you have been concealing?"

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.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, the creation of the first man is connected with Satan's defiance and consequently to Adam's sin.<sup>33</sup> 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?"<sup>34</sup> In addition, He knows what the angels reveal (when they ask God if He will appoint a vicegerent "khalīfah") 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.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Mlada Mikulicová, "Adam's Story in the Qur'an," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Theologica* 4, no. 2 (2014), 279.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, 281.

<sup>34</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 2:33.

<sup>35</sup> Jalal al-Din al-Mahalli and Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti, *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn* [The Interpretation of the Two Jalal], trans. Feras Hamza (Jordan, Amman: Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought, 2007), 7-8.

Arberry's translation of this dialogue carries losses regarding emphasis. The particle "inna" in "innī jā 'ilun fī al-arḍi khalīfatan" is omitted in Arberry's translation: "I am setting in the earth a viceroy."<sup>36</sup> 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.<sup>37</sup> 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."<sup>38</sup>

Another difficulty regarding emphasis appears in Arberry's translation of "alam aqul lakum innī a 'lamu" as "Did I not tell you I know".<sup>39</sup> 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).<sup>40</sup> This *ayah* is introduced to re-establish the meaning intended by the preceding one. This is to emphasise and elaborate further that God's knowledge includes "al-ghaīb" (the unseen things) of the heavens and earth and all things that the angels have revealed and hidden.<sup>41</sup> 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."<sup>42</sup> 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-ghaīb," which is semantically complex<sup>43</sup> and carries different shades of meaning: Did I not tell you (that) verily/indeed/ surely, I know al-ghaīb (the unseen) in the heavens and the earth.

Arberry compensates for the particle "inn" in "innaka anta al- 'alīmu al-ḥakīmu" when he renders it as "Surely Thou art the All-knowing, the All-wise."<sup>44</sup> However, he fails to compensate for "ḍamīr al-faṣl" (the separating pronoun); "anta" (you). "Ḍamīr al-faṣl" is a clearly separate pronoun, used in Arabic grammar to distinguish the nominative predicate "al-khabar" from the adjective "al-ṣifah" or appositive "al-badal."<sup>45</sup> 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-ḥaṣr" (restriction) and "al-takhṣīṣ" (specification). In this dialogue, "anta" (you) is preceded by a pronoun. So, "ḍamīr

<sup>36</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 2:30.

<sup>37</sup> Moḥamad F. al-Baghawī, *Ma 'ālim al-Tanzīl fī Tafṣīr al-Qur 'ān* [Features of the Revelation in the Interpretation of the Qura'n], vol. 1 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār 'Iḥyā' al-Turāth, 1999), 102.

<sup>38</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 2:30.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, 2:30, 33.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, 2:30.

<sup>41</sup> Mohammad S. Ṭanṭawī, *al-Tafṣīr al-Wasīl lil-Qur 'ān al-Karīm* [Intermediate Interpretation of the Holy Qur'an], vol.1 (Cairo: Dar al-Nahḍah lil-Ṭibā'ah wa al-Nashr, 1997), 96.

<sup>42</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 2:33.

<sup>43</sup> Mona Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (London, New York: Taylor & Francis Group: Routledge, 1992).

<sup>44</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 2:32.

<sup>45</sup> 'Aabbās Ḥasan, *al-Naḥu al-Wāfī* [Adequate Grammar], vol. 1 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 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.<sup>46</sup> Accordingly, “*ḍamīr al-faṣl*” is used in this context to emphasise the meaning of the preceding noun. This is achieved through “*al-ḥaṣr*” (the restriction mode). Moreover, this restriction is considered “*qaṣr qalb*,” to restrict All-knowledge and All-wisdom to God alone. This is to confront the angels’ belief that they have knowledge and wisdom.<sup>47</sup> This type of restriction can be also considered “*qaṣr ḥaqīqī*,” since it tends to limit All-knowledge and All-wisdom to God Exalted.<sup>48</sup> 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.”<sup>49</sup> 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 2: Emphasis in the Dialogue between God and Adam (*Ādam*)**

Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue	Arberry’s Translation	al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation
وَقَسَمْتُ لَهُمَا إِنِّي لَكُمْ لَمِنَ النَّاصِحِينَ (21)	21. And he swore to them, “Truly, I am for you a sincere adviser.” left align text; right align numbers	21. And he [Shaitān (Satan)] swore by God to them both (saying): “Verily, I am one of the sincere well-wishers for you both.”

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 (*Hawwā*) and to eat from it wherever he and his wife will, but not to approach a particular tree lest they become evildoers.<sup>50</sup> The Qur’an presents this dialogue in other surahs, such as Surah “*al-Baqarah*” (The Cow) and Surah “*Ta Hā*” (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

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, vol. 1, 244.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, vol. 1, 416.

<sup>48</sup> Ibn ‘Āshūr, *Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 1, 416.

<sup>49</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 2:32.

<sup>50</sup> al-Mahalli and al-Suyuti, *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*, 159.

rid themselves of their negligence and be aware of their sin. It is used as a means of warning, reminding and teaching people.<sup>51</sup>

In this ayah “*wa-qāsamahumā innī lakumā lamīna al-nāṣihīna*,” which Arberry renders as “And he swore to them, ‘Truly, I am for you a sincere adviser,’”<sup>52</sup> there are three types of emphasis in Satan’s oath. This is because Satan feels that Adam and Eve do not believe him.<sup>53</sup> The three emphatic tools used in this Qur’anic passage are: the particle “*inna*” which is followed by a nominal sentence, “*al-jār wa al-majrūr*” (the preposition and the genitive noun), “*lakumā*” which is foregrounded, and the letter “*lām al-muzaḥlaqah*” (the “*la*” which is pushed away from its proper place).<sup>54</sup> 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.<sup>55</sup> Arberry compensates for some of the STL emphasis when rendering “*innanī*” 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 “*lamīna al-nāṣihīn*” when rendering it as “a sincere adviser.”<sup>56</sup> 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.”<sup>57</sup> 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.”<sup>58</sup> 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.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Zaki al-Milād, *al-Hiwār fī al-Qur’ān: Namādhij wa Mabādi’* [Dialogue in the Qur’an: Models and Principles] (Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: King Abdulaziz Center for National Dialogue, 2010), 28-29.

<sup>52</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 7:21.

<sup>53</sup> Ibn ‘Āshūr, *Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 8, 60.

<sup>54</sup> ‘Abd al-Wāhid 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-Kikr lil-Nashr wa al-Tawzī’, 1993), 394.

<sup>55</sup> Maḥmūd ‘A. al-Zamakhsharī, *Al-Kashshāf ‘an Ḥaqā’iq Ghawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl* [The Detector of the Facts of the Mystery of the Revelation], vol. 2 (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1986), 95.

<sup>56</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 7:21.

<sup>57</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 7:21.

<sup>58</sup> Baker, *In Other Words*, 124.

<sup>59</sup> Ṭanṭawī, *al-Tafsīr al-Wasīṭ*, vol. 5, 257.

*The Dialogue between God and Noah (Nūh)*

**Table 3: Emphasis in the Dialogue between God and Noah**

Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue	Arberry’s Translation	al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation
وَنَادَى نُوحٌ رَبَّهُ فَقَالَ رَبِّ إِنَّ ابْنِي مِنْ أَهْلِي وَإِنَّ وَعْدَكَ الْحَقُّ وَأَنْتَ أَحْكَمُ الْحَاكِمِينَ (45)	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.”	45. And Nūh (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.”
قَالَ يَا نُوحُ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ أَهْلِكَ إِنَّهُ عَمَلٌ غَيْرُ صَالِحٍ فَلَا تَسْأَلَنِي مَا لَيْسَ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمٌ إِنِّي أَعِظُكَ أَنْ تَكُونَ مِنَ الْجَاهِلِينَ (46)	46. Said He, “Noah, he is not of thy 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.”	46. He said: “O Nūh (Noah)! Surely, he is not of your 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.”

The story of Prophet Noah is presented in eleven surahs in the Qur’an.<sup>60</sup> 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.”<sup>61</sup> 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.<sup>62</sup> This dialogue clearly demonstrates how the messengers (such as Noah) “fully trust the truth revealed to them and see God’s victory as inevitable.”<sup>63</sup>

In this dialogue, Arberry successfully compensates for the STL emphatic particle “*inna*” in “*wa-inna wa ‘daka al-ḥaqqā*” when he renders it as “and Thy promise is surely the truth.”<sup>64</sup> Noah’s claim, “*wa inna wa ‘daka al-ḥaqqā*” (and Thy promise is surely the truth),<sup>65</sup> is “*khābar*” (information) used to indicate “*lāzim al-fā’idah*,” related to the speaker (Noah), who already knows that God’s promise is assuredly true.<sup>66</sup> However, he omits this particle, which comes

<sup>60</sup> Abdul-Samad Abdullah, “Intertext and Allusion in the Qur’anic Presentation of Noah’s Story,” *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 25, no. 4 (2008): 3.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid, 17.

<sup>62</sup> al-Mahalli and al-Suyuti, *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*, 232.

<sup>63</sup> Abdullah, “Intertext and Allusion,” 17.

<sup>64</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 11:45.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid, 11:45.

<sup>66</sup> Ibn ‘Ashūr, *Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 12, 84-85.

before a nominal sentence in “*Rabbī inna ibnī min ahlī*,” which he renders as “O my Lord, my son is of my family.”<sup>67</sup> This particle is used to emphasise Noah’s concern for his son.<sup>68</sup> 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!”<sup>69</sup> 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 evildoing, but he seeks God’s intercession.<sup>70</sup> To reveal the intended message behind such an emphatic tool, it would have been better to follow the foreignisation 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...”<sup>71</sup>

Moreover, the statement “*wa anta aḥkamu al-ḥākimīn*,” which is rendered by Arberry as: “Thou art the justest of those that judge,”<sup>72</sup> indicates Noah’s confession of God’s power. That is, nothing stands in the way of God’s judgement and decree.<sup>73</sup> 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 “*ta’rīd*” (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?<sup>74</sup> 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.”<sup>75</sup> Moreover, he saves the particle “*inna*” when adding “surely” in the following passage: “and Thy promise is surely the truth.”<sup>76</sup> However, in “*Rabbī inna ibnī min ahlī*,” which Arberry renders as “O my Lord, my son is of my family,”<sup>77</sup> he fails to compensate for the intended STL emphatic form.

God replies to Noah saying: “*innahu laysa min ahlika innahu ‘amalun ghayru ṣāliḥin*” (he is not of thy family; it is a deed not righteous).<sup>78</sup> 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*

<sup>67</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 11:45.

<sup>68</sup> Ibn ‘Āshūr, *Al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 12, 84.

<sup>69</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 11:45.

<sup>70</sup> Ibn ‘Āshūr, *Al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 12, 84-85.

<sup>71</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 11:45.

<sup>72</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 11:45.

<sup>73</sup> Ibn ‘Āshūr, *Al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 12, 85.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid*, vol. 12, 85.

<sup>75</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 11:45.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid*, 11:46.

*min ahlika*” (he is not of thy family)<sup>79</sup> due to its indication to strange information. Moreover, the use of “*innahu ‘amalun ghayru ṣāliḥin*” (it is a deed not righteous)<sup>80</sup> 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)! Surely, he is not of your family; verily, his work is unrighteous...”<sup>81</sup> 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.”<sup>82</sup> 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.<sup>83</sup> 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.<sup>84</sup> 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 (Mūsá)***

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

Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue	Arberry’s Translation	al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation
<p>فَلَمَّا أَتَاهَا نُودِيَ مِنْ شَاطِئِ الْوَادِ الْأَيْمَنِ فِي الْبُقْعَةِ الْمُبَارَكَةِ مِنَ الشَّجَرَةِ أَنْ يَا مُوسَى إِنِّي أَنَا اللَّهُ رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ (30)</p>	<p>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 all Being.'</p>	<p>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: "O Moosa (Moses)! Verily! I am Allah, the Lord of the Alameen (mankind, jinns and all that exists)!"</p>

This dialogue between God and Moses (*Mūsá*) 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’an 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

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 11:46.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Ṭanṭawī, *al-Tafsīr al-Wasīṭ*, vol. 7, 214.

<sup>84</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Maḥātib al-Ghāib: al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr* [Keys of the Unseen: the Great Interpretation], vol. 18 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ihyā’ 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.”<sup>85</sup> 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.<sup>86</sup>

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.”<sup>87</sup> 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.<sup>88</sup> 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)!”<sup>89</sup>

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 “*asfiyā’ihi al-mukhlašīn*” (those who are only believe in God alone).<sup>90</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān also successfully compensate for the cultural-specific term “*al- ‘ālamīna*” when using a loan word followed by an explanation in brackets. This word “*al- ‘ālamīna*” 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.”<sup>91</sup> “*al- ‘Alamīn*” is: “plural for `Alam, which encompasses everything in existence except Allah.”<sup>92</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān indicate the multiple meanings implied in this term when they use the loan word followed by an explanation in brackets.

<sup>85</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 28:30.

<sup>86</sup> Hafiz Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir Ibn Kathir* [The Interpretation of Ibn Kathir], trans. Safiur Rahman Al-Mubarakpuri (Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Dar-us-Salam, 2000), 397-404.

<sup>87</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 28:30.

<sup>88</sup> Ibn ‘Āshūr, *Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 16, 196.

<sup>89</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 28:30.

<sup>90</sup> Mohammad A. Abū Zahrah, *Zahrat al-Tafāsīr* [The Flower of Interpretations], vol. 9 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Fikr al-‘Arabī, 2001), 4709.

<sup>91</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 28:30.

<sup>92</sup> Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir Ibn Kathir*, vol. 1, 73.

*The Dialogue between God and Jesus (‘Īsá)*

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

Arabic Qur’anic Dialogue	Arberry’s Translation	al-Hilālī and Khān’s Translation
<p>وَإِذْ قَالَ اللَّهُ يَا عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ أَأَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمَّيَّ إِلَهَيْنِ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ قَالُوا سُبْحَانَكَ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أَقُولَ مَا لَيْسَ لِي بِحَقِّ إِنْ كُنْتُ قُلْتُهُ فَقَدْ عَلِمْتَهُ تَعْلَمَ مَا فِي نَفْسِي وَلَا أَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِكَ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ عَلَّامُ الْغُيُوبِ (116)</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>116. And (remember) when Allah will say (on the Day of Resurrection): "O Ilesa (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 innerself though I do not know what is in Yours, truly, You, only You, are the All-Knower of all that is hidden and unseen.</p>
<p>مَا قُلْتُ لَهُمْ إِلَّا مَا أَمَرْتَنِي بِهِ أَنْ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ وَكُنْتُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مَا دُمْتُ فِيهِمْ فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتُ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَنْتَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ (117)</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>117. "Never did I say to them aught except what You (Allah) did command me to say: Worship Allah, my Lord and your 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).</p>

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.”<sup>93</sup> 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.”<sup>94</sup> Jesus at the end mentions his irresponsibility for what his people will do after him.<sup>95</sup> God comments on Jesus’ response by saying: “This is the day the truthful shall be profited 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

<sup>93</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 5:116.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, 5:117.

<sup>95</sup> Sayyid Qutb, *In the Shade of the Quran*, trans. Adil Salhi (United Kingdom: Islamic Foundation, 2003), vol. 4, 248.

with Him; that is the mighty triumph.”<sup>96</sup> 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.<sup>97</sup> 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.<sup>98</sup>

Arberry’s translation of “*wa-idh qāla Allahu yā ‘Īsá ibna Maryam a’anta qulta li-alnāsi ittakhidhūnī wa-ummiya ilāhayni min dūni Allahi qāla subhānaka mā yakunu lī an aqūla mā laysa lī bi-ḥaqqin 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?’” 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’”<sup>99</sup> 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.”<sup>100</sup> 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)<sup>101</sup> is used to emphasise his answer to God, that he does not say to his people “*ittakhidhūnī wa-ummiya ilāhayni min dūni Allahi*” (Take me and my mother as gods, apart from God?).<sup>102</sup> 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.<sup>103</sup> 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.<sup>104</sup> 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.”<sup>105</sup> The particle “inna” indicates “*al-ta’līl*” (justification) and “*ḍamīr al-faṣl*” (separating pronoun), “*’anta*” indicates “*al-ḥaṣr*” (the restriction).<sup>106</sup>

On the other hand, Arberry’s translation successfully compensates for the STL emphatic tool “*ḍamīr al-faṣl*” (separating pronoun), “*anta*” in: “*flammā tawaffaytani kunt anta al-Raqība ‘alayhim wa-anta ‘lá 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

<sup>96</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 5:119.

<sup>97</sup> Sayyid Quṭb, *In the Shade of the Quran*, vol. 4, 249.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid, vol. 4, 250.

<sup>99</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 5:116.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> al-Zamakhsharī, *Al-Kashshāf*, vol. 1, 694.

<sup>104</sup> Abū Zahrah, *Zahrat al-Tafāsīr*, vol. 5, 2407.

<sup>105</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 5:116.

<sup>106</sup> Ibn ‘Āshūr, *Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 7, 115.

everything).”<sup>107</sup> “*Ḍamīr al-faṣl*” (separating pronoun), “’*anta*” is used in “*Kunt anta al-Raqība ‘alayhim*” (Thou wast Thyself the watcher over them)<sup>108</sup> to indicate “*al-ḥaṣr*” (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 ‘lá kulli shay’in shahīdun*” (Thou Thyself art witness of everything)<sup>109</sup> is used as “*tadhyīl*” (additional clause),<sup>110</sup> which means a succession of two clauses in which the second indicates the meaning of the first for the sake of emphasis.<sup>111</sup> 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)”.<sup>112</sup> 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.

<sup>107</sup> Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, 5:117.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

<sup>110</sup> Ibn ‘Ashūr, *Al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. 7, 117.

<sup>111</sup> ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ḥ. al-Dimashqī, *al-Balaghah al-‘Arabīyah* [Arabic Rhetoric], vol. 2 (Damascus, Syria Dār al-Qalam, 1996), 86.

<sup>112</sup> al-Hilālī and Khān, *The Noble Quran*, 5:117.

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.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Abdullah, Abdul-Samad. "Intertext and Allusion in the Qur'anic Presentation of Noah's Story." *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 25, no. 4 (2008): 1-20.
- Abū Zahrah, Mohammad A. *Zahrat al-Tafāsīr* [The Flower of Interpretations]. Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Fikr al-‘Arabī, 2001.
- Akbari, Monireh. "The Role of Culture in Translation." *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies* 3, no.8 (2013): 13-21.
- al-‘Akbarī, ‘Aabdu Allah, *al-Libāb fī ‘Ilal al-Binā’ wa al-‘I‘rāb* [The Core of the Issues of al-Binā’ (words which do not change the shape of their endings) and al-‘I‘rāb (the inflection)]. Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Fikr, 1995.
- al-Baghawī, Moḥamad F. *Ma‘ālim al-Tanzīl fī Tafṣīr al-Qur‘ān* [Features of the Revelation in the Interpretation of the Qur’an]. Beirut, Lebanon: Dār ‘Iḥyā’ al-Turāth, 1999.
- al-Dimashqī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. *al-Balaghah al-‘Arabīyah* [Arabic Rhetoric]. Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Qalam, 1996.
- al-Hāshimī, Muṣṭafá. *Jawāhir al-Balāghah fī al-Ma‘ānī wa al-Bayān wa al-Badī‘* [The Jewels of Rhetoric in the Science of the Meanings, Eloquence and Rhetorical Figures]. Beirut, Lebanon: al-Maktabah al-‘Aṣrīyah, 1999.
- al-Hilālī, Taqīyy al-dīn, and Muḥsin Khān. *The Noble Quran: English Translation of the Meanings and Commentary*. Saudi Arabia, al-Madinah al-Munawwarah: King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holy Qur’an, 1996.
- al-Khaṭīb, ‘Abd al-Karīm. *al-Qaṣaṣ al-Qur‘ānī fī Manṭūqihī wa mafhūmihī* [Qur’anic Stories in its Operative and Concept]. Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1975.
- al-Mahalli, Jalal al-Din, and Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti. *Tafṣīr al-Jalālayn* [The Interpretation of the Two Jalal]. Translated by Feras Hamza. Jordan, Amman: Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought, 2007.
- al-Milād, Zaki. *al-Ḥiwār fī al-Qur‘ān: Namādhij wa Mabādi’* [Dialogue in the Qur’an: Models and Principles]. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: King Abdulaziz Center for National Dialogue, 2010.
- al-Rāzī, Fakhr al-Dīn. *Mafātīḥ al-Ghāib: al-Tafṣīr al-Kabīr* [Keys of the Unseen: The Great Interpretation]. Beirut, Lebanon: Dār ‘Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1999.
- al-Thaqafī, Sanā’ M. ‘A. "al-Ḥiwār fī al-Qur‘ān wa Tanaww‘ Asālībīh" [Dialogue in the Qur’an and its Different Methods]. Paper presented at the Second International Arabic Language Conference, Dubai, May 8, 2013.
- al-Zamakhsharī, Maḥmūd ‘A. *Al-Kashshāf ‘an Ḥaqā’iq Ghawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl* [The Detector of the Facts of the Mystery of the Revelation]. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1986.
- Arberry, Arthur J. *The Koran Interpreted*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

- Ḥamīd, Ṣāliḥ ‘A. *’Uṣūl al-Ḥiwār wa Ādabihī fī al-Islām* [Rules and Regulations of Dialogue in Islam]. Makkah, Jeddah: Dar al-Manārah, 1994.
- Ḥasan, ‘Aabbās. *al-Naḥu al-Wāfi* [Adequate Grammar]. Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 2009.
- Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Ibn ‘Āshūr, Muḥammad Ṭ. *Al-Tahrīr wa al-Tanwīr: Tahrīr al-Ma‘na al-Sadīd wa Tanwīr al-’Aqil al-Jadīd min tafsīr al-Kitāb al-Majīd* [Editing and Enlightenment: Stating the Right Meaning and Enlightening the New Mind from the Interpretation of the Great Book]. Tunisia: al-Dar al-Tūnisīyah lil-Nashir, 1984.
- Ibn-Hishām, Jamāl al-Dīn. *’Awḍaḥ al-Masalik ’Ilā ’Alfīyat ’Ibn Mālik* [The Clearest Way to the Millennium of ’Ibn Mālik]. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr lil-ṭibā‘ah wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 1995.
- Ibn Kathir, Hafiz. *Tafsir Ibn Kathir* [The Interpretation of Ibn Kathir]. Translated by Safiur Rahman Al-Mubarakpuri. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Dar-us-Salam, 2000.
- Lane, Edward William. “Ḥawr.” In *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1863.
- Lefevere, André. *Translation/history/culture: A Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Mikulicová, Mlada. “Adam’s Story in the Qur’an.” *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Theologica* 4, no. 2 (2014): 277-296.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London & New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Myskja, Kjetil. Foreignisation and Resistance: Lawrence Venuti and his Critics. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12, no. 2 (2013), 1-23.
- Nida, Eugene A., and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Netherlands: Brill, 2003.
- Ozalp, Mehmet. “What is this thing called Shari’ah?” Paper submitted to the Senate hearing on multiculturalism, Australian Parliament House, March 21, 2012.
- Pym, Anthony. “Schleiermacher and the Problem of Blendlinge.” *Translation and Literature* 4, no. 1 (1995): 5-30.
- Raḥmanī, Ishāq. “Dirasat ’Uslūb al-Ḥiwār fī al-Qur’ān” [The Study of the Style of Dialogue in the Holy Qur’an]. *Al-Nur Academic Studies on Thought and Civilization* 4, no. 4 (2011): 5-6.
- Ṣāliḥ, ‘Aabd al-Wāḥid. *al-I’rāb al-Mufasssal li-Kitab Allah al-Murattal* [The Detailed Parsing of the Recited Book of God], vol. 3. Jordan, Amman: Dār al-Kikr lil-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 1993.
- Sayyid Quṭb. *In the Shade of the Quran*. Translated by Adil Salhi. United Kingdom: Islamic Foundation, 2003.

Ṭanṭawī, Mohammad S. *al-Tafsīr al-Wasīṭ lil-Qurān al-Karīm* [Intermediate Interpretation of the Holy Qur'an]. Cairo: Dar al-Nahḍah lil-Ṭibā'ah wa al-Nashr, 1997.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge, 1995.

Venuti, Lawrence. "The American Tradition." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha. London & New York: Routledge, 1997.

Yanbo, Lei. *Metaphors in Chinese Literary Translation – A Case Study of Fortress Besieged*. Macau: University of Macau, 2011.

Zamzamī, Yaḥyá M. Ḥ. A. *al-Ḥiwār 'Ādābuhū wa Ḍawābiṭuhū fī Ḍaū' al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah* [Dialogue: its Methods and Regulations in the Light of the Book and the Sunnah]. Makkah: Dar al-Tarbiyah wa al-Turāth, 1994.